


102-4
/

Theological Seminary.
PRINCETON, N. J.
ADDISON ALEX. LEITCH LIBRARY,
which was purchased of
MESSRS. R. L. & G. A. STUART

Case, I
Shelf, 7
Book, RL







Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2017 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

✓ Princeton Theological Review

THE

✓ BIBLICAL REPERTORY

AND

THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

EDITED BY AN

ASSOCIATION OF GENTLEMEN IN PRINCETON
AND ITS VICINITY.

VOL. III.—NEW SERIES.

Philadelphia:

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY

RUSSELL & MARTIEN, 22 WALNUT STREET.

Price Three Dollars a year, in advance.

1831.



CONTENTS.

No. I.

- ART. I. REVIEW OF WOODS ON INSPIRATION.
Lectures on the Inspiration of the Scriptures,
by Leonard Woods, D. D. Abbot Profes-
sor of Christian Theology in the Theolog-
ical Seminary, Andover. Published and
sold by Mark Newman. Flag & Gould,
printers. pp. 152. 3
- II. MANUAL LABOUR SCHOOLS. 22
- III. HINTS CONCERNING PRAYER MEETINGS 37
- IV. SUGGESTIONS IN VINDICATION OF THE TEM-
PERANCE SOCIETY. 44
- V. REVIEW OF PROFESSOR STUART'S LETTER TO
WILLIAM E. CHANNING, D. D.
A Letter to William E. Channing, D. D. on
the subject of Religious Liberty. By Moses
Stuart, Professor of Sacred Literature in the
Theological Seminary, Andover. Boston,
Parkins & Marvin, printers. pp. 52. 61
- VI. THE AMERICAN QUARTERLY REVIEW ON SUN-
DAY MAILS. 85
- VII. MODERN JUDAISM.
Review.—Instruction in the Mosaic Religion.
Translated from the German of J. Johlson,
teacher of an Israelitish School at Frankfort
on the Maine. By Isaac Leeser, Reader
of the Portuguese Jewish Congregation in
Philadelphia, A. M. 5590. Philadelphia, A.
Waldie, printer, 8vo. pp. 139. 134

VIII. SELECT LIST OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.	147
Biblical.	
Theology.	
Ecclesiastical History and Polity.	
Narrative.	
Sermons and Addresses.	
Miscellaneous.	

No. II.

ART. I. REVIEW OF DR. MATTHEW'S LETTERS.	
The Divine Purpose displayed in the works of Providence and Grace; in a series of Twenty Letters, addressed to an Inquiring Mind. By Rev. John Matthews, D. D., late of Shepherdstown, Virginia. Lexington, Ky. Printed and published by Thomas T. Skillman, 1828. pp. 221.	153
II. WORKS OF JOHN HOWE.	
The Works of the Reverend and learned John Howe, M. A. sometime fellow of Magdalen College, Oxon. London.	177
III. WHAT CONSTITUTES A CALL TO THE GOSPEL MINISTRY?	196
IV. ARABS OF THE DESERT.	
Notes on the Bedouins and Wahabys, collected during his travels in the East, by the late John Lewis Burckhardt, London: 1830. 4to. pp. 439.	215
V. MEMOIR AND SERMONS OF THE REV. EDWARD PAYSON, D. D.	
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. New York, J. Leavitt, 1830, 8vo. 12mo. pp. 400.	
Sermons by the late Edward Payson, D. D., Portland. Shirley and Hyde, 1828, 8vo. pp. 503.	225

VI. REVIEW OF THE PEOPLE'S RIGHT DEFENDED. The People's Right Defended: being an Examination of the Romish Principle of withholding the Scriptures from the Laity. Together with a Discussion of some other points in the Romish Controversy. By "Wickliffe." To which is appended a Discourse on Transubstantiation, by the Right Rev. John Tillotson, D. D. Lord Archbishop of Canterbury. Philadelphia: Printed by W. F. Geddes, 1831, 12mo. pp. 228.	249
VII. THE ANNUNCIATION OF MESSIAH TO OUR FIRST PARENTS. From the German of Hengstenberg.	263
VIII. THOUGHTS ON THE MENTAL AND MORAL CHARACTER OF CHRISTIAN MINISTERS.	279
IX. SELECT LIST OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.	290
Biblical.	
Theological.	
Ecclesiastical History and Polity,	
Narrative.	
Sermons and Addresses.	
Miscellaneous.	

No. III.

ART. I. REVIEW OF SPRAGUE'S LECTURES TO YOUNG PEOPLE. Lectures to Young People, by William B. Sprague, D. D. Pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church in Albany, with an Introductory Address by Samuel Miller, D. D., Professor in the Theological Seminary at Princeton. Second edition.	295
II. ADVANCEMENT OF SOCIETY. The Advancement of Society in Knowledge and Religion, by James Douglas, Esq.	306
III. PRACTICAL REMARKS ON SELF-DECEPTION IN MATTERS OF RELIGION.	319

IV. GREECE AND THE GREEK CHURCH. Observations upon the Peloponnesus and Greek Islands, made in 1829. By Rufus Ander- son, one of the Secretaries of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Mis- sions.	333
V. AN ADDRESS TO THE STUDENTS OF THE THEO- LOGICAL SEMINARY AT PRINCETON. An Address to the Students of the Theological Seminary, at Princeton, at the close of the Semi-Annual Examination, May 16, 1831. By Ashbel Green, D.D. LL. D.	350
VI. AN INQUIRY INTO THAT INABILITY UNDER WHICH THE SINNER LABOURS, AND WHETHER IT FURNISHES ANY EXCUSE FOR HIS NEGLIGENCE OF DUTY.	360
VII. THE RELIGIOUS PROSPECTS OF FRANCE.	383
VIII. THE SEVENTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE AME- RICAN SUNDAY SCHOOL UNION.	398
IX. THE CHRISTIAN SPECTATOR ON THE DOCTRINE OF IMPUTATION.	407
X. SELECT LIST OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.	444
Philological and Biblical.	
Theological.	
Narrative.	
Sermons and Addresses.	
Miscellaneous.	

No. IV.

ART. I. BIBLICAL ELOQUENCE AND POETRY.	447
--	-----

II. REVIEW.

Lectures on Infant Baptism, by Leonard Woods,
D. D. Abbot Professor of Christian Theo-
logy in the Theological Seminary at An-
dover. Published and for sale by Mark
Newman. Hogg and Gould, printers, pp.
222. 1829.

2. Essays on Christian Baptism, J. S. C. F. Frey, Pastor of the Baptist Church in Newark, N. J. Boston, published by Lincoln and Edwards, 59 Washington street, pp. 122. 1829.	
3. Infant Baptism a Scriptural ordinance; and Baptism by sprinkling lawful. By William Hamilton, A. M. Pastor of the 1st Presbyterian Church, Newark, N. J. Newark, printed by William Tuttle, 1831.	454
III. REPLY OF DR. COX,	482
IV. REMARKS ON DR. COX'S COMMUNICATION.	514
V. REVIEW.	
The Christian Ministry, with an inquiry into the causes of its inefficiency, and with an especial reference to the Ministry of the Establishment. By the Reverend Charles Bridges, B. A., Vicar of Old Newton, Suffolk, and author of "Exposition of Psalm cxix." Second edition, corrected and enlarged.	544
VI. LETTERS ON MISSIONS.	
Letters on Missions, by William Swan, Missionary in Siberia. With an Introductory Preface, by the late William Orme, Foreign Secretary of the London Missionary Society. Boston, Perkins & Marvin; New York, J. Leavitt, 12mo. pp. 288.	570
VII. SHORT NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.	582
VIII. SELECT LIST OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.	592
Theological.	
History and Biography.	
Sermons and Addresses.	
Miscellaneous.	



THE
BIBLICAL REPERTORY
AND
THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1831.

ART. I.—REVIEW OF WOODS ON INSPIRATION.

Lectures on the Inspiration of the Scriptures, by Leonard Woods, D.D., Abbot Professor of Christian Theology in the Theological Seminary, Andover. Published and sold by Mark Newman. Flagg & Gould, printers. pp. 152.

THIS little volume, written on a subject of great importance and no small difficulty, deserves the serious attention of theological students, and of all others who are solicitous to understand the true grounds of evidence on which our religion stands. Commonly, no distinction is made between the authenticity and the inspiration of the New Testament; whereas, the proof of the former does not necessarily involve that of the latter, and accordingly, many believe in the authenticity and divine origin of the New Testament, who utterly reject the doctrine of inspiration. They believe that the scriptures contain a true revelation from God, and consequently that somebody must have been commissioned to make known the Divine will; but they deny that the persons who wrote the books of the New Testament were under an infallible guidance in making those compositions; acknowledging that they were men of integrity, who delivered the truth according to the best of their knowledge and ability; yet subject to the usual prejudices and mistakes which are common to men.

VOL. III. No. I.—A

Thus, Dr. Priestley, in his "Institutes of the Christian Religion," in a very able manner vindicates the authenticity of the facts recorded in the gospels; but in the same work, expressly rejects every idea of plenary inspiration in the writers. And in our day, there are multitudes who profess to receive the Christian religion as substantially true, who have no belief in the inspiration of the sacred penmen. Indeed, this distinction is recognised by almost every writer in defence of revelation; for the first step in stating the external evidence always is, to establish the miraculous facts recorded in the New Testament, by testimony merely human. And until this is satisfactorily done, no argument can be raised for the truth and divine origin of the Christian religion. It is evident, therefore, that the proof of the inspiration of the writers of the New Testament is entirely a distinct thing from the evidence of authenticity. This distinction is clearly and justly expressed in a passage quoted by Dr. Woods from Dr. Knapp.

"These two positions," says Dr. Knapp, "*the CONTENTS of the sacred books or the DOCTRINES taught in them are of divine origin, and, the BOOKS THEMSELVES are given by inspiration of God,* are not the same, but need to be carefully distinguished. It does not follow from the arguments which prove the *doctrines* of the Scriptures to be divine, that the *books themselves* were written under a divine impulse. A revealed truth may be taught in any book; but it does not follow that the book itself is divine. We might be convinced of the truth and divinity of the Christian religion, from the mere genuineness of the books of the New Testament, and the credibility of the authors. The divinity of the Christian religion can therefore be conceived, independently of the inspiration of the Bible. This distinction was made as early as the time of Melancthon."

The importance of this subject is strongly exhibited by Dr. Woods in his preface.

"There is no subject, which is more intimately connected with the great controversy in Christian countries at the present day, and none which in its various bearings and consequences is more interesting to man, than that which is presented in the following Lectures. On the particular views we entertain of the inspiration of the Scriptures must depend our views of the Christian religion. For, if the Scriptures were written by men divinely inspired,—by those who enjoyed the infallible guidance of the Holy Spirit; then they are truly *the word of God*, and a *perfect standard of faith and practice*. The doctrines and laws which they contain, are settled by the highest authority in the universe; and our business is, not to

sit in judgment upon these doctrines and laws, and to determine whether they are right or wrong, but to understand, believe, and obey them. As soon as we discover the sense of an inspired book, we are bound to yield it our cordial assent, not indeed because we could make out that sense by the exercise of our own unaided reason, but simply on the authority of God. Our belief, resting on such a basis, is not to be moved aside by any difficulties or objections which the wisdom of this world can suggest.

“But the moment men start from this high position, *that the Scriptures are divinely inspired*, they cease to have a sure and infallible standard for their faith, and are thrown back upon human ignorance as their guide. Not regarding the Bible as the word of God, they will feel at liberty to doubt or deny any of its decisions; and the most they will do will be to use it, as they do other books, to assist them in forming a system of religion for themselves.

“The question whether the common doctrine of inspiration is true, must therefore be acknowledged to be of vast importance. The particular decision which is adopted on this question will have a direct and sensible influence upon the degree of reverence which will be felt for the Holy Scriptures; upon the manner in which they will be perused by the common Christian, and studied and interpreted by the critic and the theologian; upon the manner in which Christianity will be exhibited by the preacher, and apprehended and received by the hearer. Every thing which pertains to the doctrines and precepts of religion, and to the belief and practice of those who embrace it, will be coloured by the particular views which are entertained of the inspiration of the Scriptures. And each of the different grades of opinion which may prevail on this subject, from the direct denial of all supernatural guidance, to the belief of a plenary inspiration, will be found to produce its appropriate effect upon those who maintain it.

“Considering, then, that the subject of inspiration is calculated to have an influence which will be so powerful, and will so extensively affect the highest interests of man and the welfare of the church; we ought surely to examine it with great seriousness and candor, and with persevering diligence. And we are under very peculiar obligations to do this at the present day, because, if I mistake not the signs of the times, this subject is likely, before long, to form the dividing line between those who adhere to the evangelical doctrines of our forefathers, and those who renounce them.”

It appears, also, from the preface, that these Lectures formed a part of Dr. Woods's regular course of instruction, at the Institution in which he is a professor; and that by special request they were published in *THE SPIRIT OF THE PILGRIMS*,

in a form somewhat abridged. And we feel grateful to the respectable author, that he has thought proper to give these fruits of his long and profound reflections, on a very interesting subject, in a distinct volume. For, although we feel constrained to dissent from some of the opinions advanced by Dr. Woods, yet upon the whole, we cannot but view this as a very able work, in which the orthodox doctrine of inspiration is maintained, and some of the most formidable objections considered and obviated. It is evident that the learned author has taken profound and comprehensive views of this difficult subject, in all its bearings; and that what he here gives to the public is not the result of superficial investigation, but, as he says himself, "is the fruit of much thought."

In the first Lecture, Dr. Woods labours to remove some common mistakes on the subject of inspiration, and to furnish the reader with some salutary cautions in regard to its proper evidence.

Two questions are, in the commencement, proposed and answered. The first is, "Can the inspiration of those who wrote the Scriptures, be proved from the miracles which they performed?" The second, "Can the inspiration of those who wrote the Bible be proved from the excellency of what it contains?" Both these questions are answered in the negative, in our opinion, with too little explanation. In regard to miracles, it is said, that they "are proofs of the divine commission of those who perform them, and of the truth and authority of what they teach, but furnish no *direct* and *certain* proof that those who perform them are under divine inspiration." There seems to be some want of perspicuity and perfect accuracy in this statement. The truth is, that miracles, separate from any annunciation or declaration, prove no doctrine whatever. God, no doubt, has often wrought miracles for other purposes, than to confirm the truth of any proposition; as, for the deliverance of his servants from danger and death. Miracles alone, therefore, do not even prove that the person performing them is commissioned of God to teach any truth, unless he makes such a declaration; and if such a person declares himself to be inspired, the miracle wrought will prove this as fully as that he is sent of God. There seems, therefore, to be no just foundation for the distinction here set up; and we are apprehensive that the rejection of miracles as a proof of inspiration will lead us into inextricable difficulties; for on this basis ultimately, must the whole

weight of the external evidence rest; and indeed, Dr. Woods afterwards declares himself, that the truth of inspiration depends on the truth of the miracles.

But we have still stronger objections to the answer given to the second question; in which, if we understand the author's meaning, the whole body of internal evidence for the truth of Christianity and the inspiration of the Scriptures, is pronounced to be "unsatisfactory and inconclusive." The reason assigned is, "because we allow great excellence to what is contained in many books, which no one supposes to be inspired. Merely writing a book which contains excellent doctrines and precepts, and which exhibits them in a very impressive manner, cannot be deemed sufficient proof of the inspiration of the writer." But we would appeal to the candour of the excellent writer, whether this is a fair statement of the case. May there not be a kind and degree of excellence, which is evidently above the ability of man, or which is manifestly superior to what could have been accomplished by writers under particular circumstances. An edifice erected by man may possess great and varied excellence; but would it be just to infer from this, that we could not fairly conclude the firmament to be the work of God and not of man? If a mere child, or a man wholly unlearned, should discover that he possessed a profound knowledge of the abstruse branches of mathematical science, we might infer that he was inspired; for although this knowledge is attainable by human industry, when the requisite talents are possessed, yet it never could have been attained in a natural way by the persons supposed. What excellence of knowledge, theological and moral, men can attain by their own unassisted efforts, is made known by the experience of the world for ages: now, if an obscure nation, little cultivated by learning, is found to possess a system of theology and morals far surpassing every thing which the most learned and polished nations were ever able to reach, why may it not be inferred, that the writers of the books containing this superhuman excellence, received their doctrine from heaven; or, in other words, were inspired? Or if a few unlettered fishermen and mechanics produce books, which, for sublimity, simplicity, purity and graphical delineation of character, are inimitable; so that every attempt to equal or surpass them in these qualities fails, why may it not be inferred that these men were inspired, from the excellency of the matter contained in their writings? Accordingly, we profess,

that we have never found a deeper conviction of the inspiration of the writers of the New Testament from any external argument, than from that which is exhibited in the little work of Soame Jenyns, on the INTERNAL EVIDENCES. But this is not all; we would respectfully ask Dr. Woods, how the great body of sincere Christians obtain their conviction that the Scriptures are inspired? It will not be said, that their unwavering persuasion of this truth is merely the prejudice of education; and it is certain, that the majority of them have no distinct ideas of the external evidences of divine revelation. Their faith must depend on the view which they have obtained of the internal excellency of the truths contained in the Scriptures. Indeed, all genuine, saving faith, whether of the learned or unlearned, in our opinion, rests exclusively on this kind of evidence. It is true, *that* excellence of the Bible which is the result of divine illumination, cannot be exhibited as an argument to others, but it may be, and is, perfectly satisfactory and conclusive to the believer himself. And even to those who have no other light than their own reason, by which to judge of the excellency of the truths of the Bible, we are persuaded, that this species of evidence comes with more force, and more frequently results in an acknowledgment of the divine origin of Christianity, than any external evidences whatever. Some of the most remarkable instances of the conversion of infidels which we have ever known, have been produced simply by reading the word of God. We believe, therefore, "that the Scriptures manifest themselves to be the word of God, by their majesty and purity; by the consent of all the parts, and the scope of the whole, which is to give all glory to God; by their light and power to convince and convert sinners, to comfort and build up believers unto salvation: but the Spirit of God bearing witness by and with the Scriptures, in the heart of man, is alone able fully to persuade it, that they are the very word of God."* According to our judgment, therefore, Dr. Woods has spoken unguardedly, when he says, "Thus, every argument which has been urged in proof of inspiration, merely from the sublimity, the purity, the harmony and the efficacy of the Scriptures, will be found inconclusive." Indeed, we are so far from adopting this opinion, as to be persuaded, that if the Bible could be placed in the hands of intelligent, impartial men, who were

* Larger Catechism.

sincerely in search of truth, without the least information of its origin and history, they might fairly and confidently come to the conclusion, that the writers must have been inspired. And if the Holy Spirit should accompany the reading of the Scriptures, an unwavering conviction of their divine inspiration would be produced, as we know by the experience of every day, in regard to all those pious persons, who believe without any acquaintance with the external evidence of divine revelation.

In regard to the remainder of this Lecture, which is much the larger part, we find nothing which we do not approve; and therefore, we shall content ourselves with giving a brief analysis of its contents. The object of the writer is, to remove some common mistakes, into which we are liable to fall, and to suggest some cautions against erroneous judgments on this subject.

In the first place, it is observed, "That we are not to suppose that we can exactly understand the *manner* in which the mind is affected by inspiration of God, or *how any man knows*, that he is under infallible guidance." Next, he lays it down as a caution, "That the influence of inspiration upon the writers of Scripture, *was not confined to the revelation of new truths.*" Under this head he shows, that inspiration often serves to assist the memories of the writers to recollect what they had before known, to guide them in the selection of what is proper to be recorded, and to render them infallible in the communication of things, the knowledge of which was obtained in the common way. This remark, the writer justly considers of great importance, in judging of the inspiration of the historical books of the Old Testament.

The third caution is, "That it is no objection against the inspiration of the Scriptures, that they were written in a language completely human, and that they exhibit all the varieties in the mode of writing, which are common in other works."

The fourth is, "That it is not to be admitted as any argument against the doctrine of inspiration, that in writing the Scriptures, the sacred penmen evidently made use of their own faculties." The fifth, "That it is no objection to the inspiration of the Scriptures, that they contain many things which are, in themselves, of little value." This is a much more important consideration than at first sight it appears to be; for, nothing is more likely to create a prejudice against the doctrine of inspiration, than observing, that the Bible contains an

account of many trivial things. The same prejudice is apt to arise, in regard to the works of creation and the dispensations of Providence, and there is a close analogy between the cases. Many things in themselves are of little or no importance, but every thing, as making a part of the whole, is important; and thus, revelation would be less perfect than it is, if all events which seem trivial had been omitted. What the learned author has written on this subject is weighty, and deserves to be carefully perused. The sixth remark is, "That it is no objection to the inspiration of the Scriptures, that the real and full meaning of some passages was not known at the time they were written, or even that it remains unknown at the present time." The seventh is, that "instances of apparent disagreement among the different writers of the sacred volume, and of apparent contradiction in the same writers, are no valid objection against their inspiration." If the discrepancies are only apparent, and can be shown to be such, then the truth of the remark is self-evident, but seems to have been scarcely worthy of a distinct mention. But how shall the reader know, whether discrepancies and contradictions are real or only apparent? Until this can be ascertained, the rule here given is perfectly useless; for, while it is evident, that contradictions merely apparent prove nothing against inspiration, it is equally certain, that real contradictions would furnish the strongest evidence against the inspiration of the words in which they were found. But the true use of this caution is, to prevent hasty judgments from first appearances. There are in the Bible apparent discrepancies which can easily be reconciled by a little explanation; and there may be real contradictions in our copies, which may be owing to the mistakes of transcribers. Now, when such things are observed, there should not be a hasty conclusion that the book was not written by inspiration, but a careful and candid examination of the passages, and even when we cannot reconcile them, we should consider the circumstances under which these books have been transmitted to us, and the almost absolute certainty, that in so many ages, and in the process of such numerous transcriptions, mistakes must necessarily have occurred, and may have passed into all the copies extant.

The second Lecture in this little volume, treats a subject of great difficulty, and involves a very important principle of biblical interpretation. It relates to the manner in which citations are made from the Old Testament by the writers of the

New Testament. The objection is, "that in some instances the quotations do not agree with the original; and, that in other instances, the texts quoted are applied to subjects widely different from those to which they were originally applied." Where the quotations in the New Testament are real predictions from the Old, "there can" says our author, "be no difficulty." The real difficulty, however, is to ascertain which are predictions. If we follow the most obvious meaning of the words used, we shall conclude that all those passages cited from the Old Testament, with the formal declaration that they were *fulfilled*, in events recorded in the New Testament, are to be considered as predictions: but we are cautioned against the opinion that such words as ἵνα πληρωθῆ "that it might be fulfilled," and other phrases of the like kind, are always used to introduce a real prediction, which was then accomplished. "They are," says Dr. Woods, "often used, and with equal propriety,—I say not in the way of *accommodation*, because that word unhappily, has been employed by certain writers, to express a doctrine which I think utterly inconsistent with the character of Christ and his apostles—but to denote *a mere comparison of similar events*, to signify that the thing spoken of, answers to the words of a prophet, or that *his words may justly be applied to it*; and so may relate to what was said by an inspired writer, in describing a character which formerly appeared, or in relating an event which formerly took place, as well as to a real prediction. Accordingly, we might take a passage where it is said such a thing was done *that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet*, might express the same thing as such phrases as these, the declaration of the prophet had an accomplishment in what took place; or his words may be aptly applied to it, or they very properly express it; or his observation is true in reference to the present case; or this thing is like what the prophet describes." Such passages, according to our author's theory, are cited in the way of *illustration*. And he goes on to say, that "this mode of illustrating and impressing the truth, was common at the time the New Testament was written. "It is common too at the present time, and obviously proper at all times;" and therefore, he concludes, can be no objection against the inspiration of the New Testament writers. But as this is a principle of hermeneutics of great importance, let us hear the learned professor further in its explanation and vindication.

“ Now is it not the almost universal practice of good writers, to make quotations from previous writers, for the purpose of giving a varied and more impressive illustration of what they would teach? If there is any book which is held in high repute on account of its antiquity, the name of its author, or the excellence of its contents; from such a book quotations are frequently made. And they are made, not merely to prove a doctrine which is doubted or denied, but to give additional force to truths commonly received, and to obligations commonly acknowledged. Nor can any one doubt, that quotations from such a book are well adapted to produce such an effect. By their means, the particular truths affirmed become associated with circumstances, which impart to them a new interest, and a higher authority.

“ These remarks apply with peculiar force to the writers of the New Testament with regard to their practice of quoting from the Old. All the circumstances which can ever be supposed to influence writers to quote freely from others, were combined in their case. They held the Scriptures of the Old Testament in the highest reverence. They were taught by the prophets, and by Christ himself, to regard those Scriptures as of divine authority; as the word of God; the guide of their life; the basis of all true religion. What stronger reason could they possibly have for making continual citations from their sacred books?

“ Another circumstance which must naturally have influenced them to quote abundantly from the Old Testament, was, that they had so few books besides. And this is connected with another circumstance; namely, that they were in the habit of consulting their sacred books so constantly, and with such earnest and devout attention, that they became very intimately acquainted with them. The historical facts, the doctrines, precepts, promises, threats, and the language in which all these were conveyed;—the metaphors, similes, allegories, types, and all the peculiarities of style, found in the Scriptures, were perfectly familiar to the writers of the New Testament, and were wrought, as elements, into the habits of their minds. They imbibed not only the general spirit of their sacred books, but the mode of speaking, and the very mode of thinking, there exhibited. Whenever they undertook to treat any subject, they seemed immediately to recur to passages in the Old Testament, which either treated the same subject, or would supply some useful illustration of it. In many instances, they employed the language of the Scriptures, *as their own*; it being more familiar to them, and better suited to their purpose, than any other.

“ Were the writers of the New Testament singular in this? Do not *we* proceed in the same manner? And is not the practice so familiar, that we often do it insensibly? In our letters, in

common discourse, in prayer, and in the more formal statement and vindication of divine truth, we frequently use the language of Scripture, either in the way of exact quotation, or by quoting part of a passage, or part of several passages, just as the case requires. And Christians do this very much in proportion to the reverence they feel for the Bible, and the diligence with which they study it. Just take such authors as Owen, Watts, Doddridge, John Newton, and Edwards, and see how considerable a proportion of their writings consists of partial or entire quotations from Scripture, or allusions to it."

"This practice of quoting from the Old Testament for the general purpose of illustration, is not only proper in itself, but is, as I have already hinted, perfectly conformable to *common practice*. What is more common at the present day, than to illustrate the truths and duties of religion by a familiar citation of texts from the Scriptures? We do this sometimes in a more formal, and sometimes in a less formal manner. When the case seems to require it, we quote a particular passage exactly, naming the book, chapter, and verse. In other cases, we quote the substance and general sense of a passage in a condensed form, without regard to the exact words of Scripture. And sometimes we make an intelligible allusion to a part of Scripture which is well understood, without actually quoting either the words, or the sense. Thus, we say, such a view of the subject is according to what Christ taught his disciples of the character of those who are blessed; or according to the direction he gave respecting the treatment of a brother who offends; or according to the final commission he gave his apostles; or according to Paul's account of justification by faith. Or we say, that Paul's account of the strife between the flesh and the spirit applies to the case of every believer; taking it for granted that every one recollects what that account is. It is then perfectly evident, that the liberties which the New Testament writers use, as to the manner of making quotations from the Old Testament, are by no means greater than common practice sanctions. And it is evident too, that they are liberties of the same general character with those which we think proper at the present day."

These quotations will be sufficient to show clearly, how Dr. Woods understands this matter; but to be fully possessed of his arguments and illustrations, it will be requisite to read the whole lecture, which will richly repay the time and trouble of a careful perusal. His reference to the method so much in vogue, of making citations from the classic authors, when their words can be accommodated to express in any degree our meaning happily, and serves to shed light on the subject.

But after all that has been said so ingeniously, and so plausibly, in defence of this mode of understanding the quotations from the Old Testament, we confess that we have our misgivings. We are not prepared, however, at present, to enter into a full discussion of the subject; neither would our prescribed limits admit of it. But we will remark, in passing, that if the form of quotation, mentioned above, does not signify that the writer proposed to cite a prediction, which he supposed was then fulfilled, no words can be used which would certainly convey this idea. That frequent allusion should often be made to the language of the Old Testament, or, that the very words of Scripture should sometimes be used, when the writer only intended to apply them for illustration, is not difficult to be conceived; but when the sacred writer says, "All this was done that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by his prophet," or, "that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophets," to suppose nothing more was intended, but that the words of the prophets have some correspondence with the events now recorded, is, to say the least, a construction not the most obvious and natural. Out of a thousand readers of these passages who had never heard of any difficulty, we believe, that there would not be found one who would not conclude, that the evangelist was quoting a *real prediction*, or what he considered such.

But again, if this solemn form of citation does not uniformly mean that a prophecy was referred to, which was now supposed to be fulfilled, we would respectfully ask, how we are to know when the writers of the New Testament are applying a prophecy to events then passing? Or if this form of expression can be set aside in one case, so that it shall not be considered as referring to a real prediction, why may it not in every case where it is used? The importance of this inquiry did not escape the sagacious mind of the author of these Lectures; in the appendix he has devoted several closely printed pages to an answer. But we profess, that after perusing what is here written, we still remain unsatisfied. The first method of determining whether a passage cited is a prediction, is, by the general rules of hermeneutics, as given by such men as Ernesti, Morus, Storr, Horne, &c. And we are directed "to examine the text as it stands in the Old Testament," and having by the proper rules ascertained, that the text in question was meant to be a prediction, we may then "come to the quotation in the New Testament, prepared to believe that the

writer designedly introduces it as a prediction of the event to which he applies it; not indeed, because it is introduced by any of the formulas which are used, as they equally respect all sorts of quotations; but because an examination of the original writer shows, *that he meant it as a prediction.*"

The author then proceeds to give directions how we should proceed in doubtful cases, and illustrates his rules by a reference to Psalm xvi. 10. where, although we cannot, from the words of David taken alone, ascertain whether he meant to utter a prediction or not; yet from the explanation given by Peter and Paul, (Acts xiii. 35. 37.—ii. 25. 31) it appears with undoubted evidence, that it was indeed such.

The illustration of the case here adduced is entirely satisfactory; but there are other cases of quotations, in determining the true character of which, all the rules given would be of very little use; for the difficulty is not, whether a prophecy was intended to be uttered, but concerning its fulfilment. And to illustrate our meaning, we shall refer to that most important citation from Isaiah vii. 14. which is the first instance of quotation in the New Testament. Now, when we turn to the passage as it stands in the Old Testament, we find that the writer did mean to utter a prediction; for the words were spoken by Jehovah to Ahaz, to inform him what sign he was about to give; but when we examine the context, we find that there is nothing which would lead any one to suppose that an event very remote in time was meant; much less, that the words were intended to predict the miraculous birth of the Messiah. So far from this, they seem to be limited in their fulfilment to a short period from that time. The whole passage is this, "Moreover, the Lord spake again unto Ahaz, saying, Ask thee a sign of the Lord thy God; ask it either in the depth, or in the height above. But Ahaz said, I will not ask, neither will I tempt the LORD. And he said, hear ye now, O ye house of David; is it a small thing for you to weary men, but you will weary my God also? Therefore the LORD himself shall give you a sign, BEHOLD A VIRGIN SHALL CONCEIVE, AND BEAR A SON, AND SHALL CALL HIS NAME IMMANUEL. Butter and honey shall he eat, that he may know to refuse the evil and choose the good. For before the child shall know to refuse the evil and choose the good, the land that thou abhorrest shall be forsaken of both her kings." Now, as we cannot learn from these words, examined alone, that they were intended to refer to the Messiah, let us turn to the quotation as

given in the New Testament. But here we have no new light; for although Matthew uses a formula in citing them which would lead us at first sight, to suppose, that he intended to apply the prediction of Isaiah to the conception and birth of Jesus Christ; yet, according to the rule of Dr. Woods, we can infer nothing from this solemn form of quotation. How, then, shall we determine whether this prediction is correctly applied, or meant to be applied by the evangelist to the important event which had then occurred; or whether he only uses the language of the prophet by way of *accommodation*; (for we must use this word to express the idea, notwithstanding Dr. Woods' objections to it) because they were suited to express the fact to which he applies them, though not meant to signify any such thing by the original writer. And not long since, while perusing the learned and orthodox work of Dr. John Pyc Smith, entitled "TESTIMONY TO THE MESSIAH," we were startled upon finding that this distinguished writer and able advocate for the ancient faith, concedes, that there is here no prophecy of the Messiah, but that the language of the Old Testament is used by the evangelist in the way of *accommodation*. And it is asserted in a late number of the SPIRIT OF THE PILGRIMS, that Professor Stuart, of Andover, only admits, "that the declaration of the Lord by the prophet, in this place, is a type or symbol of the birth of Messiah, but not a prediction of that event." We are free to confess, that this single fact has filled us with doubts respecting the validity of the modern principles of interpretation, as it relates to citations from the Old Testament.

Until very lately, we presume, no Christian author ever doubted whether these words contained a glorious and explicit prediction respecting the birth of Messiah. But according to the new canons of interpretation, Dr. Smith is correct: this important text must be given up, as proving nothing; as having no reference whatever, to the event, to which Christians from the earliest ages have been in the habit of applying it. And not only so, but on these principles numerous texts besides, which, as former commentators thought, contained predictions of Christ, must be relinquished. And we are apprehensive, that instead of finding Christ every where in the Old Testament, we shall be in danger of finding him nowhere. Even that famous prophecy, Isaiah liii. which Dr. Woods says, "cannot without violence, be understood as relating to any but the Messiah," has been by some commentators refer-

red to other objects; and by others has not been considered a prediction at all. We are, we confess, afraid of what Flatt, in his *Essay on Inspiration*, appended to this volume, calls *the new exegesis*: and although he is called orthodox, and professes to defend the orthodox doctrine of inspiration, as formerly held by the church; yet it is such a defence as actually betrays the cause; so cold and feeble is his essay, that we should have been better pleased if Dr. Woods had left it in the obscurity of its native German. Very different, however, is our opinion of the extract at the close of the Appendix, from the late work of the Rev. Daniel Wilson. This is truly excellent; and had the worthy author never written any thing besides, it would be sufficient to prove that he was a man of talents, and correct habits of thinking.

The third Lecture is occupied in the proof of the inspiration of the Old Testament, from direct assertions, and other representations in the New. On this subject there is no difficulty. The proof is abundant, and of the clearest kind.

The fourth Lecture contains the positive evidences of the inspiration of the books of the New Testament, derived from "the commission to the apostles,—from the promise of the Holy Spirit,—from the fact that the writers considered themselves inspired. Notice is taken also, of the instances in which Paul seems to disclaim inspiration: and it is shown that these passages will bear another interpretation, perfectly consistent with his being under the infallible guidance of the Holy Spirit, when he wrote them. The case of Mark and Luke, who, though not apostles, were writers of part of the New Testament, is considered, and reasons are assigned why they should also be admitted to be inspired men. The only objection which we feel to this whole argument for the inspiration of the New Testament, is, that it is defective, by reason of the omission of the evidence afforded by the internal excellence of the doctrines and precepts which it contains; but of this we have already expressed our opinion.

The fifth Lecture, takes a view "of the nature and extent of inspiration." The author very properly rejects the usual distinctions of inspiration into several kinds and degrees; for, although, in some cases, the writers possessed the knowledge required to be communicated previously, yet in these instances as well as when all the ideas were inspired, they were equally under an infallible guidance. Dr. Woods's definition of inspiration is, "a supernatural guidance or assistance afford-

ed to the sacred writers, that divine guidance or assistance having been such as entirely to guard them against error, and to lead them to write just what God saw to be suited to accomplish the ends of revelation." Although we do not admire the way in which the thing is expressed, yet we concur with Dr. Woods entirely in his views of the plenary nature of that inspiration by which the Scriptures was written.

His views, also, on the subject of the manner in which inspiration must affect the language, as well as the ideas of the books of Scripture, are, in our opinion, just; and as this is frequently a subject of inquiry and controversy among young theologians, we will give a pretty long extract on this point.

"Some have supposed, that the influence which inspired men had, related *exclusively to the thoughts or conceptions of their own minds*. But this supposition seems to me not accordant with what the inspired writers themselves advance on the subject. Far be it from me to attempt an explanation of the specific mode of the divine agency in the work of inspiration. But as the writers of Scripture nowhere limit the divine influence which they enjoyed, to the conceptions of their own minds; neither would I do it. And as there are some texts which, according to any fair interpretation, clearly imply that the divine guidance afforded to inspired men, had, in an important sense, a respect to their language; how can I entertain any further doubt? And I find myself still more satisfied by considering the cases, in which the apostles and other Christians were miraculously assisted to speak with *other tongues*; because, in all these cases, the agency of the Spirit related directly to the language they used. The very fact necessarily implies this. For to say that the divine Spirit assisted them to speak in a foreign language which they had not learned, and yet that the divine assistance afforded them had no respect to *language*, would be a contradiction. The remarkable instance of divine agency, now referred to, should at least prevent us from asserting in unqualified terms, that divine inspiration in the Apostles could have had no respect whatever to their language.

"The general doctrine of inspiration, understood in any proper sense, seems clearly to imply, that the divine influence which the Prophets and Apostles enjoyed, must have pertained, in some way, to the manner in which they communicated divine truth. For can we suppose that God moved his servants to write a particular doctrine or fact, and yet did not influence them to write it in a suitable manner?—that, after prompting them to communicate something of consequence, he so abandoned them, that they were liable, as every man without divine assistance is, to fall into mistakes, or

to make the communication in a manner less proper in itself, and less agreeable to the mind of God, than some other."

The learned author then proceeds to answer some plausible objections to the opinion which he advocates. The first of which is, "that the language employed by the inspired writers exhibits no marks of a divine interference, but is perfectly conformed to the genius and taste of the writers." While the fact is admitted, it is denied that it interferes with the theory advanced; for it is not pretended that the writers were in all cases furnished with words which they would not have themselves selected, but only that in making their selection, they were under such a superintendance as preserved them from employing unsuitable language. Another objection is, "That even the same doctrine is taught and the same event described in a different manner, by different writers." The fact is here also admitted, but it is shown to be perfectly consistent with the view taken of this subject. But the strongest objection is, "That the supposition of a divine influence, in this respect, is wholly unnecessary." This may justly be denied, for a truth clearly conceived in the mind may be unhappily expressed, through ignorance or inadvertence; and in that case, the truth would be imperfectly communicated, and the very end of inspiration would be partially defeated. The truth is, that we may as well concede, that the sacred penmen were capable of writing many parts of the sacred volume without any divine influence, as that they were able to clothe their ideas always in the proper language, without the aid of inspiration. It is true, they could have written, both as to ideas and language, substantially, what is found in some of their narratives; because, both the facts and the words were familiar to their minds; but in judging what was in every case proper to be said or omitted, they would have been liable to error; and in the narration of facts with which they were most intimately acquainted, through the imbecility of the human mind, they might have fallen into some mistake. And so, in the selection of their language, they would have been equally liable to error; and plenary inspiration, which extended only to the conceptions of the mind and not to the words, would fail of accomplishing the end designed.

This point is considered of so much importance by Dr. Woods, that he adduces several arguments from Scripture, in addition to his general reasons, to confirm it. The first is derived from the miraculous gift of tongues. The second,

from the fact that the inspired writers had not, in some instances, a clear understanding of the things which they spoke or wrote. And thirdly, he argues from the texts of Scripture where inspiration is expressly mentioned, in favour of the doctrine which he maintains.

In the sixth and last Lecture, the principles of the preceding are applied to some particular cases: and, we were pleased to observe, that the first instance adduced, was the book of Job; concerning the right interpretation of which, we have felt no small perplexity, for a long time.

The difficulty is not in relation to the inspiration of the writer of this book, whoever he might be; but to the discourses of Job himself, and of his friends. Now the question is, whether these sublime discourses are to be considered as all given by inspiration; or, whether any part of them are inspired. Against the first supposition, it seems to be an unanswerable objection, that God himself declares that these men were in error, in their controversy with Job; and he himself was reproved for some of his speeches, which are of such a kind that they could not have been dictated by the Holy Spirit. And if all their discourses were not inspired, but only a part, how is it possible for us to distinguish between what was spoken by inspiration of the Spirit, and what was the fruit of their own unassisted minds. But, on the other hand, if we determine that no part of these discourses were inspired, we contradict the uniform opinion of theologians, ancient and modern, who have even treated the declarations of Job and Elihu at least, as the words of inspiration; and have fully adduced texts from them, and also from the other speakers, in proof of the most important doctrines. We did hope, when we saw this example brought forward, that we should find some solution of this difficulty, by one who has so profoundly studied the whole subject. But we confess that we have been disappointed. We have, indeed, no special objection to what Dr. Woods says in relation to this book, but we are of opinion, that he has left the difficulty where he found it. "The Holy Spirit prompted the writer," says our author, "to write a sacred poem, consisting chiefly of a dialogue between Job and his three friends, and of a solemn address to Job from the Creator and Sovereign of the world. The inspired writer was enabled to frame such a dialogue, and such an address from God, as should be agreeable to nature and truth, and convey with clearness and force the most im-

portant knowledge respecting God and man." Very good; but how are we to distinguish truth from error in this important dialogue? When Job says, "I know that my Redeemer liveth, &c." are we to consider this as an inspired prediction of the Messiah? and if so, are all Job's words to be so taken? And so of the elevated sayings of his friends.

But we shall dismiss this perplexing subject, and hasten to the conclusion of our review, already too much extended, by observing, that the remainder of this Lecture is occupied with important remarks, "on the perfection of the Bible," on "the firmness of the basis on which our belief in the peculiar doctrines of the Gospel rests;" on the regard which we ought to pay to the Bible as the standard of our faith, and the source of our religious knowledge. He teaches, "that those authors who deny the inspiration of the Bible, are to be regarded as dangerous guides in respect to the principles of religion, and are to be read and studied with great caution." Also, "that those who disbelieve the doctrines, or who despise or neglect the precepts contained in the Bible, subject themselves to a heavy charge of presumption and impiety,—and, finally, he concludes with observing, "How important is the work of explaining and inculcating the Word of God, and disseminating it through the world." On all these points we most cordially concur in the sentiments expressed by Dr. Woods; and although we have presumed to question the correctness of some of his positions, in the preceding parts of the volume, we are persuaded, that he will be the last man in the community to be offended with our freedom. The subject is far more difficult than is commonly supposed; and has been far less discussed, than its importance demands. In the general view of inspiration, we entirely agree with Dr. Woods, and have been instructed and gratified by his little volume. Indeed, we consider it as an important accession to our theological literature, and as supplying a *desideratum* to students of theology. And our prevailing reason for reviewing it in the Biblical Repertory, is, to bring it, as far as our influence extends, into more extensive circulation, for we have reason to think, that in this part of the country, it has, as yet, fallen into the hands of but few persons. We would, therefore, cordially recommend this little volume to the careful perusal of our readers, and especially to students of theology and young ministers; for we are persuaded, that this will become one of the most frequent grounds of controversy

with the enemies of evangelical truth. On this ground the assault has been most successfully made in Germany, and we shall soon have neology in its most abhorrent form imported into this country. Indeed, it is already here, and only needs the German literature to give it support; and let it be remembered, that the conquest over truth was there made by little and little, and, instead of conceding any part of the principles of truth, let us be determined "to contend earnestly for the whole faith."

If we might take the liberty of suggesting a hint to the reverend author, it would be, that in a second edition, which we hope will be soon called for, the work should be considerably enlarged, so as to give room for the full discussion of some points, not sufficiently examined in these Lectures.

ART. II.—MANUAL LABOUR SCHOOLS.

To the Editors of the Biblical Repertory and Theological Review.

GENTLEMEN,

I should be gratified to have your opinion, or that of some one of your correspondents, on what are called Manual Labour Schools, in which it is proposed to give young men, in indigent circumstances, an opportunity of paying for their education, at least in part, by their own industry. Will three or four hours labour each day interfere with their progress in learning, or be injurious to their future usefulness? What is the best mode of conducting these establishments? What proportion of the expense of his education may an industrious young man be expected to defray? Especially, I should like to know, whether a young man, in a course of education for the gospel ministry, who has an opportunity of attending one of these working schools, or who is in such a situation that he may earn something, however small, ought to receive any assistance from education societies, or others, if, from pride or indolence, or any other cause, he neglects to do what he can in paying for his education? In a word, I should be pleased to have your views on the subject, generally, or on any particular branches of it.

With great respect, I have the honour to be,

A FARMER.

Whatever may have been the motives, which dictated the above inquiries, we consider the subject one of great practical importance, and deserving a serious and candid consideration. Without pledging ourselves to answer all of the foregoing questions, we shall make a few remarks on the subject.

Respecting the best method of conducting Manual Labour Schools, we feel and acknowledge our incompetence to give instructions; because our experience and observation do not authorize us to give a decided opinion. Besides, the experiment is one of recent date, and sufficient time has not yet elapsed to enable those best acquainted with the existing establishments to decide on the best mode of operation. It ought not to discourage the friends of this enterprise, if in a few cases a total failure should occur. It is thus with all other kinds of business. The projectors of enterprises the most useful to their country and to the world, have not unfrequently failed. Errors have been detected, improvements have been made, and the work, by repeated efforts, has at last been brought to a successful issue. Of the ultimate success of the plan of uniting manual labour with mental improvement, we have not the smallest doubt. By this means, we confidently hope, many energetic and honest hearted men will be raised from obscurity, to occupy stations of distinguished usefulness.

There is one error, however, likely to exist in the minds both of the patrons and pupils of these schools, which ought to be avoided, because, in our opinion, it will lead to disappointment, and will have a tendency to retard the final success which we anticipate. The error to which we refer, is, *expecting too much profit from the labour of young men engaged in a course of study.* Some benevolent and liberal men may imagine, that when they have contributed the means to commence an establishment of this kind, young men destitute of all other resources, will be able to work their way through a course of studies, without farther aid; and young men may commence their studies with similar expectations; and the consequences in both cases must be injurious. That a few young men, in peculiarly advantageous circumstances, may support themselves during their education, is admitted, because it has been done. But that all worthy of patronage with a view to the ministry of the gospel, can do so, ought not to be expected. And in a large school, founded on the principle of Manual Labour, instances will be extremely rare

of young men carrying themselves through their preparatory studies, solely by their own industry. All cannot find such profitable employment, as an individual in peculiar circumstances may find. Yet these schools, as regards the great body of indigent youth, are unquestionably more economical than if the same persons were scattered in various situations: because, in the latter case, nine-tenths of them could find no profitable employment, and at the same time have the advantages of competent instruction.

Bodily labour, to a certain extent, we maintain, is salutary, contributes to health, and prepares the mind for vigorous and successful action; but, carried beyond that point, it produces lassitude, torpor, and an irresistible tendency to repose. Consequently, if labour be extended beyond the degree necessary for the preservation of health, it must retard, or totally defeat the attainment of the object proposed. What proportion of the expense of his education a young man may defray by his industry, can be ascertained only by experience: and on this point the experiments are not sufficiently numerous to enable us to form any definite estimate. Besides, the profits of the same establishment, directed with the same economy and industry, will vary with the price of provisions, the demand for the articles produced, and many other circumstances incapable of enumeration. Yet, in the most favourable circumstances, it cannot reasonably be expected, that a young man, without interfering very materially with his improvement, can support himself by his own labour. The labour of apprentices for several years, is generally deemed barely sufficient to pay for their food and clothing, and the instruction received from their employers. In a majority of cases, the young men who enter our Labouring Schools, are not superior in skill and manual dexterity to common apprentices, in the work to be performed, whether it be in agriculture, gardening, or the mechanical arts. Besides, apprentices who devote their whole time and attention to a single object, must have a great advantage over those with whom labour is considered only a secondary concern. Three or four hours, daily, is as much time as, in our opinion, can be spent in labour, consistently with intellectual improvement.

From these considerations, we conclude, that it ought not to be expected of young men in a course of education, to support themselves by their personal industry. What proportion of

their expense may be paid in this way, must, as we have before said, be ascertained by experience.

The inference fairly deducible from the preceding remarks is, that young men, who are labouring to prepare themselves for usefulness in the Church, where their service is greatly needed, and where there is little probability of a worldly remuneration, ought not to be suffered to struggle alone, unaided by their Christian brethren, to whom the Lord has given the means.

We think there could be nothing unreasonable in the demand, if we should say, that such as have to labour for their own daily support, ought to contribute a part of their earnings to the education of indigent and pious young men preparing for the gospel ministry. By what rule of equity does it appear, that young men should abandon lucrative employments, labour with their own hands with a design to prepare themselves for a work, in which, if they have a just view of the prospect before them, they cannot anticipate a high earthly recompense, while others, partakers of the same hopes, and under the same obligations to their common Lord and Master, do nothing? And if the poor should give to this cause, ought not the rich, and all classes, according as the Lord has prospered them, to aid in preparing labourers to gather in the plenteous harvest now ready for the sickle? Shall the enterprise of sending the gospel to the heathen fail for want of labourers? Shall those stations which are now occupied, and where the Missionaries are fainting under excessive labours, (stimulated by the success which attends their efforts, and the demands of surrounding thousands hungering for the bread of life,) be abandoned? Will not the churches and congregations springing up in the new settlements, wherever a zealous and faithful Christian Missionary sets his foot, excite our organized churches, and all who regard the welfare of their country, to do something in preparing more men to go forth and occupy other fields equally promising? Shall this favourable moment for securing the temporal and eternal interests of the extensive and fertile regions now opening in the South and West, be permitted to pass unimproved?

There is a call for Missionaries and for Pastors to supply the vacancies daily occurring in churches already established; and there are demands for the means of their support. Yet we verily believe, that the calls of the education-cause are at this moment louder than any other. The necessity of contributing for the support of those actually engaged in ministerial labour

is seen and felt, the more easily, because the beneficial results are immediately experienced. But the services which those engaged in a course of preparatory study may render are distant, and, in some respects, uncertain. In agriculture, the preparation of the ground and the sowing of the seed, are as necessary as the ingathering of the crop ; and no prudent man would exhaust all resources on the one to the neglect of the other. Competent and faithful ministers of the gospel are, at the present moment, more needed to supply the destitute in our own borders, and to evangelize the world, than any thing else ; and how are they to be obtained ? Who are to furnish the means of acquiring a suitable education ? Shall we wait until the Lord disposes the hearts of those educated at the expense of their parents, to engage in this work ? In ages past, Protestant Christendom has depended chiefly on this mode of providing Pastors and Missionaries ; and many congregations have remained vacant, and in heathen lands, generation after generation has passed away without hearing that the Son of God died for sinful men.

In the first ages of the Christian Church, the Lord prepared men in a miraculous manner to preach the gospel. So also, he gave the Israelites, during their journey in the wilderness, bread from heaven ; but, after they were settled in Canaan, he required them to provide their sustenance by the cultivation of the earth. When the Divine Redeemer ascended to heaven he issued the command, *Go preach the gospel to every creature.* Those, who, duly qualified, have gone forth in obedience to this command, and those who have contributed the means of preparing them for the work, or of sustaining them when engaged in it, have done well. But in what way do multitudes of professed Christians comply with this command of the ascending Saviour ? Perhaps they aid in supporting the minister of their own parish. It is well. Still we ask, what hand have they in preaching, or in causing the Gospel to be preached to every creature ? What are they doing to qualify men for this work, or to sustain them when preaching to those who are destitute of the means or of the heart to give a necessary support ? We leave it to the consciences of professed Christians to answer these questions ; and we ask again, what must be done to answer the calls, repeated from almost every quarter, for pious and competent ministers ?

If a sufficient number already educated, are not found willing to enter on this self-denying work, shall such as offer

with perhaps warm and honest hearts, but destitute of suitable education, be sent to preach to shrewd and intelligent men, who would sneer at the ignorance which such persons would necessarily betray in their private intercourse and public ministrations? So urgent is the demand for gospel ministers in some places, that ecclesiastical judicatures, in connexion with the Presbyterian Church, are authorizing young men, with very little previous study, to preach the gospel. Such a procedure, if it continue, will, in our opinion, be eventually fatal to the best interests of piety. The ministrations of ignorant men must soon fall into contempt with the intelligent part of the community; and then divisions will take place, and various sects spring up, in places where all might have been united under the ministrations of a man qualified for his office.

What means can be used to avert these evils, and to supply the demand for pious, devoted and competent messengers of Jesus Christ? We answer, let individuals, and let the churches aid those pious indigent young men, who are willing to make many sacrifices, to submit to a course of laborious study, in order to qualify themselves for the important work of preaching the gospel, and managing the concerns of the Church of God. Let Christians beware, that they do not expect young men looking towards the ministry of the word, to perform impossibilities; to make the necessary attainments in learning, and at the same time, to sustain themselves entirely by the labour of their own hands.

In answer to the question on which our correspondent is particularly desirous to have our opinion, viz: Whether indigent young men, who, from any cause, neglect to provide as far as practicable for their support during their education, ought to receive any assistance from education societies, and others; we answer, that as a general rule, young men in the circumstances supposed, ought to make every exertion by economy and industry, consistent with their intellectual improvement, to diminish the expense of their education to the church by which they are patronised. And, whenever this can be done by industry requiring bodily exertion, we deem this method preferable to any other.

In the first place, because manual labour promotes health and gives that firmness of constitution, necessary in order to perform the arduous duties of the gospel ministry. With a laudable view of aiding themselves as much as possible in their education, many young men teach schools a part of the

year. To this course we object, because the employment is sedentary, and more debilitating, when faithfully performed, than close personal study. At the close of his quarter, the teacher feels more need of relaxation than when he left the academy or college. Besides, a school cannot be obtained for a less period than a quarter, and so long a period will not correspond with the vacations in any of our public schools. The time lost, cannot be redeemed without such intense application as is perilous to health. If a young man must teach a school in order to acquire the means of prosecuting his studies, he ought, in our opinion, to devote one or two years exclusively to the business, and then to return to his studies with the means he has acquired; so that he may not derange the classes, or fall behind a majority of the students in the institution to which he belongs. To be absent any part of the regular term of study, will infallibly lead to imperfect and superficial attainments in knowledge.

The plan of uniting manual labour with daily study, appears to us a most happy invention, admirably adapted to preserve the health, as well as to aid in the support of those who are destitute of other means.

In every institution, from the grammar school to the theological seminary, we every year hear of some of our most promising young men losing their health, being compelled to abandon their studies, and not unfrequently falling victims to diseases arising from sedentary habits. This is especially the case with young men taken from active life, and confined within the walls of a literary or theological institution. The change is too great for human nature to bear. Suddenly to pass from a sedentary mode of life to one extremely laborious, is generally considered dangerous to health; and, we apprehend, that an immediate change from activity and open air, to the torpidity of the study, and the confined atmosphere of the school room, is likely to be still more fatal. On this subject, there is no need of examining causes, and of showing their tendency to produce the effects anticipated: experience speaks in a language too plain to be misunderstood, and in a tone too authoritative to be neglected. Young men of vigorous frames, accustomed to an active life, are the first to feel the effects of confinement and application to study. Of this class are a majority of those, who commence a course of study expressly with a view to the Gospel ministry. The habits of these young men are too sedate, to permit them to engage with

alacrity in those gymnastic exercises, introduced into some of our literary institutions, with a view to preserve the health and promote the agility and strength of the students. We doubt whether persons of this character, would take such an interest in these feats of agility, as is necessary in order to attain the end proposed. Boys play, because they love to play, and when the book is in their hands, they long for the hour to arrive, when they shall have an opportunity of excelling their companions in some feat of activity or strength. These motives will not operate on the youth whose interest we are considering. To exercise solely with a view to promote health, like eating without an appetite merely to sustain life, can seldom be beneficial.

Manual labour has all the advantages, as far as health is concerned, that can be anticipated from gymnastics. To use the saw, the plane, the axe, or the hoe, will excite perspiration, expand the chest, and give strength to the muscles, as effectually as to climb a rope, to mount a ladder, or to turn a somerset; and while employed in manual labour, the student can indulge the pleasing idea, that he is doing something useful to himself or others. We have, it is true, no conscientious objections to gymnastic exercises. We should recommend them to youth of all descriptions, where exercise of a different character is not attainable.

Again, the practice of some useful branch of industry, is important to young men who have in view the Gospel ministry; inasmuch as the habits and skill thus acquired, may be convenient and necessary in future life. What is it that a majority of those who are preparing to preach the Gospel have reason to expect in future life? Can they anticipate a full and competent support from the people among whom they may labour? Is this the fact with regard to a majority of those now located in villages and agricultural districts? A large portion of them derive a part of their support from teaching schools, or from cultivating the earth. And what grounds have those now preparing for the ministry to expect an easier lot than that of their predecessors? In many cases, the people are not able, and in others they are not willing, to give a minister an adequate support. In these circumstances, a man acquainted with gardening or farming, may support his family on a salary not half sufficient without the aid of a small lot of ground. Suppose he does not perform much of the manual labour himself, (as he cannot, and ought not, if he devotes his time and

strength to the spiritual interests of the people,) it is important to know how his little concerns should be managed; unless he knows what service he ought to expect from those he employs, and how their labour can be advantageously directed, he will lose by every attempt to provide bread for his family in this way. If he has learned the use of mechanical tools, he can with his own hands, furnish his family with many necessaries and comforts, without which they must suffer; or, he must call a mechanic, at considerable expense, to drive a nail, to fix a latch, or to make a bench. We have known some men so ignorant of these small matters, and so utterly helpless, that their families actually suffered, when at the same time they were receiving an income sufficient, with skilful management to afford every necessary. We have known others of the same character, who were obliged to call on their people for a much larger support than would have been sufficient, with skilful economy. Now, is this right, is it honest, in a young man, having in view the gospel ministry, to form such habits that he must tax the church for a much larger amount, than with different habits would be necessary for his support?

Among people who obtain a living by personal labour, a minister loses much of his respectability and usefulness, by ignorance of the common concerns of life, and an incapacity to do any thing for the support and comfort of his family. The idea not unfrequently arises in their minds, that he entered the pulpit, because he was fit for nothing else. On the other hand, if they see that their minister knows how things ought to be done, and that he is willing, when necessity requires, to use his hands and to help himself, they conclude that he had some other motive in entering the sacred desk, than to get a living. In a missionary, among a rude and ignorant people, a knowledge of agriculture, or of some mechanical art, seems almost indispensably requisite, not only as a means of subsistence, but also of making a favourable impression on the minds of those destitute of the comforts of civilized life. If the savage do not see that the Christian is superior to himself in the arts which minister to human comfort, he will be slow to receive his instructions respecting the means of future happiness.

It is admitted, that a minister may be placed in such circumstances, that he shall have no occasion to use his hands, and that it would not be his duty to spend a moment of his time in manual labour. In these circumstances, he can easily desist from labour, and accommodate himself to his situation: but he

cannot, in early life, if his hands have never touched a spade or axe, dig his garden, or cut wood to warm his study or to cook his dinner.

We would, by no means, wish to intimate that ministers of the gospel ought to depend on a secular employment for support. A people never adopt a more mistaken policy than when they take such measures as tend to produce this result. The inevitable consequence is, that their minister becomes completely secularized. The business which occupies a great part of his time, will occupy a great part of his thoughts. When a religious society purchase a large parsonage or farm, and expect their minister to provide for his support by his own management and industry, they do all in their power to tempt him to neglect the duties to which he has consecrated his life. No man can be faithful to his vows, who suffers himself to be so entangled with worldly engagements, that the Sabbath and a day or two in the week, is the only time he can devote to the work of the ministry. Nothing less than absolute necessity, should induce any minister of the gospel to devote more time to secular occupations than is necessary for a relaxation from his studies and the anxieties of parochial duties. Yet in these hours of relaxation, he may do much to lessen the burden which his entire support would impose on a feeble congregation. And if a man, in his youth, has attempted no kind of manual industry, he will, in middle life, be utterly incompetent to assist himself. What would have become of the Apostle Paul, had he not learned to make tents? Paul was a regularly bred scholar; he had enjoyed, in youth, the best advantages of instruction which his age and country afforded, and, at the same time, he had learned a trade by which he could support himself when necessity required. The custom which, in former days, prevailed in some countries, of causing every young man, whatever might be his rank or fortune, to learn some useful art, by which he could obtain subsistence in a reverse of fortune, is one worthy of imitation, especially by such as have in view the gospel ministry.

The preceding remarks are, in some respects, applicable to all, whatever be their circumstances, who intend to enter the sacred ministry, and to endure hardness as good soldiers of Jesus Christ. No man who has in view a laborious service, ought to indulge himself in such an easy and indolent mode of life, as will disqualify him to bear the toils before him. In cases where no assistance is asked or received from the church,

such persons are answerable only to the Master whom they profess to serve. But the church has a right to inquire whether those whom she assists in their education, are forming such habits as will render wholly or partially useless, all the expense bestowed upon them.

There are other considerations peculiarly applicable to those under the patronage of education societies. Let it be remembered, that the widows mite and the hard earned savings of the daily labourer, have been thrown into the fund by which they are supported. It is fit that no more be drawn from this sacred fund than is indispensably necessary. And it must be gratifying to the feelings of an ingenuous young man, by his personal industry, to diminish the demands on the Lord's treasury, or to contribute the means of educating others. This he does, in fact, when he earns a part of that which is necessary to his own support. The labour which he performs, will also teach him economy in his expenses, as he knows from experience how hard it is to earn money.

The abstract question, whether a young man, preparing for the service of the church at her request, has a right to a support, has nothing to do with the view which we are now taking of the subject. The general principle may be true, and yet particular circumstances may modify its application. The Apostle Paul had a right to a maintenance, at the very time when he was labouring with his hands, lest the church should be burdened, and the glorious cause in which he was labouring impeded. Such, we conceive, is the existing state of things. The demand for competent and faithful preachers of the gospel is unexampled in the history of the church. Many young men of piety and talent are offering their services, provided they can obtain the means of qualifying themselves for the work. Funds cannot be raised to the full amount necessary for their support. In these circumstances, every candidate for the sacred office, if he has a right spirit, will consider it his privilege as well as his duty, to do something, however small, to bring more labourers into the plenteous harvest. And if a young man has not wealth accumulated by the industry of his ancestors, he has hands, which can provide, in part, for his own subsistence. If this can be done without retarding his progress in learning, if it is the most likely way to preserve his health, and to give him such habits as his future usefulness will demand, why should any one hesitate to make the attempt?

It will be admitted, that a candidate for the sacred office, who has at his command the means of his own support, ought not to be assisted; because the indigent have a stronger claim, and because his piety might very justly be questioned, if, in the existing state of the church and of the world, he be unwilling to sacrifice a part or the whole of his patrimony, in order to qualify himself for the service of the Master to whom he has devoted himself and all that he possesses. Labour is the origin of wealth. And why should not those, who have nothing to give except the labour of their own hands, be willing to throw their mite into the sacred treasury? We verily believe, that if a young man could not earn more than ten dollars a year, it would be worth more than an hundred contributed by those who have abundance. It would show that he was really in earnest in seeking the sacred office; that it was not from an aversion to labour that he devoted himself to study. And the Christian community, convinced that he was making every practicable exertion to maintain himself, would contribute freely and liberally to his support. We do believe, that if candidates for the sacred ministry would employ themselves in useful labour, whenever it could be obtained, there would be no want of funds to sustain all who are now in a course of preparation. Farmers, and mechanics, and others who labour for their maintenance, would contribute cheerfully to the good cause. The most common objection in the mouths of the industrious part of the community to aid indigent students, is, that they are lazy, and too proud to soil their hands or clothes with work which others have to do from morning to night, and from year to year. To be convinced that this motive operates, point out to these persons, who refuse to give on ordinary occasions, an individual who employs his vacations and his leisure hours in some useful employment, and they will give with a cheerful and liberal hand.

It has been feared, not without sufficient reason, that an entire exemption from the labour to which a young man has been accustomed, and from the care imposed by the necessity of providing for his own support, will have an injurious effect on his moral and religious character, when he is furnished, independent of his own exertions, with necessary subsistence. The necessity of providing, at least in part, for his own support, we conceive, is the only effectual means of preventing this injurious tendency. No promise of service to be rendered some years hence, no legal obligation to refund, with interest, at

some future day, moneys advanced for his education, will operate so powerfully in checking the pride and extravagance of youth, as the immediate exaction of a few hours of daily labour. The sacrifice of present ease, and the endurance of immediate toil, is a much safer evidence of sincerity and devotedness to the cause of Christ, than a promise to make ten-fold greater sacrifices at some distant period.

We should be among the last to require of a candidate for the gospel ministry, any thing mean and degrading; and we conceive there is nothing in the course which we recommend of this nature. Personal labour, when it does not interfere with more important duties, is honourable, and Christians, especially those who are looking forward to the service of that Master who washed his disciples feet, should beware of cherishing by their example those false notions of honour too prevalent in our country.

In institutions where some daily labour is required of all the pupils, the odium attached to manual industry is entirely removed. No one can despise his fellow for performing a service in which all are alike occupied. In other situations, where a majority of the pupils spend their hours of relaxation in lounging, in conversation, or in active sports, there will be prejudice and ridicule to be encountered by those who depart from prevailing habits. But ought young men, who are expected in future life to direct and control the moral and religious sentiments of the community, to yield to these prejudices? If they have not moral courage sufficient to sustain them in performing their duty in opposition to the false notions of a few individuals, will they hereafter be competent to resist the prejudices, to oppose the corruptions of multitudes, and to defend the cause of truth and holiness amidst a gainsaying world? *Non tali auxilio, nec defensoribus istis tempus eget.* The present state of our country, the perfect freedom with which men express and publish their sentiments on all subjects, and especially the opposition likely to be made to evangelical doctrines and Christian practice, will demand men of more stable purpose and firmer nerve, than to be deterred in the discharge of duty, by the remarks and sneers of a few inconsiderate youth. The apprehension of reproach arising from this cause is, we are persuaded, far greater than will be realized when the experiment is made. Let three or four young men in our most distinguished literary institutions, commence some manual operation, and we venture to predict that, in six

months, their invigorated health, their progress in study, their exemplary conduct, will silence every reproachful tongue.

We by no means think it necessary that labour should be confined exclusively to institutions in which all are required to work. Every Academy and College and Theological Seminary in the United States, might make such arrangements as would give employment to a few frugal and industrious young men. In these cases, let the period of daily labour never exceed the hours of relaxation given to the other students, and we are confident that the literary and scientific progress of the youth thus employed, will not be retarded.

If those who have the distribution of funds collected to aid indigent young men in their education, should make it an indispensable condition, that those assisted labour whenever employment can be found, we see nothing hard or unreasonable in the terms. We know respectable mechanics and farmers, able and willing to give their sons a liberal education, who require them in vacations, and in hours of relaxation from study, to assist in their shops and on their farms. This plan is adopted rather from a regard to the health and future benefit of their sons than for the sake of immediate profit.

Perhaps it may be thought, that young men of promising talents and feeble or impaired health, ought to be an exception to the general rule. So far from forming an exception, these are the persons who ought to spend a large portion of their time in such invigorating occupations as are suited to their strength. It is the most likely means of restoring them to health, and of giving them a constitution able to endure the studies and labours of the profession in prospect. Or if their constitution be so broken that they are unable to bear a few hours of moderate daily labour, they ought not to be aided by funds consecrated to a sacred object. They would probably sink under the pressure of preparatory studies; or, if they entered the ministry, they would perform a short and inefficient service.

We cannot forbear to remark, that the state of our country is peculiarly favourable to the success of this mode of educating young men. Labour of all kinds is high, compared with the expense of living. In the crowded population of Europe, where the greatest labour which the human frame can bear, is hardly sufficient to furnish the necessaries of life, this method is impracticable. In this new and growing country, the value

of labour bears a larger proportion to the means of subsistence than in any other part of the world. And this fact seems to be a plain indication of Divine Providence, that the method which we have contemplated ought to be employed in preparing for the ministry men qualified to extend the influence and blessings of the gospel in the large regions rapidly increasing in population in our own country, as well as in furnishing missionaries for foreign lands.

The question now arises, can young men of piety and talent, in sufficient number, be found, willing to undergo this toil, and to prepare themselves by a long course of discipline and study, for the sacred ministry? We answer, unhesitatingly, such young men can be found. All that is necessary is, to afford them the requisite facilities, and to show them the importance and necessity of this course, and men such as the cause of Christ needs, will be found. The fact, that hundreds of young men, under circumstances more discouraging than we have recommended, are already thus labouring in different parts of our country, is proof that others will appear when the necessary facilities are provided. On what grounds can a young man of right spirit, refuse to submit to the discipline proposed? The labour recommended is necessary for the preservation of health; the discipline is necessary for future comfort and usefulness; the attempt of each one to aid himself as much as practicable, will excite the sympathies of the Christian community, and open ten thousand purses now sealed against all calls of this nature. And is the youth who is now so delicate that he cannot endure a few hours labour, the man who is hereafter amidst rain and snow, or under a burning sun, to traverse the wilderness, to sleep in an open cabin, and to preach under the canopy of the heavens? Is the youth who will not exert a muscle or move a limb to aid in his education, the man who is hereafter to preach self-denial and liberality, and to rouse the slumbering churches to assist in evangelizing the world? Is he who is now ashamed to touch an instrument of husbandry, the man who is hereafter to teach humility, to inculcate on his hearers to labour with their own hands, so that they may have something to give in aid of every Christian enterprise? To these and similar considerations, we are very confident that no young man, worthy to be entrusted with the sacred ministry, can feel indifferent.

In conclusion, we do not hesitate to say, that no person constitutionally or habitually indolent, ought to be aided with a

view to the gospel ministry. Much less should those who are too proud to submit to such labour as would diminish the necessary demands on the Lord's treasury.

ART. III.—HINTS CONCERNING PRAYER MEETINGS.

It will here be taken for granted, that social meetings for prayer and praise, usually called *Prayer Meetings*, are founded in reason and scripture, and that all experience is strongly in their favour. Many centuries ago, when danger arose to the Jews in Persia, from the conspiracy of Haman, we find Esther and her maidens betaking themselves to social devotion in the palace, while Mordecai and his companions were engaged in the same manner without. So it has been with the pious in every age. All the sincere disciples of Christ not only love their Master, but also love their fellow disciples, delight in their company, love to mingle sentiments, desires and affection in pious conversation, and before the throne of grace; and whenever religion is in a flourishing state in their hearts, will spontaneously come together, as often as their other duties will conveniently allow, mutually to receive and impart benefit, to warm the love, and stimulate the activity of each other, in the best of all causes. It may be confidently asserted, that true religion was never in a lively state, since the days of Paul to the present hour, without prompting its genuine possessors to seek the company of each other, for mutual comfort and growth in grace. Accordingly, it is impossible, as it appears to the writer of these pages, to peruse the New Testament Scriptures, without finding ample confirmation of this statement. No sooner had the effusion of the Holy Spirit, on the day of Pentecost, taken place, than a general spirit of prayer seemed to rest on the people. They seem to have assembled for prayer "daily," and "from house to house." When Peter was imprisoned, special prayer was made by the members of the church of God for him. And when he was delivered out of prison, by miraculous interposition, in answer to prayers, he went immediately to the house of a Christian friend, and there he found a little warm-hearted circle of believers assembled, and actually engaged in prayer when he knocked at the door, perhaps praying for that very deliverance of the servant of God which had been, but a few minutes before effected, and

now, to their unspeakable joy, announced to them by the subject of their intercession in person.

What happened in the apostolic age, when religion was revived, has happened in all ages since, when a similar revival took place. So it was in the land of our fathers, the Puritans. So it was in Germany, in the 17th century, when Spener and his followers arose in the Lutheran church, to contend for the restoration of true religion. Nay, the question respecting the propriety and expediency of social prayer meetings was one of the main things which formed the line of distinction between the friends and opposers of vital piety, in that day and country. And in our own times, we know that the question, whether prayer meetings shall be tolerated or not, divides the evangelical from their opponents in several denominations of Christians. But, as was intimated in the commencement of the present article, on the warrant and reasonableness of this mode of social worship, it is not our purpose to dwell. It has too long had the sanction of the wise and the good, to admit of its being now drawn into serious question.

Among the difficulties with which the friends of prayer-meetings have had to struggle, when they occurred weekly or oftener, from year to year, has ever been the *sameness* or *monotony* of their character. The same general exercise, the same topics of petition, the same aspect and scope, have served to diminish the interest of those meetings, and to produce a degree of stagnation, if not weariness, even in pious minds; and with regard to all others, (and some who have not a true spiritual taste attend almost all our prayer-meetings) they have seemed to themselves to find nothing but one unvarying (i. e. unvarying except in language) strain of adoration, confession, petition and intercession, from one year's end to another. And indeed, after making all due allowance for the absence of genuine religious taste in those who make the complaint in question, it must be granted that it is not an easy matter in pursuing the ordinary, common-place course, to keep up the interest of such services, especially where there is little in the form of instruction or direct address, but a constant succession of devotional exercises, to engage the attention. There is a love of variety inherent in our nature, which may not be in all cases unhallowed, and which, undoubtedly, ought to be, to some extent, consulted and gratified.

The same difficulty exists with reference to the ordinary public service of the sanctuary. It is extremely apt to be mo-

notonous and wearisome. And happy is the minister who has a sufficient knowledge of human nature, sufficient intellectual and theological resources, sufficient variety, both in matter and manner, to arrest the attention, and sustain the interest of an intelligent people, from week to week, for years together. This is no easy matter, as many excellent men have found in their painful experience. The continual sameness has been the theme of complaint, concerning pulpit ministrations, for centuries; and in too many cases the complaint has been far from being without foundation. It is enough to put in requisition all the learning, ingenuity and holy ardour of the man of God, to "bring forth out of his treasure," from time to time, "things new and old," to instruct, entertain and interest the mass of those to whom he ministers; and all this without sacrificing any measure either of truth or duty to the love of novelty.

With respect to prayer meetings, I have a suggestion to make, which, though not new, I have never yet known to be acted upon, either so frequently or extensively as could be wished; and which *some* ministers and other conductors of these meetings, would seem to me never to have thought of. It is, that there be a constant effort to **DIVERSIFY THE PROMINENT OBJECTS** which are brought before the minds of the worshippers, as matter of special petition at these social meetings. The prayers at these meetings (I of course except the monthly concert and the Sabbath school concert) are all of the same general character, embracing, commonly, the same topics, and differing from each other only in the compass, order and fervour with which they are presented, there seems to be scarcely an effort made to vary from the same uniform, dull, endless round; scarcely an attempt to introduce any thing like an interesting, soul-stirring variety. But would there not be an advantage in devoting the ordinary prayer-meeting, at one time, to prayer, not exclusively but peculiarly, for the *children of the church*; at another, for the *rising generation in general*; at another, for the *revival of religion in that particular congregation*; at another, for a blessing *on ministers of the gospel*, that they may be made more faithful, self-denied, laborious, and successful; at another, for a blessing upon *our civil rulers*; at another, for the smiles of Heaven on the *great Christian enterprises of the day*, &c. &c.? It is true, the most of these topics are generally included in one or another of the prayers which are offered at social meetings; but several of them are usually noticed only in a cursory manner, thrust into

a corner, as it were, of the exercise, and make very little distinct or solemn impression. And if, in order to obviate this undesirable result, an attempt should be made to dwell upon every topic, until an opportunity should be enjoyed to give to each the extension and impression which it merits, the prayer would of course become tediously long, and instead of rousing and interesting the hearers, would be likely to weary them. How much better to let the social service be *chiefly*, though not *exclusively*, devoted one week to one of these objects, a second to a different one, a third to another still. This would allow time for dwelling on each until some distinct impression was made. And if the minister, or the individual presiding in his place, should preface the exercises, on each occasion, with some appropriate remarks, tending to prepare the minds of the people for engaging in prayer on the subject assigned, and deeply to impress upon them its importance; can it be doubted that a more hallowed and practical influence would be likely to result from the exercises, than if managed in the ordinary manner? I have somewhere heard of a pious man, who said that in his closet devotions, his habit was to continue confessing his sins before God, until his own heart was, in some degree, melted and humbled under a sense of them; and that, in like manner, he generally resolved to go on thanking God for his multiplied mercies, until his own mind was, in some measure, expanded with gratitude and love. I cannot help thinking, that something of this kind ought to be aimed at in our social prayers; and, if so, that we ought to be more in the habit than we have usually been, of devoting a whole evening, *chiefly*, to spreading our desires before the Lord, on some one particular subject, and pleading with him for a special blessing in reference to that subject. Our minds are so constituted, that we cannot think of many things at once; and still less are we likely to be deeply impressed with a variety of subjects in the same exercise. It should, therefore, be the aim of the presiding minister on such occasions, to endeavour to make some one subject particularly prominent, and to dwell upon it, until it takes hold of his own mind, and those of his fellow-worshippers, with some degree of practical feeling.

But here, while one advantage is attained, the opposite mistake ought to be carefully avoided. I mean the mistake of those who imagine that, when they are assembled to pray for a particular object, they cannot dwell upon it too long, or repeat the same ideas too frequently. Hence I have, more than once,

known an assembly, if I may so express it, prayed into a solemn frame, and prayed out of it again, by a most unwise multiplication and protraction of prayers. I should say, considering the elevated nature of the exercise, that *three* prayers of the ordinary length, at any one meeting, are quite as much as ought usually to be introduced; and that as much care ought to be exercised, by those who lead in the duty, as may be, without falling into formality, to enlarge chiefly on topics which had not been so much dwelt upon before, and to avoid multiplying words, as if they thought they should be "heard for their much speaking." The use of extemporaneous prayer is a noble privilege, worth contending for; but rant and *battologizing* ought to be avoided, and under the direction of a wise and pious leader, they may be avoided.

I will suppose a prayer meeting, of the ordinary character, to take place, stately, every Wednesday evening throughout the year. Of course, the members will assemble fifty-two times during each twelve months. Nothing is more common than for such societies to languish, and after a few months, to become thinner and thinner, and, at length, almost extinct. But if the minister or other presiding individual, at the close of the evening, were to announce, that the next evening they would come together to pray for a particular object; as, for example, for the temporal, and, above all, for the spiritual and eternal welfare of their own children, and, in a sentence or two, hint the deep importance of the subject; or, for a blessing on the ambassadors of Christ, and all who minister in holy things, that they might be visited with a new unction from above, as a foretaste and pledge of rich blessings on the flocks committed to their care, would not more people be likely to attend the next time, and to attend with raised expectations, and engaged and prepared hearts, than if nothing special had been announced? Thus, in the course of a year, ten or a dozen great objects might be made prominent in prayer, four or five times over, to the great edification of the minister himself, and to the unspeakable benefit of all who enjoyed the privilege of attending on such a series of exercises.

I have supposed that notice of the special object of each successive prayer meeting should be given at the close of the preceding. This, in ordinary cases, might be quite sufficient. But sometimes, where the contemplated service had for its object something more than usually adapted to engage the feelings of all classes, and even to attract the attention of many

who were not pious, it might be proper to give a more public notice of it from the pulpit, on the Sabbath, for the purpose of drawing some who might not otherwise know of the service intended. Yet my impression is, that this ought not to be always, or even generally done, lest it should, after a while, degenerate into a mere common-place affair, and cease to interest any one. In short, as the object of the whole plan is, to engage and keep up attention, by endeavouring to make each successive service present, as far as possible, something new, and something adapted to reward attention—every thing calculated to make the impression of common-place routine ought to be avoided.

The learned and pious Cotton Mather, in his “*Essays to do Good*,” speaks of himself as practising, and recommends to others, the habit of having stated days in each week to pray for particular persons or objects. The object of this plan is precisely that which I have in view in these remarks. It is, that, on the one hand, the various interesting objects which ought to engage our attention in social prayer, may none of them be forgotten or neglected; and, on the other, that there may be time, not merely for bringing each before our view in its turn, but for dwelling on each at some length, and in detail, until our minds become in some degree affected with them. This is, surely, nothing more than wisely consulting the structure of our minds, and adopting that course which is likely to leave the deepest and most salutary impression.

In suggesting some of the topics which may be profitably made prominent in meetings for social worship, I have only specified a few, out of the many which might be in their turn acceptably and usefully brought forward. The list might be almost indefinitely extended. And yet it may be made too large; so large as that the most vitally important topics would not be brought into view as frequently as their relative importance would render desirable. It is also to be remembered, that almost every congregation, certainly every larger district, will be apt to have some subject, growing out of its local or relative situation, which demands its special notice in devotional exercises, from time to time.

The plan here proposed, if wisely and happily executed, may be of use in another view. There is a great tendency, especially in times of revival, to multiply social meetings for prayer, to an inordinate degree; nay, to such a degree as to leave no evening free for personal or domestic edification in

private. It is worthy of notice, also, that the great number of laudable plans and institutions started within a few years, in the way of Christian enterprise, are not unlikely to lead to the appointment of many special seasons of prayer for their prosperity. The Sabbath-school cause now occupies the second Monday evening of every month; and several other similar assignments, for different purposes, have been proposed, but not yet fully adopted. Now, if every Monday evening throughout the year should be thus appropriated, besides three or four other evenings in every week, some truly pious individuals, who have large families and many cares, might really be cut off from the opportunity of attending, as they ought, to their own closet duties, and to the instruction of those committed to their care. But if the plan were adopted, of making every ordinary prayer meeting, so to speak, *specific*, and of infusing interest and life into it, by presenting, on every successive occasion, some grand object to its special notice; there would be less inducement to multiply meetings unduly, and, especially less inducement to set apart particular days in each month or week, over and above all the other stated weekly appointments, to pray for particular objects. Due attention to all these objects might be provided for on the plan proposed, without any inordinate or inconvenient multiplication of public services.

It is hoped none will suppose that there is any intention here to discourage those meetings for prayer which are strictly special or extraordinary in their character. As the providence of God toward civil communities often prompts politicians to peculiar celebrations and extra efforts, so in the church, dispensations of Providence more than usually frowning or joyful in their aspect, undoubtedly call for special mourning and fasting, or thanksgiving among her members. Far from intending to oppose such observances, I would say, that Christians are deeply criminal when they do not hear the voice of God speaking to them in such dispensations, and repair to his throne with corresponding sentiments. It is not to oppose this that the present article is intended, but to recommend that an attempt be made to render *every* prayer meeting as lively, pointed, and appropriate as possible; to impart to every one, however stated, something of the prominency and impressiveness which all expect to find in those meetings for prayer which are strictly extraordinary in their nature.

The writer of these pages is far from being confident that what he has suggested is worthy of attention. He has taken

the liberty of offering it to the notice of those who are most competent to judge; and if he should prove to have been the means of conveying the smallest hint which shall be directly or indirectly useful in imparting the least interest or life to a single meeting for social prayer, he shall feel himself richly rewarded. Certain it is, that whatever has a tendency to confer upon such meetings a character of deeper feeling, a more profound sense of what we need, and a more intense pleading with God for his blessing, is so much gained to the best interests of Zion. We are, probably, approaching times of solemn conflict, when all that faith, and prayer, and sanctified effort can achieve, will be put in requisition. Our "weapons" in this conflict must in no case be "carnal." And of those which our Master has put at our disposal, none are more universally accessible, or more powerful than PRAYER. Happy will be that individual Christian, or that church, which may be found, in the progress of the conflict, wielding this weapon with most constancy and persevering confidence! With this weapon, guided and animated by faith, we may defy the kingdom of darkness, "stop the mouths of lions, quench the violence of fire, and turn to flight the armies of the aliens." If Christians looked less to "the arm of flesh," and more to the promises, power, and faithfulness of their covenant God, they would have more comfort in their own souls, and be far better sustained in their controversy with Satan's kingdom.

QUÆRENS.

ART. IV.—SUGGESTIONS IN VINDICATION OF THE TEMPERANCE SOCIETY.

IN endeavouring to arrest the progress of intemperance, the points which principally claim our attention are two; to communicate just impressions of the calamities and crimes which spring from the use of intoxicating liquors, and to propose and recommend some remedy for the alarming evil. The destructive influence of ardent spirits upon the health, the moral character, the fortune, the reputation, and the eternal hopes of men, has been ably and repeatedly presented to view. It is therefore our purpose, at this time, to confine ourselves to a vindication, first of the principle of entire abstinence, and

secondly of the measures of the Temperance Society, as founded upon that principle.

I. The principle is to be defended.

Total abstinence from spirituous liquors, except for medicinal purposes, is to be vindicated upon the ground of moral obligation, as well as of expediency. That which under all the circumstances of our present condition is plainly expedient, becomes, from this very expediency, a moral duty in the view of all who regard the welfare of their fellow men.

A familiar illustration may be used, which, although beyond the limits of probability, may present the subject in a new light, and elicit our more impartial judgment. Let us suppose that by some change in the human constitution, animal food should cease to afford nutriment; that those who partook of it, in any considerable quantity, were observed to lose their self-control, to become wild and giddy, loquacious and boisterous, confused in intellect, and misled by false impressions of external objects; that their limbs became powerless, and that they at length fell into a disgraceful and helpless stupor. Suppose that, after many painful symptoms, the recovered man should be found to seek again and again the dangerous morsel, and crave the unnatural excitement; nay, that multitudes were seen haunting the places where it was sold, and multitudes daily under its influence; that millions of dollars were annually consumed in its purchase, thousands of lives every year sacrificed to its power, and hideous crimes perpetrated in its frantic orgies. Suppose, further, that the morbid appetite should grow upon the most unsuspecting, and prey upon the most beloved; should we not retreat from it as a poison, the poison of the soul? Could we be willing to endure it in our sight, or to admit it over our threshold, or, worse still, to prepare or to vend it? Should we not dread to approach it lest others might be allured to taste, and tremble to partake of it, lest our neighbour should sink into its abyss of woes?

Would to God that it were a sketch of fancy! The observation of every reader has already enabled him to apply it to the case before us.

The fear of "offending" others, (to use a scriptural expression,) that is, of occasioning sin in others, or making our brethren *stumble*, would, in the case supposed, lead every Christian man to cast it aside. Now this is the doctrine of the apostle Paul: "It is good neither to eat flesh, nor to drink wine, nor any thing whereby thy brother is offended or is

made weak." And this abstinence needs the sanction of no positive command, but becomes binding by all the stress of the law of love, on him who endeavours to love his neighbour as himself. Applying the principle to the case before us, and acknowledging, as we all do, that intemperance is an evil incalculably great, we argue, *That in the present state of society, it is the duty of every prudent and benevolent man, to abstain from any use of alcoholic liquors, except as a medicine.*

We say the *duty*, because that which is so far expedient, that, if neglected, it leads our brother into sin, is our duty.

In the days of early Christianity, it was a question whether meat which had been offered upon the altars of heathen gods might be lawfully eaten by a believer. There were many who supposed that the indulgence was, in itself, sinful, as giving countenance to Pagan rites, and symbolising with idolaters. Paul was clearly convinced of the contrary, and believed that he might, with unquestioning security of conscience, eat whatever was sold in the shambles. Yet mark the purity and charity of that great and holy mind: he does not say, like many among us in similar cases, 'My conscience is clear, and I am not bound by the sanctimonious scruples of others.' No, his quick perception descries the danger of leading others to do sinfully, what he could do conscientiously: his sincere love felt the argument, *None of us liveth to himself*, and he concludes, *Wherefore, if meat make my brother to offend, if my lawful indulgence lead my brother into sin, I will eat no flesh while the world standeth, lest I make my brother to offend.* The principle of the gospel, therefore, is plain: if by any indulgence, however innocent in itself, or by any practice which is not morally obligatory, I lay a stumbling-block, an offence, an occasion to sin, in the way of others, that indulgence is to be forborne. And the application of the principle to the case of any individual, is equally plain. If, by the use of ardent spirits, however innocent in my own case, I lay temptation in the way of others, it is my immediate duty to abstain totally from this gratification.

The case is not hypothetical, as just stated. What has been presented as a supposition is an undeniable truth, and by every indulgence in spirituous liquors, however limited, guarded or temperate, we lay an offence in the way of others. Grant for the moment, what is always questionable, that any given individual is fully competent to restrain his desires, and to limit

himself to the proper modicum, that he is never heated, never misled, never injured; can he, in like manner, answer for those who surround him, and copy his example? Others see him partake, but they see not his secret cautions and rules and measurement. They are led to taste, to tamper with the poison, to believe it innocent, to submit themselves to its power, to become drunkards, to perish! Such is the gradation witnessed in instances innumerable. Such an one may observe his neighbours and dependants improving upon his model; he may know that ravages are hourly made upon soul and body by the same stimulus; he may hear the entreaties of Christian friends, who sorrowfully warn him against the practice; yet he replies, 'I am not subject to other men's consciences, nor answerable for other men's sins.' Listen to the piercing rebuke of the apostle, in a like case: *If thy brother be grieved by thy meat, (mark that a single word only is to be changed) now walkest thou not charitably; destroy not him with thy meat, for whom Christ died. Let not your good be evil spoken of.* It is even so, the painful truth is not to be dissembled; the unguarded indulgences of moral and Christian men are ruining the bodies and souls of thousands. The temperate drinker is seen by his children, his domestics, his associates, to partake of the polluting draught. What wonder if they drain the cup, which he only tasted? What wonder if the son feels no dread of the liquor which his father buys or sells or uses?

It is in this way that the use of ardent spirits, however limited or temperate, tends to keep up the injurious habits of society. We have heard it justly stated, as one of the most fruitful causes of inebriety, that the almost universal custom of men overwhelms the voice of prudence and religion. False ideas of hospitality, of generosity, of festive celebrations, and of encouraging labour, promote the criminal indulgence. Every drop which we take, goes to confirm and extend these habits of society. However small our influence, we are accountable for it. When we taste of the liquor, we indulge in that which is slaying its victims throughout our land, and has already plunged millions into perdition. The sin is national; we are tainted as a community; because of drunkenness, the land mourneth, and as the nation is made up of individuals, each man is called upon to shake off, at least from his own shoulders, the burden of infamy.

He who makes any use, even the slightest, of ardent spirits,

just in the proportion of his indulgence, does his part to encourage and sustain the manufacture and sale of this bane of human peace. There are many who drink the liquor, who would scorn to make it, many who buy that would be ashamed to sell. Now, though not in the same ratio, yet to a certain and a culpable extent, every consumer gives his vote, and pays his tax to uphold the traffic.

Almost all that has hitherto been advanced is entirely consistent with the assumption, that the article, in particular cases, is neither useless nor dangerous. The assumption is false, as we shall endeavour to show. Waving the disputed question of medicinal value, it is undoubtedly true that spirituous liquors are, in every case, useless and dangerous. They are useless, and therefore it is wise to abstain. We are all alarmed at the evils, the horrid, innumerable, damning evils, which this single article has introduced. Unless, then, we are indemnified by its manifold virtues, in the full amount of this loss and suffering, it is unwise, it is sinful, it is cruel to encourage the traffic or use. What are the countless benefits of the intoxicating draught? Has it contributed to human strength? While it has brought the youth to premature imbecility, and the sturdy vigour of the robust labourer to palsied helplessness, it has never permanently braced a muscle, or added one tittle to the physical power of its votaries. Has it given nourishment to the body? With united voice, our most eminent, and most unprejudiced physiologists protest against the delusion. Has it prolonged life, or averted disease? It has but marked out the first victims of epilepsy, apoplexy, malignant fevers and madness, while it claims as its own peculiar instruments of torture, *delirium tremens*, and *mania a potu*.

Ardent spirits are injurious, even to the temperate drinker, as he is called, and therefore it is wise to abstain. This we may pass over at the present time, as pertaining rather to the evils of intemperance, which we have thrown out of the field of inquiry. Yet it is not to be passed over in the private meditations of the serious Christian.

Ardent spirits, whenever used, open the door for temptations to him who indulges, and no man under such influence is safe. Every drunkard was once temperate. It was by gradual steps that he explored the loathsome and fiery deep, in which he is now groping towards final destruction.

No human eye can mark the point where temperance ends,

and intemperance begins; and wherever that imperceptible boundary may fall, the victim is always secure in his own apprehensions. The debased and squalid sot, who creeps into the recess of his dwelling, which he supposes to be unknown, and quaffs the beloved stimulant, while he endeavours vainly and ludicrously to conceal his disgrace, was once a man who despised the drunkard; and, even now, flatters himself that he is not detected. And each of us may have known as honest, honourable, industrious and kind, the brutal wretch who now brings daily sorrow into the family circle, pours mortification into the heart of a virtuous wife, and robs his offspring of their daily food. That appetite, once grown strong, knows no restraint; and we learn to feel the words of the poet:

'Tis quenchless thirst
Of ruinous ebriety that prompts
His every action, and imbrates the man.
O for a law to noose the villain's neck
Who starves his own, who persecutes the blood
He gave them in his children's veins, and hates
And wrongs the woman he has sworn to love.—*Cowper.*

Let it be repeated, no man is safe who treads upon the crumbling brink of this precipice. The only safety is in a total relinquishment of the seductive draught; and no individual, in the view of these things, can continue in the use of ardent spirits, and consistently pray 'Lead us not into temptation.' Are you willing, we might ask, to lay before your sons and your brothers, even the *possibility* of becoming drunkards? Alas! perhaps they have already taken the irrevocable step. Perhaps they are, even now, possessed by that demon, and marked out as his prey. The cup which you cannot abandon, is the centre from which emanate those baleful influences, which, though they leave you untouched, may yet murder the dearest object of your love, blast the honour of your family, and cover your grey hairs with unavailing regrets and burning shame. *Look not thou upon the wine when it is red, when it giveth its colour in the cup, when it moveth itself aright. At the last, it biteth like a serpent, and stingeth like an adder.* Prov. xxiii. 31.

II. The measures of the Temperance Society, as founded upon the principle of entire abstinence, are to be defended.

It is to be presumed, that the most decided friends of ardent spirits will not controvert the position, *That it is the undoubted right of any individual to lay it down as a rule*

for his own conduct, to avoid altogether the use of intoxicating liquors. It has never been contended, that any moral obligation constrains men to this indulgence; or, that there is any moral turpitude in abstaining from the excitement. Single cases of such abstinence are by no means new. In every age, since the acquaintance of man with the dangerous stimulant, individuals have here and there been found unwilling to approach it. And long before any fellowship in this forbearance was dreamed of, abundant have been the instances of abstinent and temperate men. Even now, it is by no means rare, to discover one and another whose habit it is to refrain from every thing of the kind; and we have not learned that any umbrage is taken at such a peculiarity, even though dissolute wits may affect to despise the water drinker. Various considerations may lead a man to adopt such a maxim. The care of health or reputation, the wise fear of seduction, the desire of holding forth a salutary example may prompt him; and no one, even among the profligate, doubts his right to pursue his own course of life, any more than the right to choose his own regimen, or adjust his own apparel. And, as in any given case, he who, from private reasons, chooses to avoid ardent spirits, acts according to his own acknowledged right; so no one can deny *that the same individual is altogether free to frame a resolution, or if he chooses to take a vow, that he will persevere in this way.* It may be deemed unnecessary, whimsical, rash or fanatical, but no one dreams that there is hereby any breach made upon the liberties of others. Such resolutions are made by every man, under every variety of circumstances, in matters of economy or trade or religion; and with the privacy of such a transaction, no one presumes to interfere. Private engagements of this nature are found useful in the conduct of our domestic affairs. They add the force of an obligation to what was before simply a prudential maxim. They decide, once for all, upon a class of actions, instead of leaving the mind in painful vacillation upon every emergency. They afford a brief apology in every case of objection or expostulation.

That there is nothing morally wrong in such an engagement, appears from the case of the Nazarites under the Old Testament, who bound themselves for a certain length of time to abstain from all intoxicating liquors. It is true, that this example has no weight when adduced as an argument for our abstinence, but it is a case in point, to answer at once every

charge of moral impropriety in voluntary obligations to such abstinence.

Indeed, so clear is the case, that it is certain we should never have heard any strong objections raised against single cases of such resolutions. The great English moralist, during many years of his life, abstained totally from the use of wine, in compliance with a resolution of this nature; and though he moved in a circle somewhat dissolute in this particular, no one, we believe, brought any charge of error or fanaticism against Dr. Johnson.* Nay, there is not a man among the ranks of the objectors, who does not feel himself free, at any moment, to discard ardent spirits or wine from his table, as well as any beverage or dish which he disapproves; and to fortify his purpose by a resolution, or even a vow.

It may, indeed, be urged that there is always danger in such resolutions, since such is the weakness of all human purposes, that they are very liable to be violated, and that thus the sensibility of conscience is wounded, and moral fortitude impaired; also, that through the strange perverseness of our minds, we are the more likely to rush to the opposite extreme, after the removal of the barrier. There is some truth in the premises, yet the argument founded on them leads us much too far; since it would equally deny the prudence of any fixed rule for human conduct, any purpose of holy living, any serious attempt of the libertine to amend his life. Grant that, because defeated purposes are mischievous, no purposes of good, no resolutions of temperance or safety are to be admitted, and you tear away one of the strongest barriers against vice, and aids of virtue, from the wise and good of every age. It is, therefore, as prudent, and as just, for me to determine that I will not indulge in ardent spirits, as to determine that I will avoid the excesses of the table, or the accumulation of debts beyond my means.

We frequently hear it said, that it is unnecessary to form such a resolution, inasmuch as he who believes that total abstinence is prudent and useful, may be supposed to have strength of purpose sufficient to confine himself to the path which he approves. In reply to this, let it be observed, that we suppose too much, when we presume that every man who

* See in Boswell's *Life of Dr. Johnson*, the record of a conversation which took place, April 7, 1773.

“sees the right” may not “the wrong pursue;” the adage of the heathen poet is familiar:

*Video meliora proboque
Deteriora sequor.*

The stubbornness of fact repels the conclusion every day. Men indulge daily in that which they know is leading them to ruin. Witness the bankrupt, the gambler, the drunkard, the debauchee. There are, moreover, seasons of allurements, when the mind which is influenced by a floating impression of what is right, without being held down by settled resolutions, will waver and fall under the fascination. This takes place without shame, because there is no consciousness of deviation from any prescribed rule.

We suppose too much when we presume of *ourselves*, that we need no deliberate engagement to retain us in the way of duty. It would be a waste of words to argue this point. Its illustration may be read in the case of the invalid who daily tampers with forbidden food, the sluggard who indulges in excessive sleep, the father who suffers insubordination in his family, the tradesman who neglects his business and the sinner who restrains prayer before God. And, in another view of the same objection, it may be truly said, that the very argument concedes the principal thing for which we contend: ‘The prudent man *has strength of purpose* enough to abstain, without the yoke of resolution.’ If, indeed, there is a *purpose* to abstain, and a purpose of some *strength*, it is all that we ask. The resolution which we defend is not a sacred covenant, not a religious vow, but a fixed determination to avoid a certain evil. But if there is not a purpose to abstain, of some strength, if there is no more than an indolent preference of such abstinence, we deny that we have any guarantee that the individual will not succumb at the first attack.

It is urged that such a determination is invidious, and implies a tacit charge of intemperance, against all moderate drinkers. To this it is a sufficient reply, that if the objection has any weight, it lies against abstinence itself, which has been vindicated, and not the resolution to abstain; and that the same scruple might be raised against any course of life, or moral habit, which might happen to militate with the opinions of the multitude. It is, therefore, reasonable that every man should be left to enjoy the right of laying down for himself

such rules as he chooses, with regard to the use of ardent spirits.

Any number of persons, maintaining such opinions, have a right to associate themselves upon the principle of entire abstinence; and such associations deserve our warmest approbation and most decided encouragement. If one man is free thus to resolve, the same liberty must be conceded to two, twenty or a thousand; unless something immoral or injurious is likely to result from their relation to one another, or from the circumstance of their multitude; which it will be no easy task to prove.

The member of the Temperance Society states the case thus: 'If I am free to reject the poison, the members of my family are equally so, and no less free to declare their resolution in my presence, and in common with me, with such formalities as may be judged proper; and so of my townsmen and fellow citizens.' Certain persons affect to be alarmed at the idea of a *mutual pledge*, or *binding ourselves to one another*, and thus forming, as they say, a dangerous compact. There is no ground for such alarm, and no shadow is more unsubstantial than the argument suggested. If the words *mutual pledge* have been used, they mean only this, that we, who by subscription, vote or acclamation, express our purpose, do so in common, in presence of each other as witnesses, and for mutual encouragement. Further than this there is no compact, except such as a prolific fancy may trace among a hundred men who subscribe to the same school, or put their names to the paper of the same mendicant. The only bond is the community of sentiment upon a single point, already vindicated.

There is power in concert of action. A thousand men may be directed singly to address themselves to any public work, and nothing shall be accomplished; because there is no feeling of encouragement, no unity of plan, no interchange of experience and wisdom, no view of success, and no concentration of strength.

Every man must have remarked the advantage which accrues to his own mind from association with others in such a work. Were the plan of our objector adopted, we should be carried back to the precise state in which we were before the dawn of the temperance reformation. And what was this state? Here and there was found a man bold enough to stem the current of public opinion and practice, and there may have been hundreds who resolved on, and attempted abstinence, and

had relinquished the attempt, because each was isolated, and without encouragement. However numerous the cases of individual abstinence, there was no great impression made upon the hostile evil, no appreciable diminution in the sale of liquors, no general amendment visible on the face of the social body.

The truth is, that human imbecility, even in the conscientious, is greater than we willingly acknowledge. If the basest of men were judged by the resolutions of their better moments, we might esteem the world free from crime. The virtues of the wisest and most circumspect need those aids of circumstance, those incitements of practical goodness, which so much abound in associations for benevolent ends; and those are wise who gather around them a circle of advisers and helpers in executing their good intentions. This is precisely what the prudent and temperate man does, when he unites himself to those who are pursuing the only safe path of total abstinence. He feels upon himself the happy operation of such concert. He is incited to persevere by the sight of so many linked in with him in the same cause; and pride itself, where there is no better principle, may be the salutary cause of his steadfastness, since so many interests besides his own would suffer by his fall. "There are higher considerations," we may say, in the language of the eloquent Robert Hall, "which ought invariably to produce the same effects; but we have no such superfluity of strength, as should induce us to decline the aid of inferior motives, when all are but barely adequate to the exigencies of our state. The recollection that we are acting under the eye of Omniscience, will lose nothing of its force by being joined to the remembrance, that our conduct is subject to the scrutiny of friends, whose sentiments are in unison, whose influence coincides with the voice of conscience and of God."*

There is indeed no magic in these associations, which can wash the Ethiopian, or charm away the spots of the leopard. How often must we be called upon to explain, that it is not the drunkard whom we hope to reach, at least in any direct manner, by the measures proposed? It is to establish the footing of those who begin to slide, to secure the principles and fortify the minds of the rising generation, to brace the courage of the inexperienced, and arm for future combat the temperate, that we now labour. And he is no wise defender

* Works of Robert Hall, volume ii. page 195.

of innocence, who is content to see her free from taint, but strives not to make her free from danger. It is from among the temperate of our community that the army of drunkards is to be levied, and the fatal conscription is to take effect upon the kind and dutiful sons and brothers, who are now exempt from fear as well as reproach.

Let us look, therefore, at the additional force of example in these associations. The example of a single individual is not inefficacious, until it is contravened and nullified by the power of adverse practice. This, however, is the lamentable fact, and where one abstains, there are thousands who indulge. To give effect, then, to the exemplary influence of the temperate, those who have determined to avoid the very appearance of evil, must have a mutual understanding, must join their forces, must form one visible mass, and then the temperance of thousands may have weight, where that of one would have been unavailing. Now, whoever has taken the pains to examine the operations of the Temperance Society, has not failed to observe that this is just the way in which the sphere of its influence has been enlarged. A small company of persons have agreed to abandon all use of ardent spirits. This has attracted notice, and given occasion to inquiry. They have been ridiculed, vituperated and attacked, but have still increased: for obloquy and opposition have but raised more conspicuously the standard of their simple principle. The rule of their action, however misrepresented, has commended itself to some, as innocent, safe and desirable. He who came to scorn, has sat down to investigate and risen to applaud. He has observed the aged, the virtuous, the disinterested, the pious, among their band, and he has been brought in himself by the force of example. This, indeed, could not be the case, if men of eminent standing were unwilling to unite in the enterprise, because they feel no danger themselves. Of all persons among us, those are most needed to befriend our efforts, who are above suspicion of any personal risk as to their good habits. One man of high reputation and acknowledged probity, may stand in the breach, and ward off death from a multitude. In no possible way can the example of one temperate man have so much weight as by this public connexion; the light of his consistent life is no longer hid, but diffuses itself; and this is what we ask, since the great influence of the Temperance Society is *exemplary*.

The union of effort in these associations has tended to diffuse accurate and extensive information throughout our country.

It is the simple statement of facts, which is the great engine used in this work. It is the unvarnished truth respecting drunkards and their destiny, which has been the instrumental cause of this reformation. No man can open his eyes, for the first time, upon the authentic statement relative to intemperance and its train of curses, without astonishment. Its statistics are appalling. For centuries, men have known that there were many drunkards, that a great quantity of liquor was therefore used, and that much misery, crime and death ensued; yet the impression of these general truths was vague and transitory. But when, upon careful investigation, it was published to the world, that more than thirty millions of gallons of ardent spirits were every year consumed in the United States, and twenty-eight millions of dollars expended on the article, that we have in our land seven thousand distilleries; that three-fourths of our criminal prosecutions may be traced to this source, that one-third of the maniacs in our hospitals have become such by intemperance, and that thirty thousand human beings annually die from this poison; when these alarming facts, in all their horrible details, were spread before the eyes of the community, the effect was instantaneous. Many a moderate drinker forsook his daily allowance, and the catalogue of our Temperance Societies increased by thousands.

As the interest of every individual in this subject is necessarily rendered deeper by association with others, so every conscientious man is led to use all suitable means for disseminating correct opinions on it; and our presses send forth, weekly, the productions of able pens, all of which have their influence. Addresses, tracts, sermons, periodical journals and newspapers, are now directed against the desolating scourge with the happiest consequences. Without the Temperance Society, these loud and stirring appeals would never have been heard: without this information, the great reform would never have advanced.

To take another view of the same influence: wherever there is an association of this kind, however small, there will be excited much inquiry and conversation upon the subject. 'What is its principle? what its object? Who are its supporters? Why do they thus abstain?' These and other less innocent questions are raised and circulated. Ridicule and opposition are no doubt called forth; but this is by no means to be deprecated. The man who sneers, may, from mere curiosity, read the tract or the discourse, and stand aghast at the extent of the

evil, and his own peril. Self-interest will lead some who are deeply engaged in the traffic, to decry the work. The careless and the jovial will smile at those fears which most become themselves. The tap-room and the haunt of vice will resound with profane jests and boisterous merriment, when temperance is named. The sot at his fireside, and the street drunkard as he returns from his debauch, will curse the hypocrites who would rob them of their idol. In the midst of all this, the cause prevails. The inquiry once stirred, may not so easily be satisfied. The ignorant are instructed, the careless aroused, the unwary warned, and the temperate corroborated; and the result in every case is, that the wisdom and benevolence of the scheme are made apparent, and the steps of many recalled from the ways of death. According to the most moderate computation, there are in the United States 2,000 societies, comprising 200,000 persons, who are pledged to abstain from ardent spirits, except as a medicine; and in every place where any suitable efforts have been made, the cause gains strength with each successive year.

What may we not then hope? A field of promise opens before us which cheers the heart; and those of our youth who reach advanced age, may witness the accomplishment of our devout aspiration. We look for the day when no city, village or neighbourhood shall contain the poisonous draught, except in the repository of medicine; and when with a wary hand it shall be measured out at the bed-side, by the temperate physician. We hope for the time when the distillery and the dram shop shall exist only in the annals of past years, and when the fruits of Providence shall no more be prostituted to the fabrication of a brutalizing drug; when the Christian father shall dread to set before his household the deadly potion, and the Christian merchant shall blush to make his bread by affording an article which is, to many, the occasion of disease, crime and death, to most the cause of intemperance, and to all both useless, tempting and dangerous: and when the Christian minister shall be no more called to lift up his voice against drunkenness, than to denounce the fight of gladiators or the altars of Moloch.

An outcry has been heard, charging the defenders of total abstinence with infringing upon the rights of conscience and the liberty of their fellow citizens. It requires a perspicacity greater than that which falls to the lot of most, to discover the point of this objection; and the difficulty of reply arises not so much from the cogency of the argument as from our inability

to discover any argument at all. For thus the sober thinker reasons with himself: Does my abstinence from ardent spirits violate the sacred liberties of my neighbour? Am I not free to use or disuse any article of diet or drink, at my own discretion? To lay down rules for self-government, and when I please to recommend them to others? And in the exercise of this freedom, am I guilty of any infraction of another's rights? Whose rights are these which we are charged with violating? Surely not those of the abstinent; for he, exercising his free choice, acts out his own voluntary purposes. Not those of the man who declines our fellowship; he is no less free in rejecting the proposal, and so far as the question of *right* is concerned, we leave him, if such be his pleasure, to besot himself daily with drink, and to form a society for his encouragement.

But we are told that a combination is formed, upon a principle which is peculiar, and which gives an invidious notoriety to such as choose to make use of ardent spirits; that we thus reflect upon others and infringe on their rights. Without pausing to seek for the somewhat indiscernible connexion between the premises and the conclusion, let us examine a parallel case. It is well known that certain highly respectable Christians have thought it a duty to abstain from what they conscientiously believe to be a sinful extravagance in outward apparel, and to encourage plainness of dress by their own example. They have exercised an undoubted right. They may have been blamed, as needlessly scrupulous; they may have been ridiculed by the unthinking or malicious. But is my patriotic sensibility so great that I take fire at this as an infringement upon my liberties? Has their united abstinence from a certain supposed excess led to the clamour that the state was threatened, or our private rights endangered? Has their economy and rejection of ornament been considered as an invidious crimination of such among us as do not adopt their principle? The cases are parallel, and the candid mind will scorn to harbour an objection which, even if it can be comprehended, has no bearing upon the question. We lay down a rule for our own conduct, and we heartily desire that others should voluntarily assume the same; but we enjoin no law upon our neighbours, we use no coercion, we erect no new terms of ecclesiastical communion, we threaten no penalty. Still we claim the same right to declare our honest convictions, which the politician has to speak his sentiments, the

moralist to denounce vice, or the teacher of religion to proclaim the gospel.

It only remains for us to recommend to all who read these suggestions, the solemn consideration of this subject, and to propose to every lover of public order, virtue and happiness, the adoption of the principle and practice now defended. We shall not offer such an insult to their hearts, as to suppose that they look unmoved upon the sad spectacle of disgrace, crime and woe which intemperance has produced, however they may hesitate as to the expediency of these measures. To the ingenuous we may thus address ourselves: You have now set before you a method by which you may at least do something to save yourselves and your families from these fatal evils; by which, more than in any other way, you may contribute to public sobriety and consequent happiness. It has not been pretended that any real evil can ensue upon the adoption of the principle now recommended. The paltry enjoyment which you forego is contemptible, and below computation, when viewed in connexion with national prosperity and everlasting life. The rebuke or raillery of avarice and folly you may well endure, for the sake of an approving conscience, and for the good of your race; to use the happy remark of an honoured Senator, "it is surely no great trial, in such a cause, to be *the song of the drunkards*." Reflect, that even if there be but a possibility of preventing a fellow creature's ruin, that possibility is not to be neglected. Consider the subject but an hour, and you must be convinced that the hopes excited by these endeavours are reasonable, that already an amount of good has been effected which can be estimated only in an eternity to come. You may indeed be temperate without joining any association, or taking any pledge; as you may be a Christian without being a public professor; but you cannot be blind to the fallacy of any argument which would lead you to withhold your voice from this open testimony for virtue and public safety, which would restrain from lending the weight of your example and influence to a work which you know in your hearts to be pure and charitable.

There are occasions where neutrality is culpable, and where every citizen is called to be at his post, and to do his duty. Your influence is operating from day to day, on one side or on the other. Your example is cited, either for or against this enterprise. While you waver or delay, thousands are rushing onwards to disgrace and ruin. Are you willing to stand in the

way of this reform? Can you, dare you, in the sight of a holy God, set up your business, your earthly gains, your reputation among irreligious men, as motives to outweigh the high persuasive reasons urged by duty and benevolence? And will you be able, with any complacency, to look back from your dying bed, upon the advances of temperance so gloriously carried forward, and remember, that you had no part in this blessed undertaking, that you were unwilling to relinquish the manufacture, the sale or the use of a destructive drink, for the strong probability of saving souls and glorifying God?

Far be it from us to use the language of reproachful accusation. There may be many who still stand aloof because they have not yet discerned the path of duty; but we would call upon such, upon men of tender consciences to espouse the *safe* side, to avoid the very appearance of evil, to neglect no means which are innocent, and which even by possibility may stay the plague. By tampering with the poison, they may ruin their own peace, destroy their families, and vitiate the purity of their associates. By providing it for others, with whatever intention, they are ministering to the madness, the blasphemy, the crime of the drunkard; spreading before the ignorant and the unthinking the snare into which even the wise and the honourable have been inveigled. They are filling up the cup of bitterness for the more than widowed wife, and rivetting the chains of poverty on the children, who, though not yet orphans, know not the tender mercies of a father. And though the temperate only receive it at their hands, they are assisting them in the first step of that way which has led its millions to everlasting fire. Let such be exhorted to come to a decision, to spread before God in solemn prayer the doubts and anxieties of their minds on this subject. It is unwise to become offended or reject what is now proposed: it is the duty of all to seek the direction of the Holy Spirit. The father will surely be moved by the love he bears to the little ones who gather around his knees, and who are yet to endure these perilous temptations, to leave nothing undone which affords a hope of changing the habits of society, and banishing this cup of enchantment and sorcery.

In this great cause our hope is in God. Let us, therefore, with united supplications, implore the aid of that wisdom which is from above, and the blessings of that *Father of lights* from whom *cometh every good gift and every perfect gift*.

ART. V.—REVIEW OF PROFESSOR STUART'S LETTER
TO WILLIAM E. CHANNING, D. D.

A Letter to William E. Channing, D. D. on the subject of Religious Liberty. By Moses Stuart, Professor of Sacred Literature in the Theological Seminary, Andover. Boston, Perkins & Marvin, printers, pp. 52.

THE Unitarian controversy began in this country in the year 1815. It was occasioned by the publication of a pamphlet, entitled, "American Unitarianism, or a brief survey of the progress and present state of the Unitarian Churches in America." The late Mr. Belsham, of London, in his *Life of Theophilus Lindsey*, drew up this view of "American Unitarianism," from documents furnished by some gentlemen of Boston. The Rev. Dr. Morse, then of Charlestown, republished this part of Mr. Belsham's works, in the United States; and thereby subjected himself to great odium, on the part of some of his neighbours.

But we have no room here for even a sketch of the history of Unitarianism in our country. Our only object is to show that Dr. Channing, from an early period down to the present time, has been engaged in this controversy. The publication adverted to above, produced a correspondence between him and the late excellent Dr. Worcester, of Salem. This resulted in the exposure of a system, which had long been kept in concealment.

In 1819, Dr. Channing, at the ordination of Mr. Sparks, of Baltimore, preached a sermon, in which he gave a view of Unitarianism as a distinct and peculiar religious creed. The publication of this sermon drew forth a series of letters, addressed to the author, by Professor Stuart, of Andover. These letters were reviewed, but not answered; the controversy was continued by Dr. Woods, also of Andover, and by Dr. Ware, of Cambridge, until the year 1823. In these cases, it was generally thought that the Unitarians gained nothing in the argument.

In 1826, Dr. Channing preached a sermon at the dedication of the Second Congregational Church, (as it is called) in New York. This sermon was also published. Its design was to

show the superiority of Unitarianism to Orthodoxy, in its moral tendency. It was ably reviewed by an anonymous writer in 1827.

It is sufficient for our present purpose, to state further, that Dr. Channing, in the course of the present year, has published a uniform edition of his writings, and also a sermon preached by him at the "General Election" in Boston, May, 1830. Of this last discourse, our readers may form a just opinion, from extracts given in the pamphlet under review.

This brief statement will show, that Dr. Channing has entered largely into that controversy, which has for some years disturbed the tranquillity of Boston and its vicinity, and has excited an interest among Christians in all parts of the country. We wish it also to be understood, that Dr. Channing is regarded as the leader of Unitarians in the United States. He is greatly celebrated by his party; and he himself assumes before the world, the character of a man of enlarged thought and liberal feeling; of various learning and refined taste. It is no part of our present business to determine the validity of these claims. We only say, that a man who stands on narrow ground, in a high place, ought to "order well his steps," and "take heed lest he fall."

But like other men, raised far above their original aspirations, this great man seems to have lost both his prudence and his equanimity; and often betrays unexpected irascibility and bitterness of spirit. He ought to remember his own claim as the most liberal of all liberal Christians. Who would expect Dr. Channing so far to forget himself, as to adopt that *art of controversy*, which consists in making his adversary odious, instead of proving him to be in error? But this he has done. After having unsuccessfully tried his strength in argument, he has fixed his name to the charge, made in the most public manner, that Orthodox Christians in Massachusetts, *are designing and plotting the overthrow of religious liberty, the suppression of free inquiry, and the establishment of ecclesiastical tyranny.* The charge, indeed, has not even the poor merit of originality. It is taken up by the champion of Unitarianism, after it had become stale by repetition: it is taken from the mouths of open and avowed enemies of Christianity; and used, as we think, as a very culpable expedient to cover the disgrace of discomfiture. Or, if it is too much to say that Dr. Channing felt himself defeated, we shall be compelled to charge him with the use of poisoned weapons against

an adversary, whom he had not vanquished in open and fair warfare.

That any thing has ever been done by the orthodox men of Massachusetts, to excuse or palliate such a charge as this, we utterly deny. We certainly are not prepared to vindicate, in all cases, the manner in which they have conducted the controversy between themselves and the Unitarians. But, as far as we have seen, the *matter* of controversy, and not the manner, is the *chief* subject of complaint. The great question is this; are the men who deny the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures, the total depravity of human nature, the divinity of our Lord, the personality and divinity of the Holy Ghost, the vicarious sufferings and atonement of Christ, regeneration and sanctification by the Holy Spirit, justification by faith, and the eternal punishment of the finally impenitent, to be reckoned Christians or not? The Unitarians affirm, and the Orthodox deny. This denial is the great cause of dissatisfaction and complaint. The Orthodox have never withheld personal civilities and kindness, have never brought their religious disputes into politics. The whole controversy has been one entirely of a religious character; it concerns only religious opinion and practice. Decisive proof of this is found in the fact, that although a decided majority of the people of Massachusetts are Orthodox, the government of the State has, for some years, been confessedly in the hands of Unitarians.

It is true that loud complaints have been heard, that the venerable college of the State, although chiefly founded by orthodox men, for the express purpose of promoting orthodox sentiments is entirely in possession of Unitarians. But these complaints have been made chiefly, if not entirely, on the ground that Harvard University has been employed for sectarian purposes; and has indeed been used as an instrument of proselytism. The fact is undeniable. Is the public statement of this fact one ground of Dr. Channing's charge?

It was remarked above, that Dr. Channing had repeated the accusations of the avowed enemies of Christianity. As long as these accusations were anonymous, no man of any character thought them worthy of notice. But the case is greatly changed, when a gentleman of distinguished reputation, comes forward before the public as an accuser, and virtually pledges himself for the truth of the charge. He must be held either to produce his proof, or to retract.

We wish it, however, to be understood, that if Dr. Chan-

ning, after convincing himself that the principles and practice of his orthodox neighbours tend to produce the evil alleged, had only endeavoured, by fair argument, to produce the same convictions in the minds of others, *we* should have found nothing to censure in his *conduct*, whatever we might have thought of the soundness of his reasoning. But he alleges it to be a *fact*, that hostility to free inquiry is the motive, and the destruction of religious liberty is the object of his theological opponents. What a specimen of liberality!

Professor Stuart felt that he was called on to notice grave charges, thus publicly made by one whose *dictum* goes for proof among the whole body of *liberal men*, whether Christians or Infidels, in this country. His letter to Dr. Channing is now before us. It is our duty to put our readers fairly in possession of its contents; and it is our privilege to offer such remarks as the occasion seems to demand.

In the first place, Professor Stuart takes even unnecessary pains to prove that Dr. Channing does, distinctly, and in strong terms, make these very serious charges against Orthodox Christians in Massachusetts. Perhaps he supposed that many persons would be slow to believe, without very abundant evidence, that a man so exceedingly liberal as the Unitarian Doctor, would prefer such accusations; and prefer them too, against those very men whose acknowledgment of him as a *Christian brother*, he has for a long time most earnestly desired.

It may be observed, as well in this place as any where else, that such are the matter and form of Dr. Channing's accusations, that they include all *sincere* Trinitarians throughout the country, and especially all who go under the name of Calvinists, to whatsoever denomination they may belong. The charge, virtually, involves at least one half of the Christian population of the United States.

In justification of our own remarks, as well as of those which we shall quote from Professor Stuart, we give the following extracts from the writings of Dr. Channing:

“It is said, that, in this country, where the rights of private judgment and of speaking and writing according to our convictions, are guaranteed with every solemnity by institutions and laws, religion can never degenerate into tyranny; that here its whole influence must conspire to the liberation and dignity of the mind? I answer, we discover little knowledge of human nature, if we ascribe to constitutions the power of charming to sleep the spirit of intolerance and exclusion. Almost every other bad pas-

sion may sooner be put to rest; and for this plain reason, that intolerance always shelters itself under the name and garb of religious zeal. Because we live in a country, where the gross, outward, visible chain is broken, we must not conclude that we are necessarily free. There are chains not made of iron, which eat more deeply into the soul. An espionage of bigotry may as effectually close our lips and chill our hearts, as an armed and hundred-eyed police. There are countless ways by which men in a free country may encroach on their neighbour's rights. In religion the instrument is ready made and always at hand. I refer to opinion, combined and organized in sects, and swayed by the clergy. We say we have no Inquisition. But a sect, skilfully organized, trained to utter one cry, 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,—such a sect is as perilous and palsying to the intellect as the Inquisition. It serves the minister as effectually as the sword. The present age is notoriously sectarian, and therefore hostile to liberty.” pp. 25—28 of his Election Sermon.

“I know that the suggestion of persecution will be indignantly repelled by those, who deal most largely in denunciation. But persecution is a wrong or injury inflicted for opinions; and surely assaults on character fall under this definition. Some persons seem to think, that persecution consists in pursuing error with fire and sword; and that therefore it has ceased to exist, except in distempered imaginations, because no class of Christians among us is armed with those terrible weapons. But no. The form is changed, but the spirit lives. Persecution has given up its halberd and fagot, but it breathes venom from its lips, and secretly blasts what it cannot openly destroy.”—pp. 561, 562 of Discourses.

“Another important consideration is, that this system of excluding men of apparent sincerity, for their opinions, entirely subverts free inquiry into the scriptures. When once a particular system is surrounded by this bulwark; when once its defenders have brought the majority to believe, that the rejection of it is a mark of depravity and perdition, what but the name of liberty is left to Christians? The obstacles to inquiry are as real, and may be as powerful, as in the neighborhood of the Inquisition. The multitude dare not think, and the thinking dare not speak. The right of private judgment may thus, in a Protestant country, be reduced to a nullity. It is true, that men are sent to the scriptures; but they are told before they go, that they will be driven from the church on earth and in heaven, unless they find in the scriptures the doctrines which are embodied in the popular creed.

They are told, indeed, to inquire for themselves; but they are also told, at what points inquiry must arrive; and the sentence of exclusion hangs over them, if they happen to stray, with some of the best and wisest men, into forbidden paths. Now this 'Protestant liberty' is, in one respect, more irritating than Papal bondage. It mocks as well as enslaves us. It talks to us courteously as friends and brethren, whilst it rivets our chains. It invites and even charges us to look with our own eyes, but with the same breath warns us against seeing any thing which Orthodox eyes have not seen before us. Is this a state of things favorable to serious inquiry into the truths of the gospel; yet, how long has the church been groaning under this cruel yoke."

"To oppose what I deemed error was to me a secondary consideration. My first duty, as I believed, was, to maintain practically and resolutely the rights of the human mind; to live and to suffer, if to suffer were necessary, for that intellectual and religious liberty, which I prize incomparably more than any civil rights. I felt myself called, not merely to plead in general for freedom of thought and speech, but, what was more important and trying, to assert this freedom by action. I should have felt myself disloyal to truth and freedom, had I confined myself to vague commonplaces about our rights, and forborne to bear my testimony expressly and specially to proscribed and persecuted opinions. The times required that a voice of strength and courage should be lifted up, and I rejoice, that I was found among those by whom it was uttered and sent far and wide"—pp. vii. viii. of the Preface.

Such are the charges. There is no doubt as to the persons against whom they are brought. To save appearances, indeed, Dr. Channing occasionally throws in words of kindness and professions of liberal feeling. But these are only drops of sweet in bowls of bitterness. We, in common with Professor Stuart, feel no obligation to the Doctor for these little morsels, sparingly dealt out, while he is pouring on us the vials of his wrath.

Professor Stuart, however, feels that he has as good a right to maintain the doctrine which the pilgrim fathers taught to their children, as Dr. Channing has to assail them. And he very justly thinks that the time has not yet come, when any individual, however exalted in his own view or that of his party, can, by sweeping denunciations and fierce accusations, crush all who venture to oppose him. (p. 11.) He also suggests, that the Unitarian Doctor committed a great mistake in supposing himself to be the man whose word is to put down orthodoxy. We remember to have heard a rumour, some two

years ago, that Dr. Channing had said, *Orthodoxy must be put down*. And we should not be surprised to learn, that, in the Unitarian Association, every speech of certain grave and reverend seigniors has, for a long time, been concluded with the declaration of unmitigated and unappeasable hostility—*delenda est Carthago*. But Dr. Channing ought to know, that of those martyrs on whose "heroic spirit" he looks "with solemn joy," nine hundred and ninety-nine in a thousand held the very opinions which he regards with utter scorn and abhorrence. They felt the power of those truths which he treats as fables. It was the constraining influence of the *redeeming love of Christ* which bore them through the flames in their way up to Heaven. Fire could not consume this spirit: the wheel could not break it. It yet lives. And Dr. Channing's voice, even if it were lifted up with the strength and tone of a trumpet, could not put it down.

Professor Stuart sums up, in few words, the charges brought against him and his brethren.

"We are accused of a settled design to invade the religious liberties of this community, and to force upon them, sooner or later, a creed which was framed in the dark ages, and is worthy only of them. We are charged with an intention to erect *ecclesiastical courts*, which, like the Inquisition of old, are by terror and compulsion to bring this whole Commonwealth to one uniform system of religious doctrine."

The professor then places himself at the bar of the public, and put in his plea. It is a plea of *non est factum*; a denial entirely, both of the fact and the intention. But instead of a bare denial, the accused puts in a *special plea*, containing a statement, in detail, of his principles, and (by implication) of his actions, in regard to the matter alleged by the prosecutor.* We here give the general heads:

"1. *We hold that every individual has a perfect right to examine and decide for himself, what his own religious sentiments or creed shall be.*

"2. *We not only believe that all men should be left free to form their religious opinions, without any civil penalties or disabilities, but we maintain most fully, that when the religious sentiments of any one are formed, he has a right to propagate them, to defend them, and to support them, by his efforts, his pen, his property, or his influence.*"

* *Accuser* would be the better word; because, although Dr. Channing has brought his accusation, he has not *appeared* to make good his charges.

In the course of his particular statements, Professor Stuart, without at all going out of his way, retorts on his accuser with a force and pungency which must be felt by the most heated partisan. After maintaining his right to defend and propagate his religious opinions by all fair arguments, he says:

"In your view, it appears to be altogether commendable, that Unitarians should deluge the community with Improved Versions, with the works of Fellowes, and Belsham, and Priestley, and Cappe, and others of the like character; that they should form themselves into Tract Societies and distribute hundreds of thousands of Unitarian tracts, assailing the sentiments of the Orthodox openly, or secretly undermining the principles which they regard as of vital importance; that they should form Missionary Societies and endeavour not only to spread their principles among the Hindoos and cooperate with Rammolun Roy, but to traverse the regions of the West and South in our own land, and forestall the efforts of the Orthodox there; that they should hold public meetings, in which not only the clergy, but legislators, civilians, and judges from the highest seat of justice, come forward and excite the multitude against Orthodoxy; that they should issue periodicals monthly, weekly, and almost daily, in which the public are warned against the *Inquisition* that is forming among them, and the desperate set of bigots who are forging chains for their religious liberty; that they should declaim against these men and their principles, (their alleged or supposed principles,) from one Sabbath to another, (in which you above all others, unless you are very croneously represented, have taken the lead;) all this, and much more of the same nature, is not only lawful in your eyes, but altogether commendable. In public and in private, from the pulpit and the press, you have not ceased to urge on, with all your eloquence, measures of this and the like nature.

"But turn now the tablet, and look at the other side of the picture. When the Orthodox publish their books, tracts and periodicals, they are represented as bigots and as raving mad. They have neither modesty nor humility. When they associate for the purposes of friendly conference and in counsel, and in order to strengthen each other's hands, and to encourage each other to walk in the way of their forefathers, they are plotting in order to enclose the community in the toils of the *Inquisition*; they are forming "*ECCLESIASTICAL COURTS,*" before which all liberal-minded men, that choose to think and investigate for themselves, are sooner or later to be brought, and to be made to know that there is *only one* way of thinking which is to be tolerated. And since such high crimes and misdemeanors as these have been laid to their charge, the public are told, that "the times have required a *voice of STRENGTH*

and COURAGE to be lifted up ; and you rejoice that YOU are found among those by whom it has been uttered and sent far and wide." (Preface, p. vii.) Not a movement can they make, but they are suspected of forging manacles for the Liberalists, or at least of looking up the iron to make them with. The forges, to be sure, are under ground and out of sight, like the shops of the fabled Cyclops ; but you know, as the neighbours of these famous blacksmiths of old did, that *operations* are going on, for you hear the strokes."

It is then asked, and there seems to be an occasion for the repetition, why the Orthodox have not as good a right to maintain and propagate their sentiments, as Unitarians have? Dr. Channing has put his case in such a manner, that he is bound to answer the question.

If he says that no man has a right to defend and propagate bigotry, he, in very offensive terms, assumes what he has not proved. It is indeed, no new thing, for Unitarians to charge Trinitarians with bigotry. But Dr. Channing and his allies have been often enough in conflict with such men as Professor Stuart, to know that they do neither adopt religious opinions without a pretty careful examination, nor hold them, without being able to give a "reason." And that they claim, and mean to exercise the right of defending them, is now sufficiently manifest. They could not, otherwise, maintain a good conscience. The right so to do, must be conceded: but Dr. Channing will, perhaps, object to the manner in which it has been done. This, however, is by no means the point of his accusation. He alleges that his neighbours have dark, selfish, and malignant purposes; that they are determined to introduce compulsion in matters of religion, a compulsion worse than the Inquisition, with all its terrors and torments. This is a crime of enormous turpitude: and it is a poor shift for the accuser to whip around the difficulty of producing proof, by saying that he means to censure the *manner* of his adversaries.

But as for the manner itself, Professor Stuart, with commendable frankness, and genuine liberality, concedes every thing which ought to be conceded by a gentleman and a Christian. He does himself and his cause great honour by the following expression of truly Christian feelings:

"Next, as to the *manner* itself, I have but few remarks to make. I am ready to concede on my part, that I have seen and read things among the Orthodox, the manner of which I in some respects heartily disapproved. I have never thought, that to rail at our op-

ponents was either Christian or courteous. Above all, every reflecting man must say, Nothing can be more improbable, than that this kind of proceeding will be likely to convince those who differ from us. Who will hear us with patience, when we begin our reproof by letting him know that we think him either a fool or a knave?

“I am not blinded to this by party zeal. I have seen some of it among those whom I warmly love and greatly respect. Perhaps I may have shown some of this same disposition in my own writings. If so, produce it, and I will tread that part under my feet, and make my atonement by unfeigned sorrow to an injured public, and to the injured cause of Christ. But if I have indulged in such a mode of writing, I am unconscious of it to myself. I disapprove it; I even abhor it; and yet I know that I am not proof against temptation, and that I am exposed to all the weaknesses and faults of those around me.”

But it was due to the cause which he defends, to add the following very just, and, considering the provocation, very temperate reproof:

“I know of nothing in any recent Orthodox publications, which can well compare with the reiterated charges against us by Unitarians, from the pulpit and the press, of bigotry, of gloomy superstition, of dark and fraudulent designs on the religious liberties of our country, of worshipping a God who is a tyrant, of propagating horrible and blasphemous ideas of the Divinity, of worshipping a God who is no better than the devil, of an intention to renew the horrors of the Inquisition, of being gloomy, unsocial, illiterate misanthropes, enthusiasts, hypocrites, deceivers, and other things of the like nature. It were easy to substantiate this charge by abundance of evidence; and this too, from publications which you yourself patronise by your pen, your purse, and your approbation.”

All intention, however, of defending harshness and severity, even under great provocation, is expressly disclaimed. But, when Orthodox men are excited by angry denunciations and bitter scorn, Professor Stuart thinks that Dr. Channing is the last man in the world who is entitled to load them with reproaches. And he does not see that the Doctor, or any of his partisans has a right to say, “I will have unbounded liberty of speaking, writing and acting, in order to propagate my sentiments, but the Orthodox cannot claim the same liberty for themselves.”

Then follows a charge against the Unitarians, to which we have already referred, and which, we should think, would be felt by every one in Massachusetts, whose ingenuous feelings

have not been consumed by party zeal. The University of Harvard was founded by Orthodox men, and consecrated to the support of those religious opinions, which were dearer than life to its founders. And yet, by a course of secret management and unworthy artifice, it has become an entirely sectarian institution. It is regarded as the strong hold of Unitarianism; and all its rich endowments and its influence, are employed in the advancement of a cause, which the pious founder of the institution regarded with utter abhorrence. We choose to present this subject in the words of Professor Stuart:

“ We have rights in a University which is the property of the *whole* State, and was not founded or exclusively endowed by Unitarians; at least we have such rights, so long as we are not absolutely disfranchised. We have a right to expect that the property of the State in such an establishment, should not be appropriated to the purposes of a party; and that the instructors in them should not give their services to one sect only, which has in *fact*, although not in name, excluded all others from any participation with them in these privileges. We who have children to educate, in common with our fellow citizens, feel the loss of such rights. We cannot help deeply feeling them; for we are obliged to send our children abroad, at a great expense, in order to avoid their becoming partizans in the present warfare against our own sentiments. We do not complain that our sentiments are opposed; but we complain that they are opposed in this way, and at the sacrifice of rights that we hold dear and deem sacred. We do not complain that Unitarians build up seminaries for themselves, in order to educate young men to spread abroad and defend their own sentiments; they have an entire right to build up schools, colleges, or theological seminaries of this kind, and to confine their privileges to their own body. The Bill of Rights assures them of this privilege. But they should remember, that it assures us of the same. What we complain of is, that an Institution which belongs in common to the whole State, which was founded and endowed to a large extent by Orthodox men, and consecrated to maintaining their faith, should now be made exclusively a party seminary, so that from the President down to the janitor, no man of *known* Orthodox sentiments, can find access there as an instructor. We complain that rights public and common, should be seized by one exclusive party, and appropriated to their own purposes; that teachers, maintained at the expense of the Commonwealth, should be devoted to a seminary exclusively Unitarian, and paid from a fund in which the Orthodox have a common interest. Of all this we complain; but never shall or can

complain, that Unitarians manage their *own* Seminaries entirely in their own way ; provided always that they concede to us the same liberty.

“ Look now for a moment on this whole case, and put yourself in our place. Would you not feel, could you help feeling, that you had to deal with those, who being in possession of power forget right ? And yet, Sir, you are not only looking on, but heartily approving of all this, and have yourself been an efficient agent in bringing it about. How can it be that there is only one side to such a question ? ”

Professor Stuart, in his plea, takes notice, in the next place, of the reproach brought on the Orthodox, for separating from the religious communion of the Unitarians. In our honest opinion, this reproach would not be uttered, if the Unitarians were not a minority ; and did not feel that this separation is injurious to their interests as a party. Indeed, we cannot be brought to believe that, if they constituted a large majority of the community, and were free from all anxiety about consequences, they would wish to hold communion with their Orthodox neighbours. Our opinion is founded on the manner in which these *liberal christians* speak of the religious opinions and worship of the Orthodox. They say that the Deity worshipped by them is a devil ; that their religion is a strange compound of jarring attributes, bearing plain marks of those ages of darkness, when Christianity shed a faint ray, and the diseased fancy teemed with prodigies and unnatural creations : that one of the fundamental articles of their faith is a riddle ; that they have fallen into some of the grossest errors ; and that their creed is unfavourable to piety, &c. &c. Do Unitarians wish to hold communion with the professors of such a religion as this ? Is Dr. Channing desirous to fraternize with men engaged in dark designs to destroy freedom of inquiry, and crush all religious liberty ? But however this may be, Professor Stuart has placed the subject of separation in a fair point of view. The Orthodox do sincerely believe, that certain doctrines are essential to the Christian religion ; that is, Christianity cannot exist without them. What these doctrines are, has always been a subject of careful inquiry with the Orthodox ; and their opinions are founded on conviction. So at least, they affirm. The Unitarians, then, must believe them to be hypocrites, or wish them to act the part of hypocrites ; that is, openly acknowledge men to be *Christians*, whom they sincerely believe *not to be such*. If they believe them to be

hypocrites, this is a precious specimen of their liberality: if they wish them to act the part of hypocrites, it is an equally precious specimen of religious honesty. But after all, perhaps they only wish the Orthodox to become Unitarians! And zeal for their conversion produces all this bitterness.

The general principle, that there are doctrines *essential* to Christianity, as we have explained the term essential, will surely be admitted by the most liberal Christian: for if not, how absurd is the distinction between *Christians* and *Jews*, *Mahometans* and *Hindoos*! If Unitarians say that they hold these essential doctrines, and ought therefore to be acknowledged among the *faithful*; the Orthodox reply, that they are sincerely and conscientiously of a widely different opinion. They so understand the scriptures, that they cannot admit to Christian fellowship those who deny inspiration, depravity, the atonement and divinity of Christ, regeneration, &c. And what would their accusers have? Do they demand the surrender of most deliberate opinions, to interpretations of scripture believed to be erroneous, and to reasonings believed to be inconclusive? Where then would be Christian liberty? Unless Orthodox men, therefore, will submit to Dr. Channing's dictation, they must bear his reproaches and denunciations.

It is no complaint of the Orthodox that Unitarians separate from them. That liberty is fully conceded. Nor do they separate from Unitarians in any thing but Christian communion. They are perfectly willing to keep up all the kindly intercourse of social life; they contribute to their civil and political honour; and rejoice in their happiness. All this they do, and no one can deny it. In religion, however, there is a painful separation. It is made under a deep sense of responsibility to the Head of the Church; and the Orthodox can never surrender the right of making it. And now, where is the ground of accusation against them as enemies of religious liberty and free inquiry? What right have Unitarians to assume a lofty air, as though with them every thing were just and right, noble and liberal; while every thing among Orthodox men is bigoted and narrow minded, furious and persecuting? Who is to believe such extravagant and arrogant assumptions?

Professor Stuart next sums up the charges already made, and then adduces others made in a still fiercer tone. The amount of the whole is expressed in these words:

“ You have given your name to the world as the author of accu-

sations, that we are aiming to subvert and destroy the religious liberty of this Commonwealth; that we are combined to put down all free inquiry in matters of religion; that we are endeavoring, in secret and openly, to introduce an ecclesiastical tyranny worse than that of the Inquisition; that we are determined to raise up Ecclesiastical Courts to try, condemn, and punish all whom we deem to be heretics; and thus to prevent all right of private judgment, and all freedom in respect to religious opinion."

He then hurls defiance directly in the teeth of his accuser, and declares before heaven and earth that these charges *are not true*. To himself and his brethren as injured men, injured in a manner highly unjust and cruel, he calls on Dr. Channing to make reparation: and if not, to support his charges by clear, unequivocal evidence. They are alleged *as matters of fact*; and Dr. Channing *MUST either support them or retract*. These things have been borne in silence long enough. Grievous accusations have been repeated until some begin to think them true; and Dr. Channing has gone on unquestioned as to these matters, until he appears to think that he may vent his vehement and scornful denunciations, and "not a bird will move the wing, or open the mouth, or peep." But there are bounds beyond which the most meek and patient will not carry their forbearance. Thousands of men have been slandered and abused by Dr. Channing's assertions; and he is required to come out now with his proof or his retraction. *One or the other he must do*. Dr. CHANNING must do it, both because he has put his name to the charge, and because he stands before the world as the leader of Unitarianism in this country. And he may rely on it, that he will be held to the obligation which he has brought on himself. No man in our republic, however elevated by his own talents, or the zeal of his partisans, may bring injurious and heavy charges against even the most humble individual, and then refuse to bring his proofs, because, forsooth, it is inconsistent with his dignity; much less may whole communities be calumniated, without evidence to support the accusation.

Professor Stuart strongly disavows even the suspicion of intentional falsehood on the part of his accuser. But his sincerity, so far from lessening, increases the injury. Anonymous accusations pass for so little among the wise, that men engaged in a great work cannot notice them. But Dr. Channing is a man and a writer for whom Professor Stuart entertains a high respect. He does not, indeed, admit the claim to "perfect

liberality," put in for him by the *North American Review*; and he does not think that the *Edinburgh Quarterly* has done him justice. But in proportion to the reputation of the accuser is the injury inflicted by his false charges. And as an instance in point, Professor Stuart notices the retailings by certain periodicals published in our own neighborhood, of accusations found in the writings of Dr. Channing.

There is also a distinct disavowal of ill will towards the accuser, and of intention to excite hostility against him. Feelings and motives of this kind are held to be inconsistent with the Christian character. But when such men as Professor Stuart and his friends are charged with enormous crimes, with nothing less, indeed, than a conspiracy against the dearest liberties of their country, they cannot be true to themselves and their cause, without demanding that the charge should be either substantiated or denied.

Professor Stuart further remarks, that the Orthodox Christians of Massachusetts have no secrets in their plans and designs. They believe that the scriptures are the sufficient and only rule of faith and practice; they agree in heart and soul, in all the great doctrines of the Reformation, because they find them in the Bible. They are Calvinists; they claim to be *true* sons of the Pilgrims, because they have examined the Holy Scriptures, and find substantially the same doctrines there, which their forefathers embraced and taught. And if Dr. Channing wishes to know how the Orthodox may be put down at once, and for ever, Professor Stuart can tell him. Let him only show that the Bible, when fairly interpreted, does not support Orthodoxy, and it will forthwith be abandoned. But as for submission to any thing but the divine wisdom and authority, the Orthodox never think of it. So far from being the men to bring back the dark ages, they are a great deal further from commending the *faith* and *works* of those who labour to extend the Romish superstitions in this country than Dr. Channing.

As for the reproach and scorn heaped upon them, they have some portion left of the spirit of men, who gave up home, and friends, and country, rather than renounce the least jot or tittle of the doctrine which they had derived from the Bible. And even the *strong voice* of Dr. Channing will hardly turn them from their ways. They may not bear injury as meekly as might be wished. They may feel the exclusions to which they have been subjected; the jeering in private, and the scorn

in public, to which they have been exposed. And all this has gone on long enough. A flame has been kindled in secret, which cannot always be smothered. By saying this, Professor Stuart does not mean to terrify, but in kindness to give reasonable warning. Under a sense of both civil and religious injury, which the Orthodox citizens of Massachusetts have suffered, they are looking now at Switzerland, where men who had dared to preach Christ crucified, are languishing in dungeons, or wandering in exile. And it is known that Unitarianism has done this. A disposition to do similar things is manifested by some intolerant men of the same creed in Massachusetts. But Professor Stuart hopes, that the appearances which now portend storm and tempest may vanish, and that unclouded sunshine may follow.

We have thus given as full a view as our limits will allow, of the manly, temperate, and opportune production. And we are happy in the opportunity thus publicly to express our approbation of the whole spirit and manner of the writer. Indeed, we know not how, in better terms, to give utterance to our feelings in this respect, than by here recording our most earnest wish that Christians, when arguing with their fellow Christians respecting their different views of religious doctrine, might always exhibit the respectful and kind consideration, the fairness and candour, which Professor Stuart has always shown, in his controversy with the Unitarians. On comparing the pamphlet with some things which we have read in the last two years, we have been very much struck with the difference. If our anonymous commendation can affect any thing, Professor Stuart will frequently give examples of the manner in which religious controversy ought to be conducted. But *verbum sat*.

The sketch given by us, imperfect as it is, has been so extended as not to allow room for all the remarks which we intended to subjoin to Professor Stuart's statements. The subject, however, is one of such deep and general interest, that we cannot dismiss it at once.

Our first observation is, that the pain felt on seeing a respectable man bringing unfounded accusations against others, is mingled with some consolation in the present case, arising from the persuasion, that Unitarianism is reduced to great straits. If it were not so, such a man as Dr. Channing, the leader of the most *liberal* of all denominations, a man of real talents and of high standing in the world, would not resort to these petty and discreditable arts of controversy which he has

permitted himself to employ, and on which we suffered the pain of remarking in the beginning of this article. He has brought a charge of most *criminal designs* against his Orthodox neighbours. This is an accusation which it is at all times difficult to establish. Even when *actions* are proved, the *intention* is often uncertain. But in this case, without a single fact to rely on, with nothing, indeed, but passionate declamation for its accompaniment, Dr. Channing has alleged a crime, which, if proved, will fasten everlasting disgrace on thousands, and if *believed* on his authority, will cover them with reproach. He cannot prove the *wicked intention*. If he has half the discernment for which he has credit, he knows that he cannot. And it is impossible for any who do not take part with him, to read his writings and not feel that his design is to bring odium on men whom he has not yet, with all his *strength of voice*, been able to put down. Alas! how are the mighty fallen! In some of the extracts given by Professor Stuart, there are tokens of anger which one is surprised to find in one who thinks himself a conqueror. And in the tone of all his writings, as far as the Orthodox are concerned, there is a querulousness, mingled with acrimony, entirely misbecoming his pretensions. When he, who undertook to instruct the world how they ought to appreciate the genius and character of the greatest conqueror of his age, and the greatest poet of past ages, descends to the arts of a defeated sectarian controvertist, we cannot help thinking that he feels himself to be the advocate of a sinking cause. We speak of Dr. Channing as he appears before the public in his works. Of him as a man we know nothing, and of course we say nothing.

But there are other topics of higher interest, on which we wish to touch in these observations. It does seem strange, that in this country, where the press is perfectly free, and where, every day, men are endeavouring by speech and writing, to propagate Atheism, Deism, Unitarianism, Universalism, Popery, Episcopacy, Methodism, Presbyterianism, Baptism, &c. and all without let or hinderance, there should be frequent and earnest attempts to bring odium on one particular class of men, because they endeavour to maintain their opinions. On what principle may it be accounted for, that the zeal of EVANGELICAL MEN of all denominations, calls forth from various quarters ungenerous, bitter, and even furious denunciations? How does it happen that they who deafen us with loud boastings of their liberality, and with outcries against religious dis-

putes, who have never read a book of controversy in their lives, and almost swear that they never will, how does it happen, that they embrace and even *make* every possible opportunity to calumniate the professors of *evangelical piety*? The alleged *exclusiveness* of these persecuted men cannot be the true reason. Because, the Romanists are of all people in the world, the most exclusive. They alone constitute the true Catholic Church! and all who are out of that pale are heretics, the children of the devil and heirs of perdition. Our Episcopal brethren of the high church party, are also sufficiently exclusive to incur odium, if that were the true cause. Our Baptist brethren, too, might come in for their share of reproach on this account; for in regard to the ordinance which gives them their distinctive character, they hold that none are in the Church of Christ who have not been immersed, after a profession of their faith.

But notwithstanding the efforts, foreign and domestic, to promote Popery, notwithstanding the immense sums contributed or extorted to sustain Jesuit missions and build Roman Catholic Chapels, and establish free schools for the benefit (forsooth!) of protestant children, not a whisper is heard, in certain quarters, on this subject. On the contrary, the very men who in newspapers, magazines and reviews, show a partisan activity and bitterness, in denouncing Evangelical Christians, manifest a strong sympathy with Jesuitism as it is working in the United States. The exclusive high church Episcopalians too, are quite in favour with most of the men who set up claims to peculiar liberality. And as far as our observation goes, the evangelical principles and the zeal of the Baptists are censured a thousand times, for once that a rebuke is given to them for their exclusiveness in regard to baptism. Such instances might be greatly extended; but we shall advert to only one fact more. Perhaps there are not in this country more active, restless *proselytists*, the Jesuits always excepted, than the present Universalists. And unless they have changed their creed to suit the times, their favourite and fundamental principle is, that the merit of Christ in making the atonement is so great, that it covers the sins, and will be efficient for the salvation of all men, whether penitent or impenitent, believers or unbelievers. But Unitarians totally deny the atonement, and reject the whole of Christianity, which depends on that doctrine. And yet, notwithstanding, this eager spirit of proselytism, and this world-wide difference between Universalists and Unita-

rians, the latter have shown quite a disposition to sympathize, and fraternize with the former. We are warranted by facts such as these, to draw the conclusion, that the outcry which has been raised against orthodox men, is not to be attributed to any alleged exclusiveness in their opinions, nor to the claim put in by them to the right of defending and propagating their principles.

Nor can it be said that the reason is to be found in the right to apply the discipline of the Church to members of their own communion, claimed by evangelical Christians. For not to insist on the fact, that every society on earth exercises this right, it is notorious that the terrors of excommunication constitute the sword and buckler of the Romish Church; and to this day, these weapons are used with most tremendous efficacy, wherever popish doctrines are received. But *Infidel Socinian Catholics*, and *Catholic Socinian Infidels* know all this; and yet they smother all resentment against Jesuitism and Popery, and reserve the *bottles* of their wrath to be poured on the heads of evangelical men!

On what principles, then, can we account for the fact, that these men are the objects of dislike, of scorn, of contumely? Is it alleged that they are bigots? All history proves that they have built their system on the sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures, and the right of private judgment, as fundamental principles. This is not the way with bigots? Is it urged that they are intolerant and oppressive? The historian of martyrdom has very few occasions to go out of the record of their sufferings, to give completeness to his narrative. Are they charged with being narrow minded and illiberal? Their confessions of Faith, and their practice, show that they acknowledge brotherhood with all of every denomination, who call on the name of Jesus Christ, the common Lord of all.

In none of these reasons, then, can we find a satisfactory answer to our inquiries. We will, therefore, show our opinion. But to do this, we must make the following statement. All Orthodox, evangelical Christians, whatever minor differences of opinion may prevail among them, agree in holding inviolably the following doctrines:

All men are sinners. No sinner can be justified, except by faith in Jesus Christ as a divine Redeemer. No human being can be admitted to heaven, without a change of heart, wrought by the Holy Spirit. There is no good evidence of faith and regeneration, but a holy life.

As a practical inference from these principles, it is held, that no one can be acknowledged as a Christian, who does not profess to receive these doctrines, and give credible evidence of his sincerity.

But the leading wish of mankind, is to have a religion which will give them assurance of salvation without a change of heart. In a word, they want a religion which will allow them to live as they please in this world, and to go to heaven when they die. If, however, the prevalence of religious truth is such, and in Christian countries it generally is such, as to prevent the conscience from resting on this scheme of broad and boundless liberality; then, that system is most acceptable, which as far as possible admits of a compromise, and allows a balance to be struck between the sins committed, and the duties performed. This last plan, however, is only a substitute for the first, adopted through necessity. The one is received, because the truth stands too much in the way of the other. And he who has received it, always manifests a strong leaning towards that, for which it is a substitute.

Hence we see how it is, that various classes of religionists, who differ widely in their external forms, and even in many points of doctrine, approximate in spirit. A *virtuous* Deist, and a *liberal* Unitarian are but a single step asunder. They both rely on their good works, and on the mercy of their Creator; the one because his reason tells him so, and the other because his reason approves that *part* of the Bible, which, he *thinks*, teaches the same doctrine. The gentlemanly, scholar-like, wealthy Roman Catholic, can write in defence of the holy church, and in abuse of the fanatics; buy absolution, and be assured that he is going to heaven, without any change of heart. The Deist and Unitarian, who meet him at the theatre, in the ball room, and at the wine party, never trouble his conscience, and he praises them, for very liberal gentlemen. And then comes the Universalist, with a system wide enough to embrace men of all sorts and conditions. The greatest illiberality of which he can be guilty, is to send the worst men to hell for a few myriads of ages. But his *everlasting punishment* is so much like the Roman Catholic's purgatory, that the two find no difficulty in uniting in cordial hatred of evangelical principles. And if the Universalist should happen not to be a *poor or low creature*, the Deist and the Unitarian can forgive his error also, in regard to revelation, and the atonement, for the sake of his general liberality. And thus Deists, Papists,

Unitarians, and Universalists, with all others, who resolve that they will walk according "to the sight of their eyes, and the desires of their hearts;" and, if there is a heaven, that they will go to it, without being born again, find no difficulty in uniting to denounce, and, if possible, put down orthodox, evangelical Christians. The Deist in his heart despises, and in his sleeve laughs at the opinions of all the rest; the Unitarian has more than half a mind to do the same thing; while the Papist holds them all to be heretics, and the Universalist pities the errors of all. But there is nothing so intolerable as the austerity of the evangelicals; and nothing so wearisome as their everlasting cry, "ye must be born again." This sameness of feeling produces something like mutual understanding and concert, in all parts of the country. A calumny is started respecting an evangelical man, for instance, in New York, and appears in a certain newspaper. To a certainty, the very same thing will appear in some forty or fifty papers successively, in all parts of the country. This is so much the case, that we who have for some time been observing things of this sort, can tell beforehand, with considerable accuracy, in what papers, through a very large part of the country, the falsehood will be reprinted. And we have sometimes had a strange sort of painful amusement, in *guessing* on this subject, and noticing the truth of our conjectures. If, for instance, the *thing* is coarse and blackguard in its character, we have said, this is too low, except for such and such papers. But if the lie, or the caricature, and this is a species of lying, is well got up; if it is *witty*, and *caustic*, and *gentlemanly*, we have said, this will appear in such and such papers, in Boston, New York, Philadelphia, &c.: and, after a little observation, we have been surprised at the accuracy of our guesses. This strong appearance of concert, can be accounted for in no way, but by supposing the existence of a common feeling among men of very different religious creeds. That feeling is a deep dislike of evangelical religion; of the religion which tells them that they are sinners, that they must be born again, and be saved through the merits of the Lord Jesus Christ.

But it deserves also, to be remarked, that evangelical principles are making great progress in this country. And there is strong probability that they will finally become prevalent; not indeed as embodied by one class of Christians, but as embraced by numbers among all denominations of Protestant believers. *Hinc illæ lachrymæ.* Hence the wailings of many

respecting religious liberty, the hideous outcry which has recently stunned us about the union of Church and State, *et id genus omne*. But in connexion with this, it ought to be especially noted, that the evangelical Christians, who, from whatever cause, are, or appear before the world to be most active and zealous in carrying on various enterprises of Christian benevolence, are the objects of the most envenomed hostility. It cannot be denied, that in this country, the Presbyterians and Congregationalists are most prominent in support of the Bible, Missionary, and Sunday School Societies. We are anxious to avoid invidious comparisons; and declare that we have no intention to exalt our friends. We will say, then, that these denominations are regarded by the world as the *principal* agents in carrying on, throughout a great part of the United States, these and other benevolent operations. Now, it cannot have escaped observation, that Presbyterians and Congregationalists, are attacked violently, and without cessation, by all who manifest a strong dislike to evangelical religion. Nor is this any new thing; it has been so from the beginning. The only novelty in the case, is the change in the mode of attack. Before the revolution, they were denounced as enemies to the monarchy, and to the established Church; and many a diatribe was written to prove that their fundamental principles strongly favoured *republicanism*. During the struggle of the revolution their services were so important, that, for the time, they had some degree of favour. But a new generation has risen up, which "knows not Joseph." And now they are denounced as enemies of religious liberty, and of free inquiry; and this, while they hold precisely the same principles, which sixty years ago, made them objects of jealousy to the British government, and of hatred to the established Church! Among these hated, we had almost said persecuted, Christians, we readily admit that there are many things erroneous, many things wrong, on which their adversaries might found charges. They dispute a great deal too much about little things; they do not love one another as much they ought; their ministers are often very culpably jealous of each other's reputation and influence. They all love this world too well; they have not, by one half, as much active zeal as they ought to have. They are often engaged in controversy, when they ought to be engaged in sending the Gospel of Christ to them that are ready to perish. We could swell this catalogue, until we should be

compelled to hang our heads in shame, and blot out our own charges with tears. But all these evils are passed over without notice by the accusers; while they, with one voice, denounce these Christians as conspirators against religious liberty! That is, charges which might easily be proved; under which, indeed, ninety-nine in a hundred would, at once, confess guilt, are not once mentioned; while one is repeated even to hoarseness, which not only cannot be proved, but on the contrary is falsified by facts of every day's occurrence, and by the whole tenour of history. We ask, why is it so? Can it be accounted for on any other principle than this? The enemies of evangelical piety know the sensitiveness of the American people, in regard to liberty in general, and religious liberty in particular: they know too, (for many of them are politicians) the effect of bold denunciations often repeated; and they have resolved to open and keep up this outcry, because it is the surest way to bring evangelical men, and their principles, into odium. The dislike of all unconverted men, to the peculiar doctrines of the Gospel, and to their advocates, is well understood by Dr. Channing, and his *co-accusers* in all parts of the country; and it was no doubt expected that such charges as were brought by him, unsupported as they are, would be believed by numbers, because they want to find some reason for the dislike of which they are conscious. This, then, has all the appearance of a deep laid scheme to stop the progress of evangelical truth in the United States. And it accords well with another declaration understood to have been made by the Dr. in some Unitarian Association or Convention, "These Bible Societies, and Missionary Societies must be put down." Yes, *delenda est Carthago*. But the present race of evangelicals are incurable, they must be permitted to die out; and as for the rest, care must be taken so to rouse public hatred, and so to cover evangelical principles with reproach, that in this country, where every thing is governed by opinion, a stop may be put to their progress.

Our readers will, we hope, understand, that in all these remarks we are attempting to account for facts, undisputed and indisputable, such as these: that evangelical Christians in general, and Presbyterians and Congregationalists in particular, are treated with much obloquy and scorn; that the liberal Dr. Channing, and Deists, and Roman Catholics, and others like them, have openly accused these Christians of dark and malignant designs against the religious liberties of the country.

And now, let every one judge, whether we have assigned the true cause. Of one thing we are most certain; there must be some deep seated, powerful passion urging onward the men, who appear before the world, and accuse millions of their fellow citizens, of a deep-dyed, atrocious, damning crime, without one tittle of evidence to support the accusation. We are willing to admit, that very often this allegation is made by men who do not consider what is implied in it. But it would be a poor compliment to Dr. Channing and to some men who copy him, to plead the excuse of inconsideration. They know that the American nation regards their religious liberty as the most precious part of their birthright; and that they who plot its destruction, are in heart guilty of the worst sort of treason. Of the thousands condemned to infamy in the dungeons of our penitentiaries, perhaps not one ever meditated wickedness so dark and diabolical, as that of which a very considerable part of the citizens of the United States are publicly and frequently accused. It is time that such injuries should have an end. Especially at this period of general agitation; during this shaking of the nations, men appointed to make, and men appointed to administer laws, ought not to inflict deep and irreparable injury on an innumerable multitude of the citizens of this country. But if a sense of justice will not, at least a sense of shame ought to prevent a repetition of these outrages.

What are these men doing who are thus furiously denounced? They are making efforts to put a Bible into the hands of every citizen. They are endeavouring to afford elementary instruction to every child in the United States. And inasmuch as a very great proportion of the instruction received by the mass of our population is received on the Sabbath, they have asked the government of their country not by any arrangements to desecrate a day so important for general improvement.* And it is inferred that there is a dark, Judas-like plotting against the religious liberties of the country! In other countries, where religious liberty was actually destroyed, the deed of wickedness could not be achieved but by taking the Bible from the people, and preventing their instruction, and destroying the religious influence of the Sabbath. The Reformation too, could not be effected until the Bible was restored and the people taught to read, and the Christian Sabbath consecrated to its

* It is not our object here to vindicate the *wisdom* of the application to Congress in regard to Sabbath mails; but the *intentions* of the applicants. Of the former we say nothing; of the latter we have no doubt.

proper uses. With these facts recorded on the pages of history, citizens of this country are denounced. Often native citizens are denounced by foreigners and men of foreign education, for doing the very things which, more than charters and laws, have secured religious freedom!

This case is rendered more striking and extraordinary by the fact, that the very same efforts which have brought on evangelical men in this country such injurious accusations, have produced in England, at the same time too, denunciations of an exactly opposite character. Here the cry is, "Liberty is in danger!" There, "The Church is in danger!" Here the accusation is, "These men are plotting to effect a religious establishment." There, "They are the enemies of the establishment." The case was the same in Russia, as far as the experiment was made. The Bible Society was suppressed by the priests and nobles, lest the people should become discontented with their condition. We could easily adduce similar facts in the case of Switzerland and France; and we could easily ask, why do the laws in some States of the Union shut out the Bible, and the Sabbath school, and the Missionary from the labouring part of the population? But the absurdity of these charges is only equalled by the credulity of the men who believe them.

The Presbyterians and Congregationalists are now the prominent objects of dislike and attack. But it is not because they are Presbyterians or Congregationalists; but because they are thought to be particularly active in promoting evangelical principles; because they with some zeal propagate that religion which tells man he is a sinner, and he must repent or perish; he must be born again, or he cannot enter the kingdom of heaven. Orthodox Baptists, Evangelical Episcopalians, and all other evangelical Christians, are as really the objects of this dislike as the men who at present have, for some cause, to bear the brunt of the battle. None need suppose that the world loves them or is at peace with them.

Only let those who have been first selected as adversaries be put out of the way, and the *turn* of some others will come next. The opposition will go on, either until evangelical piety shall be exiled to some Patmos in the Southern Ocean, or, which we believe will be the case, until the "truth as it is in Jesus," shall so prevail as to make all opposition hopeless.

We can only offer one additional remark. The spirit which has manifested itself in the writings of Dr. Channing, as brought

under review by Professor Stuart, and which has shown itself in many other places and on many other occasions, is the very *spirit of tyranny*. It claims for itself the right of doing what it is greatly offended if others do. It arrogates to itself all taste, all wisdom, all liberality, all comprehension of views, and attributes to others vulgarity, folly, contractedness of feelings, and narrowness of mind. "*Nihil non arrogat sibi.*"

ART. VI.—THE AMERICAN QUARTERLY REVIEW ON
SUNDAY MAILS.

We have frequently been struck, in reading the numbers of the *National Gazette*, with the justness and weight of its editorial remarks on the responsibility of the conductors of the periodical press. And we have often sympathized with its accomplished editor, on observing the severity with which he has been treated by party prints, for endeavouring to conduct a paper on national principles, abstaining equally from indiscriminate commendation and abuse. We readily yield the tribute which is due to him, for the elevated stand which he has proposed to himself, and think that, as far as politics are concerned, it has been successfully maintained. As it is universally understood that the editorial departments of the *Gazette* and of the *American Quarterly Review* are filled by the same individual, we had hoped that the moderation and fairness which mark the political character of the former, would also have been impressed on the pages of the latter. We entertained this hope with the greater confidence, from the conviction that the editor had too much discernment not to be aware, that a responsibility peculiarly serious rests upon the individual who undertakes to conduct an *AMERICAN REVIEW*, which aspires, in its measure, at once to form and represent American sentiments and opinions. In despite of our sectional partialities, we are constrained to admit, that in respect to candour and fairness, whenever religion has been concerned, it has fallen far below its great eastern compeer. In the very first number of the work, there was an article, which, from the levity and injustice with which the character of several of the most distinguished of the American clergy was treated, we considered of unpropitious omen. This, however, it seems,

was but a premonition of the spirit afterwards to be exhibited. We question whether the pages of the respectable periodical literature of this country, can furnish an instance of a more uncandid assault on the character and opinions of a large part of the Christian community, than the recent article on Sunday Mails in the American Quarterly Review. We cannot but regard the publication of that piece as a high offence against the professed principles of the work, and a flagrant breach of the confidence reposed in its conductors. The public, unquestionably, have a right to expect that works of this character should not avail themselves of the power lent to them for other purposes, to disseminate principles which the mild and venerable Bishop White has pronounced anti-christian in their character, and licentious in their tendency. It is no justification of this course to state, there is a portion of professed Christians who agree with the leading doctrine of the article in question; for the Review professes not to be the virulent and party advocate of any set of opinions; much less does it claim the right of insulting, in behalf of an inconsiderable minority, the faith of nine-tenths of the Christian community of the country. The public, indeed, do not presume to pry into the private belief of its Editor, nor of any of its conductors; but in consenting to admit the work into their families, to operate on the opinions and character of their children, they surely have the right to expect that it should be kept free from decidedly anti-christian sentiments. It may well be that some of the contributors to that Review have no faith in Christianity at all, no regard for its institutions, nor respect enough for its worship to induce them to pass the threshold of a church once in twenty years. But would such persons be authorized to avail themselves of the access afforded them, under the name and sanction of American reviewers, into hundreds of Christian families, to attack the authority of our religion, or to asperse its doctrines and institutions? Assuredly not. And yet they might with too much truth affirm, that many of their readers coincide with their views. Or were they to appear as the open advocates of Unitarianism, the same justification might be offered. In either case, however, it is acknowledged that they would violate their contract with the public, by appearing in a different light from that in which their prospectus and general object present them. We are utterly at a loss to discern how they can justify themselves for having, in the article under review, assailed opinions which they know to be held

sacred by a large portion of the community. Let it be borne in mind, that we are not objecting to a consideration of the expediency or in expediency of carrying the mail on Sunday; nor even to a discussion of the grounds on which the religious observance of that day is obligatory on Christians; but to the avowal and laboured support of the doctrine that the Sabbath was not originally a day devoted to the exercises of religion, and that it is now most appropriately kept by festivity and amusement. It is this doctrine which we affirm is abhorrent to the feelings of nine-tenths of the serious part of the public.

The reviewer asserts, "that the true construction of the Mosaic law is, that it (the Sabbath) should be kept as a day of festivity and gladness, and not by gloomy lectures and religious worship," p. 178. In reference to the meaning of the phrase, "to keep it holy," he says: "It is asserted, on the other hand, that we are commanded to abstain, not only from labour, but from our usual amusements, from festivity, from social intercourse, such as is allowable on every other day, and that we should devote the Sunday to the solemn offices of religion, to the worship of God, public and private. We deny that such is the meaning of the commandment, but the reverse," p. 180. "In short," as he quotes from some 'learned author,' "the Sabbath was celebrated, at first, like other festivals, with feasting, dancing, and other holiday recreations, p. 182.

To our apprehension, these assertions carry the mark of absurdity on the very face of them. They represent the Sabbath as standing in a predicament occupied by no other religious institution in the world, ancient or modern. They exhibit it as being at utter variance with the whole system of which it is a part. The injunctions of every religion are certainly to be understood in a manner congruous to its own nature. The festivals of the heathen were thus in keeping with their religion. Those in honour of Ceres, Bacchus, or Venus, were attended by rites adapted to the character of the imaginary power to which they were consecrated. But the Reviewer's position requires us either to suppose that the Sabbath had nothing in common with the system with which it was so intimately connected, or to renounce our whole belief as to the nature of that system. It is so evident that where a festival is enjoined, the manner of its observance must be adapted to the religion to which it belongs, that the very same formula of words must have very different meanings, under different circumstances. When we are told that a day was

kept among the heathen as a time of joy and gladness, in honour of their gods, we take it for granted that the nature of that joy, and the mode of its expression, was determined by the nature of their mythology. And when in the Bible, we are commanded to rejoice, to sing, to make the Sabbath a delight, we know just as surely that the joy, singing and delight are to be of a spiritual character, adapted to the religion of the Bible. If the Lord's day is to be observed, as we shall show is the faith of the whole Christian world, in commemoration of the resurrection of Christ, and of the pardon, purity and eternal life thereby secured, it is self-evident that its appropriate celebration is not by worldly singing, dancing and festivity; but by sincere thankfulness for these blessings, and joy adapted to their nature. Any man, therefore, who believes the Bible to contain a revelation of the true religion, and who entertains any correct idea of what religion is, must feel that the Reviewer's assertions are in themselves incredible.

If the object for which any festival was instituted, determines its nature, and the manner of its observance, then it scarcely needs an argument to prove that the Sabbath is to be religiously celebrated. It was instituted to keep in mind the creation of the world. The great source of idolatry was ignorance of the origin of things. To preserve, therefore, the knowledge of the fact that God called the universe into existence, and as the Creator was the only proper object of worship, was the most effectual means of preserving the true religion. That this was its object is expressly and repeatedly asserted. Thus in Ex. 20, v. ii. "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy; for in six days the Lord made the heavens and the earth, and all that in them is, and rested on the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the seventh day and sanctified it." This assuredly means, that the end for which the day was to be observed was to commemorate this event. When the Hebrews were commanded "on the first month on the fourteenth day of the month," to keep the Passover, "for in this self-same day have I brought your armies out of the land of Egypt: therefore shall ye observe this day in your generations by an ordinance forever," it is evident that the object of the feast was to keep in mind this merciful deliverance. And it is not less evident that when they were commanded to sanctify the seventh day, because God rested on that day, it was in commemoration of that event the day was to be celebrated. This is so often recognised as the end of the

Sabbath, that it is not denied by any one, as far as we are aware, who has any pretension to knowledge on the subject. It is so obvious, that Rosenmüller remarks on this passage, that God appointed the Israelites to be thereby witnesses to all nations, that their God was the Creator of all things. "*Volebat septimae dici feriis memoriam creationis mundi conservari, et Israelitas ea re testatos omnibus gentibus facere, ab ipsis coli id numen, quod omnia creavit.*" It was hence a common saying among the ancient Rabbins, that "He who violates the Sabbath denies the creation." *Selden de Jure Naturali et Gentium*, lib. iii. p. 333. But if this was the object of the institution, how was it to be attained? The end to be answered was purely a religious one, the preservation of correct ideas of God; and will any one in his senses maintain that this was to be done by festivity and dancing? Can any one believe that God ever enjoined for such an end such means as these? But if the day was to be spent in the worship of this God, we can readily conceive how it should answer the end of its institution. Besides, if as our Reviewer maintains, the object of the Sabbath was to give leisure for mere amusement, would, even under the Mosaic law, the penalty of death have been inflicted for its violation? This is impossible. But if its object was to secure, in that age of idolatry, a weekly recognition of God as the only true God, the creator of heaven and earth, we see how a deliberate profanation of the day might be viewed as a denial of the truth it was intended to commemorate, and consequently a rejection of the fundamental principle of the Jewish economy, which, under the theocracy, was an act of rebellion as well as of impiety.

It is in no measure inconsistent with the grand primary object of the Sabbath, that in Deuteronomy the Jews are commanded to observe it, and to allow their servants the necessary cessation from labour, because they themselves had been bondsmen in Egypt. It has always been admitted, that a secondary object of the institution was the refreshment of all labourers among men and the lower animals. The passage referred to, enjoins on the Hebrews a strict observance of this part of the command, from a recollection of their former hardships. This, therefore, is presented, not as the principal object of the institution, but a motive to obedience; and it is one of constant recurrence in the law of Moses. Thou shalt not oppress a stranger, because thou wast a stranger in the land of Egypt. All duties of this class are enforced by this same touching con-

sideration, that God intended the Sabbath should be a day of rest, therefore, to all men and beasts, is perfectly consistent with its being properly, and primarily a religious institution, intended to commemorate the creation of the world. Hence, Selden, p. 332, says, "That the Hebrews when interrogated concerning the reason of keeping the Sabbath, might answer, because in six days God made heaven and earth. But the seventh they acknowledged to be *την του κοσμου γενεθλιον ημεραν*, *Diem mundi natalem*, and *την εορτην του κοσμου γενεσιον*, *Festum natalibus mundi sacratum*, as Philo denominates the Sabbath." And this he asserts was its great design.

It is clear, therefore, from the very intention of the Sabbath and from the nature of the religious system of which it was a part, that the Reviewer's doctrine as to the manner of its observance is incredible and derogatory to the religion of the Bible. Let us, however, hear his arguments in its support. They consist in the assertions that the phrase "To keep it holy," does not mean to separate it to religion; and that the amplification of the law does not warrant that construction here. "The literal or proper signification of the word *holy*," he says, "as we shall show, carries no such meaning; and in the context or amplification of the law, we find not a word to warrant this construction," p. 180. Instead of redeeming his pledge, and proving that the word *holy* has not the signification usually assigned to it, he only supports his own assertion, which he of course could not expect to be of much weight on such matters, by the *assertion* of some other 'learned author' "That the word *kadash*, or *keep holy*, does not ALWAYS signify to separate a thing to religion, as *sanctificare* does in Latin, but is taken for any separation whatever, from a common to a peculiar use, especially when that use is instituted of God." Now these two assertions are very wide apart. The difference between saying a word "has no such meaning," and that it has not ALWAYS that meaning is immense. In the one case nothing short of an absolute necessity, *necessitas loci*, can authorise its being so interpreted in any given passage: whereas in the other, the strongest reasons should be present to justify a departure from what, by the assertion itself, is admitted to be its ordinary meaning. The Reviewer's zeal, therefore, has carried him much too far. The argument resolves itself into two parts, the first relating to the proper signification of the word *kadash*, and the second to its meaning in this particular command.

It so happens, that this word and its derivatives are among the most frequently recurring in the Hebrew Scriptures, and of course in the indefinite variety of their applications cannot have always precisely the same sense. All that is necessary to our purpose is, to show that its proper and dominant meaning is, *to separate to a sacred use*. And this, we presume, the Reviewer's author would not venture to deny. Let us for a moment appeal to authority on this point. Gesenius, in the last edition of his Hebrew Lexicon, tells us that in Piel (the form in question) it means first, to sanctify (heiligen), to consecrate, as any one to the priesthood, an altar, and especially an offering, *Deo consecrare*. 2. To esteem holy. 3. Declare holy. 4. To perform something holy; and 5, to separate as holy. There is not one of the numerous passages cited under these several heads in which the idea of separation to a sacred use, is not included in the meaning of the word. Eichhorn, in his edition of Simonis' Lexicon says, that it means *ab usu et statu communi ad peculiarem et sacrum separare*. Rosenmüller on Gen. ii. 3, defines it, *sanctificare, in usum sanctum segregare, ut et Græci exponunt, ἀφοριεῖν*. In Ex. xx. 8, the words which we render "Remember the Sabbath day and keep it holy," he translates and explains thus, "*Memor esto diei sabbathi, ut eum sacrum habeas, i. e. soli Deo dicatum, sive sepositum; hoc die Deum sancte colas.*" We have selected these three, from the multitude of lexicographers and commentators whose authority might be adduced, not only because they are among the most distinguished Hebraists of modern days, but because they can be as little suspected of reverence for the Sabbath as the Reviewer himself. This is a subject, however, on which we need rest on no man's authority. Every one who is able to read his Bible knows, as well as the greatest Hebraist can tell him, what the meaning of the word is. He knows that throughout the Scriptures, the word holy is predominantly used to express one or the other of these two ideas, *morally pure*, as when God is called holy, and when we are commanded to be so, or *separated to a sacred use*. It is in this latter sense that the Hebrews are called a holy people; that the priests and Levites are called holy; that any place, as the tabernacle, the temple, Jerusalem, Palestine is called holy; that the altar, candlestick, and all sacred utensils are called holy; and that the festivals are so denominated. In short, any person, place, thing, or portion of time devoted to sacred purposes is called holy, and this is the only proper

word for expressing this idea. This use of the term occurs not once, nor twice, nor a hundred, but literally thousands of times, so that it is really idle to waste words on such a subject. The Reviewer never made a more adventurous assertion, than when he affirmed that this was not the proper meaning of the word.

But it is said, the amplification of the command gives no warrant for this construction. To this we reply, that the proper and dominant use of the words is warrant enough. If the context presents nothing inconsistent with this sense, we are not authorised to depart from it. That there is no such inconsistency is perfectly obvious. The command is, Thou shalt devote the Sabbath to the service of God; and the amplification is, In it thou shalt do no work. Is there any inconsistency here? But the Reviewer seems to suppose that the command to keep the Sabbath holy, is explained by what follows, so that the whole sanctification consisted in omitting all servile labour. But this is not exactly so. The reason why such labour was to be omitted was, that the day was holy, i. e. consecrated unto God. This is constantly stated as the reason. "Six days may work be done, but the seventh is the Sabbath of rest *holy unto the Lord*, Ex. xxxi. 15. There is therefore nothing in the context to warrant a departure from the ordinary signification of the word, which is so uniformly preserved in all such connexions, that the utmost violence must be done to all just rules of interpretation, to make the command mean any thing else than what it has usually been supposed to mean.

This interpretation is confirmed by all the notices of the Sabbath which we find in other parts of the Scriptures. We are told that on that day, the usual sacrifices were doubled. A great part of the ancient worship consisted in presenting these offerings, which were necessarily attended with confession, thanksgiving and prayer. By this institution alone, the religious character of the day is distinctly marked. In Levit. xxiii. we have an account of all those feasts on which it was the duty of the people to assemble for worship. Among these the Sabbath is included. "The seventh day is the Sabbath of rest, an holy convocation." In the xvi. c. 2. it is said, "Ye shall keep my Sabbaths and reverence my sanctuary," which implies that the day was to be observed religiously, from the connexion here expressed between the observance of the Sabbath and the duties of worship. All those numerous passages in

which the object of the sanctification of the seventh day is stated to be, that they might know that Jehovah was their God, prove the same thing. Thus Ezekiel says: "Hallow my Sabbaths, that ye may know that I am the Lord thy God." Isaiah, in predicting a happy state of the church, says: "It shall come to pass, that from one new moon to another, and from one Sabbath to another, shall all flesh *come to worship before me*, saith the Lord." Is. xvi. 23. Does not this imply that divine worship was the appropriate duty of the day? Again, Isaiah lviii. 13, it is said, "If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day; and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord honourable; and shalt honour him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words, then," &c. Does this look like a description of a day devoted to festivity and dancing? Even Gesenius tells us that it means that all worldly business was to be omitted and the day consecrated to devotion. "Wenn du den Sabbath nicht durch Umherlaufen zu weltlichen Geschäften entweihest, sondern daheim der Andacht weihst." See Com. on Isaiah. It would, however, be almost an endless business to gather up all the intimations contained in the Old Testament, of the religious character of the Sabbath.

When we come to the New Testament, we find still clearer evidence of this fact. Every where it is said that the Sabbath was the day on which the people met in the Synagogues for worship. Here the Scriptures were read, prayer was made and religious instruction communicated. This, it is asserted, was not a recent custom, but "Moses hath," it is said, "of old times in every city them that preach him, being read in the Synagogues every Sabbath day." The Reviewer, it is presumed, will admit that long continued practice under a law, is the best rule for its exposition. We have, however, still further testimony to the point in hand. Philo, the most learned of the Alexandrian Jews of the time of Christ, says, *De vita Mosis*, p. 602. "The day of the creation having sunk into oblivion was thus restored of God, and is to be observed by pious contemplations of divine things and of the works of nature, and by no means in sloth, luxury or amusement." In his *Tract. de Cherubim*, he draws a contrast between the manner in which the heathen festivals, devoted to amusement and vice were observed, and those of the Hebrews. Josephus, the most distinguished of the Jews of Palestine of nearly the same

age, in his work *Contra Apion*, lib. iii. says, "This day, as the memorial of the creation, is to be piously celebrated, and was instituted of God that the law might be publicly read to the people and made known to all."

The assertion, therefore, of the Reviewer and his author, that the Sabbath was originally and properly observed as a day of dancing and festivity, is not only entirely gratuitous, but is contradicted by all the evidence of which the case admits. The meaning of the command is as plain as words can make it, that the day should be consecrated to religious worship. This interpretation is confirmed by the object of the institution, by the nature of the system of which it is a part, by the indubitable declarations of the ancient prophets, by the practice and testimony of the Jews in the time of Christ, and the opinions of their learned men to the present day. And this, as we have seen, is the conclusion to which not only devout Christians, but civilians, historians, and infidel antiquarians and commentators, have arrived. The learned Selden, who was no clergyman, speaking of the celebration of this day, says, p. 316. "Quæ (i. e. celebratio Sabbathi) in, opere et laboribus, *cultus causa*, abstinendo, lege legenda, audienda, ac sacrificiis singularibus, maxime cernebatur."

We deem it hardly necessary to attempt to show, that among Christians, the first day of the week was observed as a day for religious worship, and not for recreation and amusement. In the New Testament, they are said to have met together "to break bread," that is, to celebrate the Lord's supper, and to hear the word. As the Christian Fathers universally say that the day was kept in commemoration of Christ's resurrection and the blessings thereby secured, it is evident from this consideration alone, that it was a religious observance: that the joy to be indulged was such as flowed from the contemplation of these blessings, and the exercises of the day such as should fit us to appreciate and enjoy them. Our limits do not permit us to make numerous quotations in support of this assertion. The testimony of Barnabas, Ignatius, Justin Martyr, Athanasius, Tertullian, and many others, may be found in Bingham's *Origines Ecclesiasticæ*, vol. ix. c. ii. or Augusti's *Denkwürdigkeiten der christ. Archæologie*, in several parts of the work, particularly the introduction to the first vol. and vol. 3. p. 345, and onward. Even the heathen knew enough of Christianity to know that it was a religion, and its festivals religious observances. Pliny, in his celebrated letter to Trajan, says,

Christianos stato die ante lucem solitos convenire carmenque Christo, quasi Deo dicere secum invicem, seque sacramento obstringere non in scelus aliquod, sed ne furta, ne latrocinia, ne adulteria committerent, ne fidem fallerent," &c.

Gregory Nazian, Orat. 38, in exhorting Christians to observe their sacred days aright, says, that it must not be done in a worldly manner, by adorning their houses, or gratifying the senses, by feasting or any kind of amusement. These things, he tells them, should be left to the heathen. "But we," he adds, "who worship the word, should find our only pleasure in the scriptures and the divine law, and in narrating the events which the feast commemorates."

Under Constantine, the first Christian Emperor, laws were made respecting the proper observance of the Lord's day, and repeated with more particularity under Theodosius; not commanding the people to spend the day in amusement, but forbidding public shows and recreations. "Dominico, qui septimanæ totius primus est,—omni theatrorum atque circensium voluptate, per universas urbes earundem populis denegata, totæ Christianorum ac fidelium mentes Dei cultibus occupantur." Cod. Theod. xv. tit. 5. Such ordinances were frequently repeated, prohibiting all the usual business of life on that day, and all worldly amusements. They are cited here as indisputable evidence of the opinion of the early Christians, that the Lord's day was to be devoted exclusively to religious purposes. To give one testimony more. Ephrem the Syrian, in his discourse *De diebus festis*, says, "Festivitates Dominicas honorare studiose contendite, celebrantes eas non panegyricæ sed divine; non mundane, sed spiritualiter; non instar Gentilium sed Christianorum. Quare non portarum frontes coronemus; non choreas ducamus; non chorum exornemus; non tibiis et citharis auditum effæminemus, non mollibus vestibus induamur, nec cingulis undique auro radiantibus cingamur; non comessionibus et ebrietatibus dediti simus, verum ista relinquamus eis quorum Deus venter est, et gloria in confusione ipsorum."

Augusti, in his remarks on the festivals of the early Christians, says, "The main idea and object of the holy days and feasts, was to keep vividly in mind the principal benefits of Christianity, and the person of the Redeemer, to promote gratitude to God, and the exercise of the Christian virtues. It was common to prepare for these festivals by fastings, but the festivals themselves were regarded as days of rejoicing; in which the Christian, undisturbed by any of his ordinary em-

ployments, should devote himself to contemplations and exercises of piety. So far, however, were these festivals from being days of worldly pleasure, or similar to the holidays of the heathen, that from the moment Christianity became the religion of the state, the Church felt that she had no more urgent duty to perform, than to employ her power in protecting the sacred days and usages, and to secure the prohibition of all public amusements by which the sacredness of divine worship might be invaded." *Denkwürdigkeiten*, vol. p. 97: This is the testimony of a historian and antiquarian, not a "sabbatarian," or a "terrorist," but of a German rationalist, respecting the usage, not of a set of gloomy puritans, but of the early Christian Church in general, and of that Catholic Church which boasts of being infallible.

With regard to the opinions of the several denominations of Christians on this subject, little need be said. It is universally known that the Church of England is one of the strictest of Protestant Churches in her doctrines respecting the Sabbath, we shall give but a single extract from her book of Homilies, "So if we be the children of our Heavenly Father, we must be careful to keep the Christian Sabbath day, which is Sunday, not only for that it is God's commandment, but also to declare ourselves to be loving children in following the example of our gracious Lord and Father. Some use all days alike. The other sort worse; for although they will not labour nor travail on the Sunday, yet they will not rest in holiness as God commands them, but they rest in ungodliness and filthiness, prancing in their pride, &c. &c." Volumes might be filled with quotations from her most illustrious sons to the same amount. That her children in this country have not forsaken her doctrines, on this subject, we need no other proof than the "Three Letters addressed to the Editor of the *American Quarterly Review*," by the venerable Bishop of Pennsylvania. Standing, as he does, at the head of the Episcopal Church in the United States, his ready appearance to vindicate the Lord's Day from the unworthy attack of the Reviewer, entitles him to the grateful acknowledgments of all the Christians in the country. That the Congregationalists and Presbyterians regard the Sabbath as a day that should be devoted to religion, no one would thank us for proving. The same is true with regard to the Methodists and Baptists. The Catholics are as strict, in doctrine, in this respect, as the Protestants. They hold that the Scriptures teach that the

feasts and usages of the Old Testament, were not repealed, but merely spiritualized, under the new dispensation, and that this was especially the case with the Sabbath; which the ancient Church merely transferred from the seventh to the first day of the week, in commemoration of the Saviour's resurrection. This is the Catholic doctrine, as defended by Bellarmin in his work, "Adversus hujus temporis hæreticos;" i. e. the Protestants; by Durand, "Rationale divinatorum officiorum;" by Gretser, and all their leading writers.* The last named author in his work "De festis Christianorum," lib. i. contends, that the Christian festivals are not matters of mere external order and discipline. "Festa Christianorum non solum ratione ordinis et disciplinæ, sed etiam ratione mysterii celebrari: et esse hos dies festos aliis sanctiores et sacratiores et partem quandam divini cultus." And the council of Trent enjoins that these festivals should be observed, not as days of amusement, but "in a truly religious and devotional manner."

The Reviewer, therefore, in denying that "the Sunday is to be devoted to the solemn offices of religion," and in asserting that it is appropriately a day of recreation and amusement, has not assailed an opinion of this or that particular sect, but of the whole Christian Church. If this is not to be considered as a breach of contract with the public, we know not what can be. Surely no one doctrine of our religion, nor that religion itself, can be considered safe from his assaults, if this be deemed a justifiable aggression. We, of course, do not complain of him, nor of any other man, for publishing his opinions, but we do complain that he should make a Literary Review the vehicle of such doctrines. Believing, as Christians almost universally, at least in this country, do, that the religious observance of the Lord's day is one of the most essential means of sustaining the cause of religion and good morals, it is as much a matter of surprise as regret, that the enlightened conductors of the American Quarterly, for the sake of gratifying an unworthy pique against the religious public, should allow themselves to be betrayed into so serious an attack on such an institution. No one appears to have a quicker or more just perception of the indications of coming evil, in this country, than the editor of that Review. He mourns over the unbridled licentiousness of the press; he is startled at the idea of universal *equal* education; he regards with little complacency the

* See Augusti, Vol. i. p. 32.

annual importation of thousands of uneducated foreigners, to control our elections, and vitiate our population; and he would be the last man in the world to maintain, that a popular government, founded on ignorance and vice, was either possible or desirable. He seems even less disposed than his neighbours, to rejoice in the progress of freedom, where he suspects the requisite intelligence and virtue do not exist. Recognizing, as he does, that good morals are the only stable support of free institutions, and the only effectual bulwark of social order and domestic happiness, and why is it he so pertinaciously attacks an institution, without which, public virtue assuredly never can be maintained? We use the word pertinaciously, because the article in his Review, is not the only effusion on this subject, which has appeared under his auspices. His paper has been repeatedly made the vehicle of nearly the same sentiments; culling, from sources the most heterogeneous, matter suited to his purpose; pardoning even the radicalism of the Morning Chronicle, in behalf of its latitudinarianism on religion. As the friends of good morals and decorous discussion, we are very far from being insensible to the merits of the National Gazette. We cheerfully acknowledge that it is often the able advocate of the cause of virtue, and the temperate and dignified rebuker of corrupting publications. This, however, only increases our regret that it should manifest such hostility to an institution, which, as a means of promoting public virtue, stands, in our view, pre-eminent and unapproachable. Whether this opinion be correct or not, it is entertained by so large a portion of the community, that it is entitled to respectful consideration, and is, we think, capable of being clearly established.

Neither the Editor nor the Reviewer, will deny that some religion is essential to man; that by the constitution of our nature, men are as necessarily religious as they are moral or intellectual beings. This is proved by universal experience, and according to Cicero, *Tusc. I. Omni in re consensio omnium gentium, lex naturæ putanda est.* As all nations have had some religion, we must admit that it is a law of our nature, that men should have some method of expressing the feelings which arise from their consciousness of relation to a superior being. All history teaches us that the forms in which these feelings express themselves, depend on the light communicated to the understanding. If men are taught that they are in the hands of numerous and conflicting powers, some intent on

good, others on evil, we see them tossed and agitated with constant fears, busying themselves with all possible devices to obtain favour or impunity. There is no more melancholy spectacle than men thus struggling under the pressure of distorted notions of the objects of worship; notions which pervert the finest constituents of their nature, and impress their own deformed image on the soul. It is a fact established by experience, and one easily accounted for, that men are always conformed in their internal character to their religion. Not to the religion which they may profess, but to that system of religious opinions which they really entertain. The most important feature of human character, therefore, depends on correct knowledge of God. How is this to be obtained? Arguing either from the Bible, which the Reviewer does not profess to reject, or from experience, it is clear, that it never has been, and cannot be secured by the unaided reason of man. The cause of this lies, as the Apostle informs us, not in the inadequacy of the revelation which the works of God and our own constitution make of the divine character, but in the moral state of the human soul, which blinds it to these manifestations of divine excellence, and disinclines it to the purity of truth. So that although knowing God, men glorify him not as God, neither are thankful, but become vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart is darkened, professing themselves to be wise, they become fools, and change the image of the incorruptible God into an image made like unto corruptible man, and to birds and four footed beasts and creeping things. This is the history of man in all ages and countries, and under all diversities of culture, where the light of revelation has not been enjoyed. We might as well expect the productions of the vegetable world to unfold in all their variety of beauty, in utter seclusion from the sun, as that the religious feelings of men should be developed in conformity with truth, where the rays of divine knowledge never visit the mind.

Experience teaches us another lesson with equal clearness and fullness, that there can be no adequate culture of our moral nature under the influence of a corrupt system of religion. The apparent exceptions to this remark are few, and they are but apparent. Its correctness as the statement of a general fact cannot be denied. If these two points, resting on the testimony of indisputable facts, be admitted, the necessity of correct knowledge to the existence of true religion, and the necessity of religion to good morals, then it is clear, that to secure

for society correct religious knowledge is essential to preserve it from the equal horrors of superstition and immorality. The insufficiency of mere speculative knowledge or general illumination, to accomplish this object is evident, not only from the limited sphere of its action, but from its want of adaptation to the end. Only a few, comparatively, can ever be made the subjects of this high intellectual culture, and if they could, there is nothing in the mere knowledge of facts unconnected with religion, to call forth and form any man's religious or moral feelings. These are still left to be moulded by notions which enter by chance and gain a lodgement in the mind. If surrounded by a society in which correct ideas on these subjects abound, he may imbibe a portion of these, and thus, in a measure, be preserved from the evils resulting from that neglect of religion in which he glories. And this, it may be remarked, is the security of our modern infidels, or we should see them, after the manner of better men of old, suspending their most important movements on the flight of birds, and quaking at a raven's croak.

If religious knowledge is thus essential to form the character of men, how is it to be communicated? It does not come by immediate revelation from the omnipresent and all pervading Spirit of God: and although traced in lines of light and beauty on his works, these have never been read with sufficient clearness to enlighten the understanding or impress the heart. But God has communicated it to us by those "holy men of old who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." But even this clear and sufficient revelation of God and our duty, which happily in this country may be in every man's hands, is silent. It arrests no man's attention, it utters no remonstrance when neglected, and never was designed to supersede a more direct and impressive mode of instruction. We are told that "it hath pleased God, by the foolishness of preaching, to save them that believe." And it is written, that when Christ ascended up on high, "he gave some pastors and teachers" for the very purpose of diffusing this knowledge and securing its effects. It is, therefore, by divine appointment that religious knowledge should be communicated by living teachers. But waving this consideration, how in point of fact is it communicated? Can it be denied that, in this and every other country, the great majority of men derive their knowledge on religion mainly from the ministrations of its public teachers? Most men are so occupied with the concerns of life, that they entire-

ly neglect the attainment of any regular or adequate religious knowledge by their own exertions. Were it not for what they learn from the "gloomy lectures" of the Sabbath, they would remain as ignorant as the heathen of God and a future state. So long as a large portion of society observe this day, and gather enough of knowledge to imbue the common fund with correct ideas, the evils may not be so apparent. But let us look at places where the Reviewer's plan is fully carried out, where religious instruction from the pulpit is utterly neglected, and the Lord's day devoted to amusement, and we will find the most deplorable ignorance on all religious subjects. It matters not whether such communities be found on our own western frontiers, among the polished circles of Paris, or the profligate population of London. We of course speak of general facts. Individual exceptions, to which the mind is apt to advert, and which, to be properly estimated, must be viewed in all their circumstances, disprove nothing on this subject. It is capable of being clearly proved as a matter of fact, that the public teaching of the Sabbath is the great source of religious knowledge to the mass of the community, and consequently if this be neglected, and men spend the day appropriated for this purpose in festivity or idleness, ignorance the most destructive to their best feelings and interests, must be the result.

The diffusion of religious knowledge, however, is not the only good resulting from a proper observance of the Sabbath. It is a day appointed not only to learn our duty towards God, but to perform it. To call off the mind from the objects which necessity forces upon it during the week, and place it in the presence of God. To awaken from their torpor those feelings of adoration, gratitude and confidence, which the divine greatness and goodness should excite. The regular return of this day is as healthful to society as the showers which soften, fertilize, and beautify the earth, bringing with them the influence of heaven. The good derived from such seasons of devotion, is not confined to the hour spent within the church. The feelings there excited are strengthened by the exercise: their permanent influence over the mind is increased. The whole man is refined and elevated, and he goes forth into the world better fortified against its temptations, and better fitted to diffuse a healthful tone into public sentiment and feeling. These stated periods of public worship, therefore, are the great means of keeping alive a sense of religion among men, of main-

taining the consciousness of their relation to the infinite God, and thus preventing them from sinking down into the mere intellectual or sensual animal. If the observance of the Sabbath be the great means of preserving religious feeling in the community, the question comes to this, whether it is desirable that this feeling should be maintained; whether, if all sense of the infinite and eternal, all connexion with the pure and the holy, every bond with the invisible and future world were destroyed, men would be either better or happier? Could civilized society exist were this once effected? We think not. The restraints, which regard for reputation, a sense of honour, or desire of influence exercise over men, derive their principal force from the general tone of society, which would, under such circumstances, be entirely vitiated. The Reviewer, however, would join beyond doubt in praising religion in the general, and repeat the common places as to its necessity and excellence, while he laboriously advocates a course which would more effectually banish it from Christendom than any other he could devise. Voltaire is said to have vowed the destruction of Christianity, and tried long and hard to effect his object, but gave it up in despair, saying, it was impossible as long as people would assemble every week for religious worship. And this is true. For every religion must have some means whereby to sustain itself and bring its influence to bear on those who profess it. Paganism has its rites and its priests; Mahomedanism has its mosques, its public prayers, its sacred day and its koran, their civil and religious code; and Christianity has its Sabbaths, on which to exhibit its claims and urge its duties and promises. We have seen, that in point of fact, it is mainly through this instrumentality its influence is exerted. What then is the desecration of this day, but the destruction of its power? And what is an exhortation to men to spend the day in idleness and amusement, but an exhortation to emancipate themselves from its sacred influences?

It is not, however, merely as a means of sustaining religion that this day is of such incalculable importance; its proper observance is the only security for public morals. This assertion is not founded exclusively on the assumption, however correct, that religion is necessary to virtue. The subject may be viewed in another light. Every one knows that the moral sense acts under the guidance of the understanding. It is not the power of deciding infallibly on what is right or wrong, but it is the feeling of approbation or disapprobation which rises in

the mind on the view of actions which it has been taught, either from the constitution of its nature, or by education, to consider good or bad. The class of actions respecting which information is derived from the first of these sources, as all other intuitive truths, is very small; and, therefore, although conscience be as much an original constituent of our nature as reason, it as much needs culture and correct information to secure its proper exercise. Hence the only possible way to preserve men from all the evils of a perverted or hardened moral sense, is to have a correct rule of duty presented to them; as the only way to save men from intellectual aberrations, is the exhibition of truth and its evidences. That Christianity contains the purest system of moral truth ever presented to the world, is admitted, except by infidels of the very lowest class. It is one great object of the exercises of the Sabbath, to exhibit this rule of duty; to bring the people to understand its requisitions and feel their obligation. And such is the constitution of our nature, that moral truth contains its own evidence. The ground of the assent which we yield to it, is its congruity with the internal law of our nature. Hence this knowledge does not rest in the understanding, but is imbibed and becomes an active principle. It makes men better as well as wiser. It might easily be proved, that the services of the Lord's day are the great source of information and culture of a moral kind to the people. It is here as with religious knowledge, comparatively few read or study for themselves. If the Sabbath, therefore, be devoted to amusement, the people will assuredly grow up in ignorance. Let it be remembered, that ignorance here is error. A man whose moral sense is unenlightened, has not the restraints nor the incentives necessary to virtue. What a society must become, where the moral sense is thus degraded, every man can conceive. Men may be virtuous though they know nothing of science or history, but ignorance of duty is inseparable from vice. Virtue cannot exist under it, for virtue is the conformity of heart and life to moral truth. It is, therefore, the height of inconsistency for a man to be constantly repeating the truism, that virtue is essential to the well being of society, and yet labour to destroy the great source of that knowledge without which virtue cannot exist.

The advantages of a religious observance of the Lord's day already referred to, are sufficient to entitle it to the respect and reverence of all good men. There are others scarcely less im-

portant, on which our limits will not permit us to dwell. The regular congregation of friends and neighbours on that day in the place of worship, to mingle their feelings before the throne of God, tends to unite them in the purest and strongest bands. The differences arising from wealth and other adventitious circumstances, here disappear. The high are humbled without being depressed; the low are exalted without being elated. The cord, which vibrates in one breast, is felt in all the others, awaking the consciousness of community of origin and of nature. They learn that God has made of one flesh all the dwellers upon earth; that he has breathed one spirit bearing his own image into them; placed all under the same benevolent laws; offers the same glorious immortality to all, and has thus bound them together as one great brotherhood. It is hence obvious, that of all institutions, this is the most directly efficacious in promoting peace, charity, justice, sympathy and all other amiable feelings. Experience teaches us, that of all men those are most sincerely attached who are accustomed to worship together.

The exercises of the Sabbath, moreover, are among the most efficient means of intellectual culture. The mass of men employed in mechanical occupations, have few subjects on which their minds can be exercised. Their employments present little or nothing to enlarge or vary their thoughts. For reading they have little time and less inclination. It is principally from attendance on church, where other subjects are presented; where new and elevating ideas are exhibited; where their attention is excited and minds tasked, that their intellectual powers receive their chief development. It is the grand desideratum in education, to devise means to call forth the powers of the mind in due proportion, without perverting or injuring its moral sensibilities. With this view, enlightened men have laboured to bring down the abstract principles of science to the level of the labouring classes. But these subjects are not sufficiently exciting to arouse general attention. It must be admitted that there is nothing so well adapted to the purpose, as moral and religious truth. As objects of intellectual knowledge, they are the most expanding which the mind can apprehend, while their influence on all the feelings is correcting and purifying. A community in whose education these truths are made mainly instrumental, will be of all others the most adequately cultivated; their intellectual faculties most fully developed, and their moral principles the most correctly formed.

In support of this assertion, we may again appeal to experience. It is a fact familiar to all, whose attention has been turned to the subject, that even illiterate and feeble minded men, when brought to take an interest in religious truth, have exhibited a surprising increase in mental strength. The contrast between Pagan and Christian countries, in respect to mental improvement is, in no small degree, owing to the same cause. The truths of Christianity cannot enter the mind without enlarging it. To the same source may, in a great measure, be traced, the striking difference between the common people in Catholic and Protestant countries. The religious services of the former consist, almost exclusively, in exercises of devotion. And even their worship, conducted in an unknown language, is but imperfectly comprehended. No distinct objects of mental apprehension are presented, and consequently their minds are but little exercised, although devout feeling may be excited. Hence the religion of the Catholics is, with the common people, so much a matter of feeling and so little of principle. And hence the glaring inconsistency, so often to be found among them, between their open immorality and austere devotion. Bandits and prostitutes being habitually religious. In Protestant countries, a great part of the duties of the Sabbath is the communication of knowledge. The Scriptures are uniformly read, and discourses delivered by educated men.

Another advantage of the religious observation of the Lord's day is, that it tends to promote genuine liberty. This necessarily results from what we have already said. If it is the means of enlightening the minds of men, it disenthral them from the yoke of superstition and the bondage of the priests. If it is the means of teaching them their essential equality before God, it destroys the very foundation of tyranny. In making them feel that they have a common origin and a common destiny, it teaches the high they have no right to oppress the low, and the low they are entitled to be recognized as brethren. Hence Christians are the only freemen on the face of the globe. The rise of this religion was the era of civil liberty. And it has only been where Christianity has been obscured, and its truths prevented from entering the minds of the people, that they have ever been reduced to bondage. The men to whom the world is principally indebted for their civil liberty, were men most deeply Christian. The principles of our religion are thus directly favourable to freedom, and they are essential to

its preservation. Any thing, therefore, which diminishes their force on the public mind, is so much done to destroy that cause to which we are so loud in our profession of attachment. We do not now insist on the acknowledged necessity of virtue to freedom, of religion to virtue, of knowledge to religion, and of a regular system of instruction to bring this knowledge to bear on the minds of the people. These, however, are obvious truths, and they go to show how intimately the happiness and liberty, the knowledge and virtue of men, are connected with the proper observance of the Sabbath.

There is still one other view, and one which confers on this institution its chief value in the eyes of Christians. The Bible tells us that men are sinners; that the wages of sin is death; that Jesus Christ came into the world to deliver men from the consequences of their apostacy; that the gospel is the proclamation of God's readiness to pardon and accept them on the terms which it prescribes; the Sabbath is the day appointed for making known these offers of mercy and for urging their acceptance. Thousands thus hear these offers, who would never hear them in any other way. And of the millions who accept them, few would do so, were it not for their being thus constantly presented and urged. Here, to those who believe the Bible, opens a prospect which earth and its interests cannot bound. It is not the welfare, nor even the virtue of men here, that is alone concerned; it is their everlasting welfare and virtue in the world to come, which the Christian sees are intimately connected with the proper observance of this day. He cannot shut his eyes to the evidences of the fact, that it is through the regular preaching of the gospel, men are usually brought to accept of its offers, and become fitted for death and eternity. To his view, therefore, the importance of the Sabbath is beyond all estimate. And he cannot but regard any attempt to lessen its influence, or to lead men to neglect its duties, as directed not only against all that is desirable in human character in this world, but against their well-being in the world to come. Infidels may sneer at all this. But truth is indestructible by ridicule. And he must be weak indeed, who suffers the light estimation of others, to affect his reverence for an institution, while all the evidence of its value remains untouched.

We feel persuaded we have not over rated the importance of the Sabbath. The experience of communities and nations bears out our statements. Those sections of our own country

where the day is best observed, are distinguished by superior intelligence, piety, good morals and social order. Those nations which are remarkable for a regard to the Sabbath, take the lead in the world in general cultivation, in sound religion, in activity and energy of character, in internal stability and order, and in external respect and power. These are the nations which have been the mothers and guardians of civil and religious liberty, and are now doing almost all that is done in the diffusion of knowledge and piety through the world. Such is the position occupied by Great Britain and these United States. Two countries distinguished throughout Christendom for their regard for the Sabbath, as they are distinguished throughout the world for their internal prosperity and their diffusive and benign influence. That this favourable distinction will not long survive their regard for the Sabbath, we as firmly believe, as that religion and virtue are essential to the well being of society.

We come now to inquire, what obligations are Christians under to observe this day. And here we would remark, that if what we have already said be correct, the obligation must be of the highest moral character. If the religious observance of the Lord's day be the means of diffusing religious knowledge, of exciting and sustaining religious feeling and moral principle in the community; if it tends to refine the character and promote all the social virtues; if it is the highest means to multitudes of intellectual culture; if it raises men to a sense of their own dignity, while it depresses their false pride and arrogant claims; and, finally, if it is the grand means of leading them to the attainment of eternal life, then is every man bound to promote this observance, by all those obligations which bind him to promote the temporal and eternal interests of his fellow men. Then, too, it is obvious, that all efforts, whether by argument or ridicule, to lessen its influence, is so much done to render men wicked and miserable, both in this life and that which is to come. We feel almost as though it were superfluous to inquire, whether God has added to an obligation so obvious and so imperious, that of a positive command. Had no such precept as "Thou shalt not kill," or "Thou shalt not commit adultery," been recorded in the Scriptures, the obligation would be complete from the nature and consequences of the acts themselves. In like manner, though we were unable to prove that God had commanded us to keep holy one day in seven, we think the obligation would still be binding, after a

custom so salutary had once been introduced. There is, however, from the obvious tendency of this observance to promote the best interests of society, a strong presumption that God has enjoined it. We know that the object of the religion which he has revealed is to promote the purity and happiness of men. And if there is an institution, which is essential to the preservation and influence of this religion, it is surely to be presumed that it is of divine appointment. That the observance of a day on which the rites of this religion should be celebrated, its truths and claims presented, is of primary importance, we think can hardly be denied. How is any system of truth to be received and obeyed, unless presented to the mind? And how is this to be done, unless time be appropriated for the purpose? Will men of themselves, and each one for himself, go to the silent record and ascertain and receive all that God has enjoined and promised? Surely no other religion was ever thus left without any means of accomplishing its object. Besides, if it be a dictate of reason that we should worship God, if this is to be done in our social, as well as individual capacity, and if this union of men to make their joint homage to their maker be, in like manner, a dictate of nature, then is it to be presumed, that in a revealed religion, which enforces all other duties which the law of our nature enjoins, this duty of public worship is commanded. And as it is a duty which must be often repeated, it is also to be presumed, that its stated discharge would be insisted upon, and time allotted for the purpose. Nothing, surely, can be more obvious than that if this were not the case, the duty itself would be in a great measure neglected. The evident importance, therefore, of the appointment of a day for religious purposes, in order to enable the religion of the Bible to accomplish the purposes for which it was revealed, and to secure the stated discharge of one of the plainest of moral obligations, creates at least a presumption that the true religion is not the only religion without its sacred days.

In turning to the Scriptures, we find almost on the first page, in the very history of the creation, it is recorded, that in six days God made heaven and earth, that he rested on the seventh day, "Therefore the Lord blessed the seventh day and sanctified it." The meaning of this passage admits of no dispute. When God is said to bless any thing, it implies that he favourably distinguishes it, in some way or other. The seventh day was thus distinguished by being sanctified, or set apart for a

sacred use. That this is the meaning of the term we have already proved. If, then, from the very creation of the world God commanded men to consecrate one day in seven to his service, we may fairly conclude that this is a duty of universal and perpetual obligation. The way in which the force of this passage is commonly evaded, is not by denying its obvious import, but by assuming it to be a prolepsis, or anticipation of an event which occurred upwards of two thousand years afterward. According to this idea, Moses does not mean to state, that God did then sanctify the seventh day, but merely that his having rested on the seventh day was the reason why, in after ages, he selected that day as the Sabbath. The objections to this assumption, however, appear to us decisive. In the first place, it takes for granted, without the least evidence, that the book of Genesis was not written until after the giving of the law on Mount Sinai. Whereas, the probability is entirely on the side of its having been written at an earlier period. But secondly, it does evident violence to the context. This verse is obviously a part of a regular narrative of consecutive events. Let any unprejudiced man read the passage, and decide for himself. "And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made. And God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, because that in it he had rested from all his work." Is not this a regular narrative of facts? God created all things in six days, he rested on the seventh, and blessed the seventh day and sanctified it. There is not the slightest intimation that the latter verse refers to an event, which did not take place for ages after those recorded in the two immediately preceding. Those who make so violent an assumption, are surely bound to produce the strongest reasons in its justification.

In favour of taking the passage in its obvious sense, it may be urged, that there are many important arguments in favour of the ante-Mosaic origin of the Sabbath. The day was appointed in commemoration of the creation. Its grand design was to preserve the knowledge of the true God as the creator of the world. The necessity or ground of the institution, therefore, existed from the beginning. There is in this consideration alone, a strong presumptive proof of its having been appointed at the time specified in Genesis ii. 3. Besides, we know that a large portion of the laws of Moses did not originate with him. The rites and usages of the Hebrews, from

the earliest times, were incorporated into his code. Circumcision, sacrifices, the distinction between clean and unclean animals, the right of divorce, the duties of the avenger of blood, the obligation of a brother to marry the widow of his deceased brother, and many other cases of this kind might be cited. It was the object of Moses, under divine direction, to embody in one code all the traditionary knowledge and laws of his people, and to institute such new regulations as should most effectually preserve them distinct from other nations, and prepare them and the world for the coming of Christ. With regard to the laws, and especially the festivals, which originated with him, it is to be observed, that they arose out of the existing state of the people, or were intended to keep in mind some recent event in their history. This was the case with the Passover, Feast of Tabernacles, &c. When, therefore, there is an institution, which betrays no such local origin, and is designed to commemorate no such recent event, the presumption is strongly in favour of its being one of the traditionary usages which make up so large a part of his laws. This is the case with the Sabbath. This command is not enforced, as the others are, by considerations drawn from their immediate history; but they are commanded to rest on the seventh day because God rested on that day and sanctified it.

The very form in which the command is given, favours the idea of the previous observance of the day. *Remember* the Sabbath day to keep it holy. This mode of expression is not used in reference to feasts which he had but just established. It is no where said, *remember* the Passover, or any other festival. Besides, there is positive evidence of the observance of the Sabbath before the solemn enactment of the law on Mount Sinai. This did not occur until the third month after the departure out of Egypt. Yet we find that in the second month, when in the wilderness of Sin, being pressed for food, the people were supplied by manna from heaven. This perishable article they were commanded to gather from day to day, and not to attempt to preserve it over the twenty-four hours. But on the sixth day, Ex. xvi. 22, the people, of their own accord, gathered a double portion. The rulers came and told Moses, apparently desirous to know whether the manna would keep, or whether they might not expect the usual supply on the following day. Moses told them, the people were right, that as the morrow was the Sabbath, no manna would be given, but the double portion gathered on the sixth day would remain

X
1821

sweet over the seventh. Had the people acted under the direction of Moses in this business, the rulers could not have been ignorant of it, and would not have gone to him for instruction.

There is another remark applicable to many of the laws of Moses; in frequent instances something is commanded, but the manner of the performance or details of the duty are not specified. This is the case, however, only where the thing prescribed was already familiar, and usage had fixed the mode in which it was to be done. Thus, in regard to the Sabbath, we find merely the general directions, that the day was to be consecrated to God; all labour intermitted, the sacrifices doubled, and a holy convocation held. But what particular things were prohibited or enjoined, we find no where minutely stated. With respect, however, to those feasts which were unquestionably instituted by Moses, we find the greatest particularity as to the prescriptions. Whence this difference? Does it not arise from the fact, that the Sabbath was one of those usages with which the people were familiar, and therefore did not need such particular instructions?

A strong confirmation of this view, is derived from the division of time into portions of seven days. It is mentioned in the account of the deluge; in the history of Jacob; it is found among all ancient nations, the Egyptians, Greeks, Romans, Asiatics, and even among the American Indians. Whatever was the origin of this division, it is evident that it must have been very ancient. There are three methods of accounting for it. The first is, that it arose from dividing months into four portions. This is very improbable, because seven is not the fourth, either of twenty-nine and a half days, the real length of a lunar month, or of thirty days, which was the number assigned as early as the flood. The other method, is that which Selden and many others have adopted. They suppose, the names of the seven planets being given to the days of the week determined their number. To this supposition it may be objected, that the division existed at a period anterior to any indications of much astronomical knowledge, and that affixing the names of the planets to certain days, was evidently subsequent to the introduction of idolatry, and belief of the influence of the stars over the affairs of men. Of the latter, especially, we have no evidence as early as the times of Noah. Besides, had this been the true origin of the division of time into weeks, we should expect that the names of the planets

would have been given in their natural order, instead of succeeding each other in a manner perfectly arbitrary. The various ingenious answers which have been given to this difficulty, all suppose such a degree of refinement in the mode of proceeding, as could only belong to an age far more recent than that in which the computation by weeks is known to have existed.* The third method is by far the most satisfactory. It supposes the division to have existed from the beginning, and to have arisen from the fact recorded by Moses, that God created all things in six days and rested on the seventh. We know that some obscure knowledge of the creation, deluge, and dispersion has been preserved among all nations. And, therefore, it is not surprising that so convenient a distribution of time, although arbitrary, has passed from one nation to another. If God did from the creation set apart the seventh day to himself, we need no other reason to account for the origin and prevalence of this mode of computation. This fact, too, best accounts for the sacredness attributed among almost all ancient nations, to the number seven. This was every where a sacred number. The manner in which the ancients speak of this number and of the seventh day, is sufficiently remarkable, and has led many learned men, as Theophilus of Antioch, and Clemens of Alexandria, among the ancients; and Grotius, Huet, Budes, and many others among the moderns, to suppose that this day was held sacred by all antiquity. The passages cited on this subject may be seen in Selden, lib. iii. c. 16—19, together with his answers to the arguments derived from them. Admitting all that he says, it is at least clear that this number was considered sacred throughout the ancient world.

We say, then, the plain meaning of the narrative in Gen. ii.; the very reason and nature of the institution; the manner in which the law in Exodus is expressed; the observance of the day before that law was given; the fact that Moses, as a general rule, adopted the *jus consuetudinarium* of his people; the division of time into weeks, long before him; the diffusion of this mode of computation over the world, and the universal sacredness attached to the number seven, are arguments for the institution of the Sabbath from the creation, which we are unable to resist.

The most obvious objection to this opinion, is the absence of

* See, on this subject, *Selden de Jure Nat. et Gen.* Lib. iii.

positive evidence of the religious observance of the seventh day by the Patriarchs. To this it may be replied, there is not such absolute want of evidence on this point, as is often asserted. In the history of Cain and Abel it is said, "at the end of days" (as the Hebrew phrase should be rendered) they brought their respective offerings unto God. We cannot decide, with certainty what this expression means; but, taken in connexion with the statement immediately preceding, that God had set apart to religion the seventh day, which was the close of a regular period, the probability is, that by the "end of days," we are to understand the end of the week, or Sabbath. Besides, the fact already noticed, that Noah and the immediate ancestors of the Hebrews, divided their time into weeks, renders it probable there was some regular observance of the seventh day. But admitting all the objection assumes, that there is no evidence of the religious observance of the Sabbath anterior to Moses, we remark, this is no decisive proof that it was not in fact observed; and if it were, its non-observance would be no decisive argument against its original appointment. In support of the former of these assertions, that silence is no decisive proof of non-observance, it should be remembered the narrative is very short, and goes but little into detail. The history of two thousand five hundred years is comprised in a few pages. This circumstance alone almost invalidates the objection. But the argument would prove too much. From the time of Joshua to that of David, a period of five or six hundred years, there is little or nothing said of the Sabbath. Are we hence to infer, that it was not at all observed during this period? certainly not. This is equally true of a great majority of the laws of Moses; their faithful observance cannot be historically proved, and yet we should not be authorized to conclude from the mere silence of the record, that they were entirely neglected. As to the second point, that non-observance is no decisive argument against the original appointment of the Sabbath, the case is still clearer. As just remarked, although we know that the Hebrew polity was arranged by Moses, as described in the Pentateuch, yet there are many of his laws of which there is no evidence, for ages, of their being actually obeyed. The objection under consideration, as applied to the Sabbath, would require us to believe, that Moses never enjoined any of these laws. We may take a still stronger case. We know from the highest authority, that God in instituting marriage, ordained that a man should

have but one wife. Yet the patriarchs were polygamists; and even after Moses, a plurality of wives was considered lawful among the Hebrews. This, of course, cannot be considered as any proof that God had not at the beginning given a clear intimation of his will on this subject. How then, can it be inferred, from the fact the Sabbath was neglected, even if the fact be admitted, that it was not commanded at the time of the creation? The inference is obviously unauthorized; and yet this is the main ground on which the advocates of the Mosaic origin of this institution, rest their cause, and endeavour to invalidate the plain testimony in Gen. ii. 3.

Another argument is, that the Sabbath was a Jewish institution, having a local origin and design; that is, designed to commemorate an event in which they alone were interested. In proof of which, they appeal to such passages as Exodus xxxi. 13. and others, in which the Sabbath is said to be a sign between God and his ancient people; and to those in which Moses is said to have given them the Sabbath, as in Nehemiah ix. 13, 14. From the former class it is inferred, that if the Sabbath was a sign between God and the Jews, it must be peculiar to them and instituted for them. But this inference is unsound. Any thing, in the language of the Scriptures, is called a sign, which was selected by God to be a memorial of any truth, or confirmation of any promise. It matters not whether the thing selected be ordinary or extraordinary in its character; whether it was previously familiar or originated for the occasion. Thus, God tells Noah the rain-bow should be a sign between him and the earth that the flood never should return. This does not prove that the bow of heaven had never previously been seen; it only declares that it was selected as the memorial of God's gracious determination. In like manner, though the Sabbath had long been familiar to the Hebrews, God might have chosen that observance as a standing memorial of the fact, that the true God was their God. And it is evident that the selection was, of all others, the most appropriate; for the object of the original institution of the Sabbath was to keep in mind that God was the creator of the world, and therefore it was in perfect unison with this design, that God said to the Jews, "keep my Sabbaths" for a sign that your God is the true God. As to those passages in which Moses is said to have given them the Sabbath, the argument is still less conclusive. For Nehemiah, in the passage referred to, says: "Thou gavest them right judgments and true laws, good statutes and

commandments, and madest known unto them thy holy Sabbath; by the hand of Moses thy servant." Were all these right judgments and good statutes, said to be given by Moses, unknown before his time? The reverse is notoriously the case. Christ even says, "Moses gave unto you circumcision," though it was of the fathers and customary long before Moses was born. Such passages no more prove that the Sabbath was instituted by Moses, than they prove that the Hebrews were ignorant of the many moral precepts which he gave them, or of the multitude of usages which he adopted and enforced. The argument from Deut. v. 15, in which the Jews were commanded to keep the Sabbath, because God had delivered them from the land of Egypt, has already been answered. They were to keep it, not in commemoration of that event, but they were to give this opportunity for rest to all their servants, because God had thus interposed to give them rest. The remembrance of their former sufferings should make them kind. These are the objections to the belief that God "sanctified the seventh day" from the beginning. That they are of little force, we think must be admitted. And, therefore, all the direct evidence in favour of the early origin of the institution, which we have adduced, remains unimpaired. But Dr. Paley himself says, "If the divine command was actually delivered at the creation, it was addressed, no doubt, to the whole human species alike, and continues, unless repealed by some subsequent revelation, binding upon all who come to the knowledge of it." *Moral Philosophy*, p. 247. That it was thus delivered, we think we have proved; that it has been subsequently repealed, it becomes those who deny its continued obligation clearly to establish. The necessity of an express repeal is the stronger, because the principle that a command is to be considered binding as long as the ground or reason of it remains, applies here in its full force. All moral precepts are immutable, because the ground on which they rest is immutable. The commands "Thou shalt not kill," "Honour thy father and thy mother," arising out of the unchanging relations of society, must remain in force as long as these relations subsist. And the command to love God must be binding as long as rational creatures are in being. We have seen that the design of the Sabbath was to secure the continued worship of the true God, and must therefore be binding as long as this obligation continues, unless it be shown that the command has been repealed, and other means appointed for securing this great end.

The arguments of those who assert that the law of the Sabbath is no longer obligatory, are either derived from the general principle that all Jewish laws, as such, are repealed, or from some specific declarations of the New Testament writers. The principal dependence is placed on the assumption that the Sabbath was peculiarly a Jewish institution, and therefore ceased to be obligatory, when the law of Moses was abrogated. That this assumption is unauthorised, we have already endeavoured to prove. A precept having been adopted and incorporated with the Hebrew laws, did not take it out of the class to which it originally belonged, or alter its relation to other nations. This is confessedly the case with all moral precepts which were in force before the law of Moses enacted them, and which continue after that law, as such, ceases to be binding. And this is also true of every law the ground or reason of which continues. The remark, therefore, of Dr. Paley, which the Reviewer quotes, "If the law of the Sabbath be binding, it is binding as to the day, its duties and its penalty," is evidently unfounded. Shall we say that the command, "Thou shalt not commit adultery," if binding at all, must be binding as to its penalty as well as its precept; and that every adulterer must be punished with death? Surely not. Whatever was purely Jewish fell when that system fell; whatever was of prior obligation remains, unless positively repealed. It is precisely on this ground Christians place the law of the Sabbath. Every thing as to duties or penalties which were attached to it, and which had a peculiar reference to the circumstances of the Hebrews, or which arose out of them, is no longer obligatory on us. Hence we are not bound to offer sacrifices on that day as they were, nor are we exposed to the punishment which they incurred, for every violation of a fundamental principle of their theocratical system. Further than this, it is evident, the abrogation of the Mosaic law cannot affect the law of the Sabbath; its original claims remain unaffected. The very position which this command occupies in the Mosaic institutions, shows that it was not considered as one of those positive or ceremonial enactments, which were to remain only until the Messiah appeared. It is presented in the midst of moral precepts of confessedly permanent obligation; it was inscribed on the tables of stone; it followed immediately those precepts which refer to our duty to God as enjoining the means by which the love, obedience and worship which belong to him were to be secured and preserved. It is

thus *custos primæ tabulæ*. If the Sabbath, therefore, be not a peculiarly Jewish institution, the repeal of the Jewish law does not impair our obligation to observe it.

There are, however, some passages in the New Testament which are appealed to as proving that the observance of a day devoted to religion is no longer obligatory. There are only two of much importance. The one is Colossians ii. 10. "Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a festival *ἐν μερεὶ ἑορτῆς*, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath *days*." In explaining any passage of this kind, we must of course bear in mind the circumstances of the persons to whom it was addressed. Almost all the early Christian churches were composed of converts both from the Jews and heathen. The former were, naturally, so much attached to their own law, that it was with difficulty they could be brought to relinquish its observance. Hence in all the churches founded by the Apostles, there was continual difficulty on this subject. Judaizing teachers abounded every where, who insisted on the necessity of conforming to the Mosaic institutions. Paul occupies a large share of his several epistles in counter-acting these men. He exhorts Christians to stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ had made them free; severely re-proves those who suffered themselves to be led into the observance of Jewish rites; and bids them, as in this passage to the Colossians, not to let any man presume to condemn them for not keeping the law of Moses. That this is the simple and full meaning of the passage is evident, because this was the very subject of controversy at Colosse, and because the things here specified, meats, drinks and festivals, were all of them prescriptions of that law. It is clear, therefore, from this passage, that the Sabbath as a Jewish festival, was no more binding than the feast of the new moon, or the distinction between clean and unclean meats. But this is saying nothing more than all Christians admit; that the law of Moses as such, is no longer obligatory. By the *Sabbaths* here mentioned, (although that term is often used generally for all solemn feasts) is meant the seventh day of every week. The observance of this day no one holds to be binding. The name *Sabbath* was distinctively applied to that day. Hence the early Christian fathers earnestly dehort their hearers from keeping the Sabbath; insist upon it, that it is no longer obligatory; while they urge upon them the religious observance of the Lord's day. Thus Ignatius' *Epist. ad Magnes.* c. ix. 10, says: It is altogether

unfit for Christians to live as do the Jews, and, therefore, they should not keep the Sabbath (*μηκερι σαββατιζουτες*) but live in accordance with the Lord's day. This is their constant language. Are we to infer from this that they felt themselves free from all obligation to devote one day in seven to God's service, while they were urging, in the same breath, the observance of such a day? Clearly not. Therefore, while the passage before us is a warrant for Christians not to keep the seventh day, which was the Sabbath, it affords no evidence that the great obligation to devote one day in seven to God, has been repealed.

The other passage is one of similar import in Rom. xiv. 1, 2, 3. "Him that is weak in the faith receive, but not to doubtful disputations. For one believeth that he may eat all things: another, who is weak, eateth herbs. One man esteemeth one day above another: another esteemeth every day *alike*. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind." To what days does the Apostle here refer? Clearly to the festivals of the old dispensation. The Jewish converts thought they ought to observe them; the Gentiles thought they ought not. Paul tells them it was a matter of indifference, that every man should be fully settled in his own mind, and act accordingly, and not condemn those who acted differently. The Reviewer has too much knowledge of the rules of construction, to suppose that this passage is to be taken out of its connexion, and assumed to mean all that the words themselves will possibly bear. This case is precisely parallel with the declaration of Christ, "I say unto you swear not at all," i. e. take no such oaths as were the subject of discourse. That judicial oaths were not intended is plain, because Christ himself afterwards took such an oath, and so did his disciples. If a fair construction of the Saviour's command, frees it from the objection of condemning what he sanctioned by his own example; we cannot refuse to see, that when Paul tells the Roman Christians the observance or non-observance of particular days was a matter of indifference, he meant the declaration to be applied to the subject of discourse, and that he had no reference to a precept which had been in force from the creation of the world. That he had no such reference is still clearer, from the fact that we find him, and the Christians whom he instructed, actually distinguishing one day from another, by consecrating the Lord's day to religious services. There is the same evidence, therefore, that Paul did not mean to declare the weekly observance of a day

for the worship of God a matter of indifference, as there is that Christ did not mean to condemn judicial oaths, when he said, "Swear not at all."

The obligation, therefore, to devote one day in seven to the service of our Maker, has not been repealed in the New Testament. The observance of the seventh day or "Sabbath," has been abolished. As the keeping of that day was in commemoration of the first creation, it was evidently proper when the second or moral creation was effected by Christ, that the latter event should be the particular object of commemoration. Do we, then, actually find the inspired founders of our religion, and the churches under their immediate direction, neglecting the Jewish Sabbath, consecrating the first day of the week to divine worship? This question even Dr. Paley answers in the affirmative. Our Saviour arose from the dead on that day, and twice met his assembled apostles on "the first day of the week." This would in itself be of little consequence, were these two instances of religious convocation not the first of a series continuing unbroken throughout every age and section of the church. An observance thus commenced, and thus continued, we cannot but consider as an authoritative declaration that the great command to devote one day in seven to God, was recognized by Christ and his Apostles as still obligatory on Christians. We accordingly find in the New Testament, that the churches of the apostolic age did observe the first day of the week. In Acts xx. 7, it is recorded that when Paul was at Troas, "On the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached to them." Here then are the Christians of Asia Minor observing this day, under the direction of the Apostle. In the first epistle to the Corinthians, xvi. 1, Paul says, "As I have given order to the churches in Galatia, so also do ye. Upon the first day of the week let every one lay by him in store," &c. In this passage it is clearly intimated, that both in Galatia and Corinth, churches founded by the Apostle, the first day of the week was the day of religious convocation. In Rev. i. 10, St. John says, "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day." By this expression, the prevalent one in the early ages for the first day of the week, there can be no reasonable doubt that Sunday is intended. The phrase itself would seem to imply that the day was consecrated to divine service, as in the expressions, the Lord's supper, the Lord's house, this idea is conveyed.

That this day was religiously observed by the early Chris-

tians, admits of the most satisfactory proof. Our limits do not allow us here to adduce the evidence of this fact in detail, we must therefore again refer the reader to the works mentioned in a former part of this article. We shall cite only one or two passages. Barnabas, one of the apostolic fathers, argues that even in the Old Testament, God had expressed his dissatisfaction with the Jewish Sabbath, and by the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple, proved that a new order of things was introduced, therefore, he says, "we observe the eighth day, on which Jesus having arisen from the dead ascended up to heaven," c. 15. Justin Martyr, Apo. ii. p. 99, says, "We all meet together on Sunday, on which God having changed darkness and matter, created the world, and on this day Jesus Christ our Saviour arose from the dead." Dyonysius of Corinth, speaking of the first day of the week, says, "To day we observe the Lord's holy day." See Eusebius, lib. iv. c. 23. Origen Hom. vii. in Exod. says, "That manna was rained down from heaven on the Lord's day, and not on the Sabbath, to show the Jews that even then the Lord's day was preferred before it." Tertullian and John of Damascus, both argue at length against the observance of the Sabbath, and declare that Christians consecrate the first day of the week to God. The law of the Sabbath they say, Christ in part repealed, (i. e. as to the day, &c.) and in part spiritualized. "We then," adds the latter, "celebrate the perfect rest of the human race, that is, the day of the resurrection, on which the Lord Jesus, the author of life and salvation, has introduced us into the inheritance," &c. *De fide orth.* lib. iv. c. 24. Athanasius Opera, tom. i. p. 1060, says, "Formerly among the ancients, the Sabbath was honourable, but the Lord transferred the Sabbath to the Lord's day." And soon after adds, "We therefore honour the Lord's day on account of the resurrection." It was a common slander against the early Christians, often repelled by the fathers, that they worshipped the sun because they kept Sunday holy: which Tertullian says they did, *alia longe ratione quam de religione solis.* In allusion to the consecration of this day among the heathen to the sun, Ambrose, Serm. 62, says, *Dominica nobis venerabilis, atque solennis, quod in ea Salvator velut sol oriens discussis inferorum tenebris luce resurrectionis emicuit: ac propterea ipsa dies ab hominibus sæculi Dies solis vocatur, quod ortus eam Sol justitiæ Christus illuminet.*" The first day of the week was often called *Dies pa-nis*, because the Lord's supper was celebrated on every return

of it. It was also called the "Queen of days," βασιλισσα των ημερων. "Let every Christian," says Ignatius, "keep the Lord's day, the resurrection day, the queen, the chief of all days." The most common, and the most appropriate appellation was the Lord's day. This expression, as used with emphasis by the ancients, imports, says Augusti, vol. iii. p. 351, "The day appointed in place of the Sabbath by Christ, the founder of the new covenant, and 'Lord of the Sabbath,' on which men could as well worship God as on the seventh day, which Jewish superstition had desecrated; and on which men should joyfully call to mind the resurrection of Christ and the out-pouring of the Holy Spirit." This day, according to the institutions of the early church, was to be a day of religious joy and thanksgiving. No fasting was ever allowed on Sunday, for this was considered tantamount to a denial of the resurrection of Christ; all prayers were to be offered up in a standing posture; all public and private business was to be suspended; all games forbidden; religious assemblies, even in times of persecution, frequented; and even the previous evening was to be spent religiously as a preparation for its sacred duties.

If, then, from the creation of the world, God commanded men to devote one day in seven to his worship; if this command was introduced into the decalogue and enforced upon the Old Testament church with peculiar strictness; if Christ and his Apostles, the churches founded and instructed by their care and Christians in all ages, have continued to recognise this command; and if the institution be as important for the preservation of religion and good morals as we have endeavoured to show; then it is evident, that the neglect or desecration of this day is the violation of one of the strongest of our obligations, and destructive to the best interests of society.

We have now seen that, according to the opinion of the Christian church in all ages and among all important denominations, the Lord's day ought to be devoted to rest and the worship of God. This rest is not to be absolute, for that some works are lawful on this day, has never been questioned. Even the superstitious Jews admitted this, and, after one sad lesson, determined to defend themselves at least, on the Sabbath. Our Saviour clearly lays down the principle on which we are to decide such cases of exception, when he says, "The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath," and again, "God will have mercy and not sacrifice." The principle contained in these declarations, and which he applies himself in

several instances, is, that when two obligations interfere, the stronger destroys the weaker. This is an universal principle in morals. As a general duty, children are bound to obey their parents, but when this obedience would interfere with their duty to God, the obligation ceases; so that it is no violation of filial duty to refuse to obey a parent, who requires what God forbids. In like manner our Saviour teaches us the obligation to rest on the Sabbath ceases, when a higher obligation requires us to labour. The priests in the temple profaned the Sabbath, and were blameless. Every man might loose his ox and lead him away to watering. It is on this principle that Christ vindicates himself for having healed the sick, and his disciples for plucking ears of corn and eating them. This latitude of interpretation the nature of the law requires; so that we are not only allowed, but bound to perform works of necessity and mercy. In deciding on the cases which come under either of these classes of exception, every man must judge for himself, and on his own responsibility. The petitioners to Congress against carrying the mail on Sunday, never pretended to assume any other ground. They merely presented themselves at the bar of that body to say that, in their judgment, carrying the mail was not a work of necessity, and, therefore, did not come within the exception. When the Reviewer, therefore, himself takes this ground, and presses it with so much coarseness on the attention of the petitioners, he gives himself much gratuitous trouble. They are as well aware as he can be, that the whole question is one of construction; that the point at issue is, whether the carrying the mail on Sunday is a work of so much consequence, that we are freed from the obligation to devote that day to the service of God, in order to effect it. The petitioners think not; and, in our estimation, for very sufficient reasons. They take it for granted, that the pressure of the necessity must be proportionate to the extent of the interference with the object of the day. Although rescuing an ox might be a sufficient reason why his owner should devote the requisite time and labour, it would be a very poor reason why a whole neighbourhood should neglect the religious duty of the day. Due attention to this principle, would have led the Reviewer to see there was little force or propriety in most of his caustic arguments ad hominem, on this subject. The degree of attention which Christians devote to the decency and comfort of domestic arrangements, involves so slight an interference with the duties of the Sabbath, as to

be fully justifiable on their own principles. To justify a work, however, which gives constant employment to thousands in a manner entirely incompatible with its religious observance, and which leads to the partial employment of many millions more, must require a necessity pressing in the extreme. The petitioners do not believe that any such necessity exists for carrying the mail on Sunday; on the contrary, they believe that incalculably more harm than good results from it. Those who entertain this opinion amount to some millions, unquestionably, in this country. Men who belong to the best educated, the most moral, and in every respect most estimable classes of society. It is not in the power of any man by scoffs and ridicule, to render the opinion of such a body of men unworthy of respect; and every such attempt must recoil on its author.

The petitioners are confirmed in their opinion that no such necessity exists, as can authorise this extensive and demoralizing disregard of the Sabbath, by the fact that, in the earlier periods of our national existence, the Post Offices were closed, and the mail was but partially carried on Sunday, and yet no dreadful inconvenience resulted. They know too, that in the immense commercial metropolis of England, no mail departs or is distributed on Sunday. Such facts speak louder than theories or mere prognostications. They observe, moreover, that our government is very inconsistent in this respect. They see that all our legislative and judicial proceedings are suspended on the Sabbath throughout the whole country. And they cannot doubt that this is done at an immense sacrifice of time and money to the community. Thousands are kept waiting the proceedings of these bodies; are prevented receiving what in justice belongs to them; prisoners are detained in vile duration, and the whole march of business is arrested. They cannot perceive why it is, if in the opinion of the community, and of the government too, all these inconveniences are to be cheerfully endured, rather than interfere with the day devoted to religion, the evil arising from stopping the mail on that day, should be regarded as enough to justify a total disregard of it. They believe the inconvenience in the former case, is much greater than it could be in the latter. They, therefore, beg their representatives to be consistent, and to extend the respect they so properly pay to the Sabbath in all other departments of the government, to that of the Post Office. In answer to this reasonable request, to their utter amazement, they are met

on the one hand, with grave arguments to show that Congress has not the constitutional power to do, in regard to the mail, what they do in regard to every other branch of the government; and on the other, still more to their surprise, they are overwhelmed with injurious reflections on their motives, general defamation of their character, and insulting ridicule and taunts. With regard to this latter course, we shall say but little. The former, alone, deserves consideration.

It has, indeed, somewhat ungenerously perhaps, occurred to us, that it was not possible for such men as the chairman of the committee of Congress, and the reputed author of the article in the American Quarterly Review, either to blind themselves, or hope to blind others by the sophistry employed on this subject. We find, however, the Editor of the Review, in a recent number of the National Gazette, gravely recommends the said article, though he gives up its theology, to the serious attention of members of Congress, as a decisive argument on the question. We are free to confess that we are entirely incapable of discovering either the force or consistency of the Reviewer's arguments. On page 189, he says, "The man, or set of men, who say that I shall not ride or walk or sail into the country, because he adjudges these things to be breaches of the law, having thus determined what I shall *not do*, will next say what I *shall do*, will direct that I shall go to church, and then that I shall go to *his* church, &c. If the point now disputed be carried or yielded, the progress of the same power to the point suggested, will have no new principle or impediment to overcome in its way. Every thing is gained over any rights of conscience and religious freedom when a single point is carried against them." The argument here is, that it is inconsistent with religious freedom for the government to undertake to decide that the Reviewer shall not receive his letters or papers on Sunday, because if this be allowed, it may order him to go to church, decide for him what church, &c. That there is a fallacy somewhere in this argument, is evident. The government, as well state as general, does undertake to tell that gentleman that he shall not hold a court, if a judge; or plead a cause, if a lawyer; or prosecute a suit, if a client, on that day. However inconvenient the delay, he must wait. The government, moreover, does tell merchants and tradesmen, they shall not buy or sell on Sunday; that their store must be closed on that day. Where, then, is the difference between these cases? Why may not the government as

well tell the people that it will not allow its post-masters to distribute letters, as forbid its judges to administer the law on Sunday? Where is the difference in principle? We cannot perceive any. And what is more to the point, the Reviewer cannot. He entirely abandons the ground here assumed, of a constitutional difficulty, in his answer to the *North American Review*. "It is true," he says, "that the other offices of government do generally suspend their operations on Sunday; and that the Post Office does not. We have suggested the reason, which we shall show is the true one, and is wholly independent of any supposed religious obligation, or imperative command of Him, who should be obeyed in all things. [A declaration contradicted in the next sentence.] The difference of practice in these branches is founded on the difference of their duties, which allows of the permitted or PRESCRIBED rest from labour in the one case, and does not allow it in the other." "Sunday is observed as a day of rest and worship, unless some public or private necessity or utility warrants a dispensation; and the dispensation must be commensurate with the necessity or utility which demands it." pp. 190 and 191. The Reviewer has here strangely forgotten himself. This is the whole doctrine of the "terrorists." The length and breadth of Calvinistic rigour on the subject. There is not a man amongst us, who goes one jot beyond this; Sunday is to be observed as a day of rest and worship, unless necessity or utility warrants a dispensation. Has any man ever maintained that God requires us to rest on the Sabbath, when necessity requires us to labour? The Reviewer, therefore, in acknowledging (what, indeed, he could not deny) that the government does respect Sunday as a day of rest and worship, whenever it can do so, has entirely given up the ground that there is any constitutional difficulty in the case. He admits that no new principle is to be recognized, but that the whole question is, whether a principle already acknowledged shall be applied to a specified case. In doing this, he acknowledges that all the abuse which he and others have heaped upon the petitioners for applying for an unconstitutional exercise of power, is utterly unfounded. The principle which he admits is properly recognized by the government, has been acted upon since its formation. It has been adopted by every State in the Union, and by every incorporated town which has made any municipal laws to regulate the observance of the Lord's day. Unless the Reviewer will maintain that government, from the first, has been tramp-

ling on the rights of conscience and religious liberty, he must retract his censures, and admit the futility of his own arguments and those of the chairman of the post office committee. How this latter gentleman, with any seriousness, could ask, as an argument on this subject, how government was to accommodate all classes of the community, Jews, Mahometans, seventh day Baptists, &c.? we are at a loss to conceive. Why does he not wonder how all these classes are suited at present, with government respecting Sunday, as our Reviewer tells him it very properly does, in every branch excepting the post office? Can he not see that if they would have any ground of complaint if the latter department was closed on that day, they have the same ground already? The truth is, however, they would have no reason to complain in either case, as we shall presently show. We are equally at a loss to imagine how a gentleman of any discrimination could ask, "Why the petitioners have confined their prayer to the mail; why they have not requested that government should be required to suspend all its executive functions on that day; why they have not required that our ships of war should not sail; that our armies should not march; that the officers of justice should not seize the suspected or guard the convicted?" The petitioners will allow our Reviewer to answer him. Sunday is to be observed as a day of rest and worship, unless necessity warrants a dispensation. Consequently, to ask why the petitioners think one thing is necessary, when they dont think another so, is not a very pungent question. It might as well be asked, why they think it wrong to work on Sunday, if they think it right to take a cup of water? Yet this is what the Reviewer calls a cogent appeal! He somewhere remarks, that "honest and sincere men become so absorbed and infatuated with their own notions," as to lose all power of discrimination. If he wishes the benefit of this remark, we must in courtesy grant it.

The truth is, the grand mistake of the chairman and the Reviewer in all their arguments on this subject is, they think themselves heathen, whereas they are Christians; members of a Christian community, and bound to act accordingly. If they consider this a misfortune, they can only help the matter by making the majority of the same mind. But as long as the great mass of the people profess the Christian religion, so long must government respect that religion. Our legislature and every other governing body, are under a two-fold obligation as it regards religion. They are themselves bound as individuals

and as legislators, to act in accordance with the great principles of moral and religious obligation. This is a duty they owe to God. And they are, moreover, obliged to respect the religion of those for whom they legislate. They have no right to order the violation, on their part, of any of its precepts. This latter obligation is irrespective of the nature of that religion. The British government in India, has never pretended to the right, nor would they dare to assume it, of requiring the Hindoos to act contrary to their faith. And the Emperor Nicholas is obliged to accommodate his laws to his Mohammedan subjects, as far as they are concerned. From the fact that our constitution having wisely placed religion beyond its jurisdiction, it has been strangely inferred, that those who act under it, are authorised to legislate as though the people had no religion. This is the fallacy of all the Reviewer's arguments on this point. The people, in reserving the care of this subject to themselves, never intended thereby to authorise the government in making laws for them, to trample on their religious opinions. All they desire, and all the petitioners desire is, that Congress WOULD LET THE MATTER ALONE. As they have no right to pass any law in support of religion; so they are not authorised to make any, which interferes with it. If it be proper for them to pass a law which requires thousands to disregard the Sabbath, or submit to certain disabilities; it is competent to them to pass an act which visits with similar pains any man who goes to church. So long as it cannot be denied that Congress legislates for a Christian people, any law which requires the violation of the Christian religion, is oppressive and unjust. But it is asked what government is to do when the people are of different religions? We answer, the principles, which should regulate the movements of government in such cases, are perfectly obvious. In the first place, it should interfere as little as possible with the opinions of any party. It should pass no law, except in cases of necessity, which requires the violation of the precepts of any form of religion its citizens may adopt. Secondly, as it is clearly impossible to avoid this evil entirely, where there are Atheists, Deists, Christians and Jews living together, that course must be pursued which will produce the least injustice. In a Jewish country, the Jews are to be principally regarded, and in a Christian country, Christians. The plain principle is, that the religion of the country is to be respected. By religion of the country is meant, not an established religion, but that which the mass of

the people profess. Unless this be regarded, intolerable oppression must be the result. Acting on the principle assumed by the chairman and the Reviewer, that the government are to pay as little regard to Christianity, as to Judaism, that is, to the interests of thirteen millions, as those of a few hundred, would only multiply the evil an hundred fold. It would disfranchise all the sincere Christians in the land, without the least benefit to the Jews. But the fact is, no government could exist which acted on this principle. Our own has always been wise enough to know that they were legislating for Christians, and to act accordingly. They, therefore, have in practice and by laws, recognised Christianity, and disregarded Judaism. They have acknowledged a God, and a future state of retribution, to the confusion of the Atheist and the Universalist. These "theological points," the Government takes for granted as embraced in the religion of the people, and proceeds upon them as settled. The principle of the chairman is completely and radically revolutionary. It would change the whole practice of the government, and overturn it from its very foundations. Let Congress once announce to the people that they are to be treated as Atheists; that their most sacred rights and opinions are to be trampled in the dust, and our government is at an end. This recurrence to first principles, in matters of government, and pushing them, even when correct, to extremes, is of all courses the most dangerous; and yet, one of the most common with men of ardent and inconsiderate minds. Because a man's religious opinions are sacred and the rights of conscience inviolable, it is inferred, that the government can pay no regard to Jews, Turks, Christians, or Infidels, but drive on blindfold, careless whether its laws clash with the opinions of the hundred or the million. Yet, acting on this plan would be absurd and impossible. The same is true with regard to the liberty of the press, the inviolability of property, and other essential or conventional rights. They are of necessity limited and restricted, when men live in society; and pressing any of them to extremes would ruin any community in the world.

Setting aside, therefore, the obligation which Congress, as Christians, are themselves under to obey the precepts of Christianity, it is obvious that as long as they are the legislators of a Christian people, they have no right to pass a law which requires the violation of any of its commands. This, in the judgment of the petitioners, they have done; and of this they

complain. Is it a crime, then, to represent to Congress, that by any law of theirs, they encroach upon the rights of their constituents; that they require of them what their religion forbids? The Reviewer, however, tells us that this is not the case; that every man is free to act as he pleases. "He is not called upon *to do what he thinks wrong*; nor is he *prohibited from doing* what he thinks right." "No one requires him to depart a jot from his principles, or to violate his sense of duty." The law does not force him to be a mail contractor, nor a postmaster; neither does it require him to get his letters or papers on Sunday. This is all true. Let us apply this principle to other cases. Suppose a law passed ordering both houses of Congress to sit on Sunday; the president, heads of department, all clerks and minor officers, all judges from the highest to the lowest, to disregard the Sabbath; and then Congress to tell their Christian constituents that they need not act against their conscience; the law does not require any man to be either a senator or representative; nor does it force him to accept of any office, from the president to a tide-waiter. If any of them have a cause pending in court, they need not prosecute it on Sunday; should it happen to be called up, they can easily submit to be non-suited. A lawyer need not take a case likely to come to trial on that day. All that such persons have to do, is to renounce all places of honour, power, or profit; submit to be defrauded at every turn, and allow those "less scrupulous" to govern them. Strange liberty and equality this, in a Christian country! This course, which would disfranchise millions of the people; which would visit religious opinions with civil pains and penalties the most disgraceful; which would be a test-act of infidelity, according to the principles of the Reviewer, is true liberty, good enough, at least, for petitioners. We rather suspect, those same Calvinists, whom the Reviewer beards so unceremoniously, would find such a law as hard to bear, as they did the stamp-act of old. That such enactments are in fact test-acts, needs no proof. Any law, which prevents access to office to men of a certain creed, is a religious test. Our Reviewer might have comforted the Irish Catholics, as he now consoles American Christians, by telling them, they were "not required to do what they thought wrong, nor prohibited from doing what they thought right." What could they wish more? They need not take the offensive oath; all they had to do, was to stay out of parliament, and let the

less scrupulous manage matters for them. Strange doctrine for freemen! Strange instructions for an American Congress! It is undeniable, that the post-office law, as far as it goes, is a law of proscription, a religious test administered to every servant of the department. So far, therefore, is the assertion, that the petitioners apply for a law to deprive any man of a right, from being correct; that their application is only for the repeal of an act which deprives a large body of our fellow-citizens of their rights. But the Reviewer tells us he has a right to have his letters on Sunday, and therefore, a law forbidding him to get them, is injurious and oppressive. If he has this right, it is more than any other man in the land has. Who gave him the right in a Christian country, to require the government, or any individual, to wait on him on Sunday? Must other people violate their sense of duty for his accommodation? Has he a right to have a cause tried on Sunday? Can he force Congress to receive a petition or perform any of its functions, on that day, in his behalf? If not, whence does he get the right to make government carry letters for him, or to employ persons to deliver them on Sunday? No such right exists.

The fact is, the Reviewer knows, as well as we do, that all his arguments on this head are not worth a straw. He cannot help knowing it; because, he himself has placed the whole subject on its proper basis. He tells us that Sunday, in this country, is to be respected by the people and government, as a day devoted to rest and worship, except when public or private necessity forbids. And, consequently, the whole question about the mail is, whether this necessity exists. If this be once made out, there is not a Christian in the land who would utter a syllable of objection. As this, according to his own showing, is the real point at issue, he must be able to see, that all arguments to prove that granting the prayer of the petitioners would be an interference with the rights of conscience, and requires an unconstitutional exercise of power, are in direct contradiction to his own doctrine, and bear with all their force on the practice of government in all the other departments. He must see, too, that if his principles were applied to the other branches of the State, the result would be a most odious proscription and tyranny, a test-act more offensive than has ever yet disgraced a Christian country.

We have dwelt on this subject much longer than we at first intended. It is, however, one of incalculable importance. Did the petitioners not believe that the Sabbath was divinely

appointed, as the great means of preserving religion and good morals; that its influence was essential to the well-being of society, Congress would never have heard one word of remonstrance or complaint. No selfish motive can, with the least semblance of truth, be imputed to them. If stopping the mail on Sunday would occasion all the inconvenience which is predicted, they would bear their full share of the burden. Seeking such an object as the best interests of their country, by means obviously just and proper, is surely not a crime of sufficient magnitude to justify the amount of vulgar abuse which has been heaped upon them. So long as this was confined to papers confessedly hostile to all religion, and to many of the most sacred institutions of society, it was not a matter of surprise. Nor did we wonder that the chairman of the committee of Congress should allow himself to stray from the real point in hand, into a disquisition on the diversity of religious creeds, and the value of religious liberty. Such things are common in reports. But that a work, of the standing of the *American Quarterly Review*, should present its readers, not with a fair discussion of the question at issue, but with an article in which the religious principles of a large part of the community are ridiculed, their motives vilified, and their general character defamed, is a matter of unmingled regret. It would seem as though, by a strange mishap, some stray sheets from pens under the influence of a nameless female, had found their way into the mahogany escritoir of the unsuspecting editor. The *tone* of a book cannot be quoted. A specimen we are bound to give, to justify a charge so serious, and so derogatory to the respectability of the work. On page 186, the following passage occurs: "It is your *man-gods*, who make such laws, and impiously assume the power to condemn and inflict awful penalties upon those they shall adjudge to violate them; while with a most impudent self-complacency, they find an expiatory apology for their own deviations. The stern and cruel severity with which these self-righteous expounders of the law visit its utmost rigours upon all who dissent from their opinions, warrants us in probing their pretensions to the quick; and in searching their lives to see if the fruit shows the tree to be better than those they would cut down, and cast into the fire. Admitting that there are pure and bright examples of a good life among the terrorists—not, however, more or better than are found among their opponents—if we look at them individually, we shall see them,

GENERALLY, as devoted to worldly wealth and enjoyments; as solicitous for distinction and influence; as easily and happily puffed with pride and conceit; and as mere creatures of flesh, as those they pity or spurn, because, forsooth, their pretensions to sanctity are not so lofty—or their notions of Christianity so mysterious as their own; nor their observances and deportment squared by the rule they have adopted. They are as impatient of injuries; as vindictive in their passions; as unforgiving in their temper; as sordid and penurious; as keen, close and avaricious in their dealings; as hard creditors; as inflexible and unpitying in exacting their rights. But all this offends no law of the land; and is not forbidden by the Decalogue, as they interpret it; but to step into a steam-boat on Sunday! that is the fatal sin, and must be expiated by eternal torments. The religion of such men is satisfied by a hard and austere observance of the Sabbath, which happens to fall in with their taste; by professing a belief in certain sectarian tenets, which they do not understand; with occasional ostentatious donations to institutions which flatter their vanity by adulatory resolutions, and give them importance by a pompous publication of their piety and generosity.”* Such language the petitioners may well pity, and will, doubtless, readily forgive; more readily, we trust, than the Reviewer can forgive himself, or regain his self-respect. On page 190, he says, “Assuredly, a Calvinist would hold it to be a much more important service to religion, to prohibit all men from an attendance on an Unitarian or Catholic church, than to stop the mails and steam-boats on Sunday; and, therefore, in his own principles of duty, he would not only be willing, but bound to prevent it, if he could. *And he refrains from the attempt, only because there is a stronger power over him;* but if he can hoodwink or break that power in the one case, there is no security in it for any other; and we shall hold all these rights, not on guarantee of the Constitution, but at the discretion of legislatures, to be acted upon by popular feeling and interests.” This is a bold assertion, not with that boldness which is required to meet danger with unconcern, but that which enables a man calmly to contradict truth and history to the face. There are several millions of Calvinists in this country, and

* The committee of the House of Representatives, speaking of these same persons, say, “It is believed, that the history of legislation in this country affords no instance in which a stronger expression has been made, if regard be had to the numbers, wealth, or the intelligence of the petitioners.”

the assertion is not true of any one of them, we verily believe. Before the Reviewer can prove that Calvinists are particularly inclined to tyranny, he must blot out all the record of the past. They have, notoriously, been the staunch advocates and champions of liberty. The Calvinist Hampden was pleading and dying for the liberty of the world, while the infidel Hobbes was writing and raving for passive obedience. The liberty secured by Calvinists has given birth to all the world now enjoys. Calvinists* gave the world the Reformation, and England her constitution. They have ever been in advance of the rest of the world in the principles of toleration. Do Unitarians suffer from Calvinists here, in the nineteenth century, what Calvinists are now suffering from Unitarians in Switzerland? Take them, age for age, with others, and for the solitary victim to their bigotry, you will find hecatombs of martyrs. No man, with the light of history before his eyes, would hesitate to prefer leaving life, honour, or property, in the hands of the strictest Calvinists of the age, rather than in the power of those "less scrupulous" personages, whom the Reviewer has taken under his especial favour.

ART. VII.—MODERN JUDAISM.

REVIEW.—*Instruction in the Mosaic Religion. Translated from the German of J. Johlson, teacher of an Israelitish School at Frankfort on the Maine. By Isaac Leeser, Reader of the Portuguese Jewish Congregation in Philadelphia, A. M. 5590. Philadelphia, A. Waldie, printer. 8vo. pp. 139.*

A JEWISH book, in our own language is indeed a rarity; and we must solicit the indulgence of our readers, while we pause for a short time over its contents. The fortunes of this extraordinary people have been so wonderful, and their relation to Christianity so near and interesting, that we cannot but regard their very errors as instructive. In controversy, therefore, with a child of Abraham, we entertain feelings far remote from those with which we discuss the points of difference between ourselves and an idolater, or an infidel. Our

* In the sense of the Reviewer.

unavoidable associations of thought cast a melancholy interest over all that pertains to Israel, "whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever." With such feelings we took up this volume, purporting to be "the attempt of an Israelite to give his brethren a clear knowledge of the religion which they have inherited from their ancestors." We expected to meet with error, bigotry, and perversion of the Scriptures, with much of falsehood, and much of vain tradition; but we likewise looked for subtle vindication of Jewish tenets, and above all, for some clear exposition of the hopes and wishes of that people as to their future exaltation. We have been disappointed; for while every syllabus of Scriptural truth, however partial may be its views, must contain much that is important; and every religious treatise which is opposed to Christianity, must be radically erroneous; the work under consideration is a singular instance of studied abstinence, alike from characteristic doctrine and adventurous error. It is neither a complete outline of acknowledged Judaism, nor an ingenious refinement upon that system, but a specimen of naked, cold, unimpressive Rationalism. We cannot even designate it as the body without the soul, for it is so defective and jejune, that it is scarcely the skeleton of that body.

The work is intended for catechetical instruction, and is accordingly presented in the form of question and answer, under the following general heads: The dignity and destination of man; Religion; God, and his attributes; Immortality; Revelation; the Decalogue; Tradition; Duties towards God, ourselves, our fellow men, and the state; and the means of becoming pious.

It may be remarked of the work in general, that the most frequent course of discussion is to place every doctrine upon grounds which may be ascertained by the mere light of nature, and to append such passages of Scripture as confirm the position. The dignity of man, which is the first subject, is so far exalted as to represent him (for all that appears) as being quite as glorious a being as Adam before his defection. Indeed, there is not one word which indicates the most remote suspicion of a fall; and the sum of the Mosaic creed as here represented, upon this point, is that "the pre-eminent mental endowments, wherewith man is so peculiarly gifted; as also his reason, freedom of will, conscience, and the ever-active impulse which spurs him on to reach higher perfections and greater

happiness, clearly prove to us, that he is destined to advance continually in perfection, wisdom, and virtue."

The chapter upon *Religion* contains a number of undeniable truths concerning the great objects of man's existence, and the beneficial influence of piety. When, however, the author comes to give us a summary of the "fundamental articles of the *Mosaic religion*," it is surprising and painful to find among them no allusion to some of the most prominent and cardinal truths, for which Jewish writers of every foregoing age have contended. Omitting the doctrines of mere Theism, the three which are stated as fundamentals,—one of them being moreover palpably false—are, that God revealed himself in a supernatural manner to the ancients, and especially to Moses;—that Moses and the prophets were divinely inspired, and that their promises and predictions will be accomplished;—and that "the more particular explanations and definitions of the written precepts, were likewise communicated and orally delivered to Moses by God; so that these traditions (which were afterwards delivered by Moses to the elders and rulers of the people by word of mouth solely, and thus handed down from generation to generation) constitute a prominent and essential part of the law." p. 12. The reader will naturally inquire, at what time did the doctrine of a Messiah, the seed of the woman, the king in whom Israel has always gloried, cease to be a prominent and essential part of the Mosaic system? To this question he will vainly seek for an answer in the volume before us; and no hint is given that any such majestic personage was ever promised.

An apparent liberality of sentiment, with regard to other religions, may be observed in the following paragraph: "Mankind are not of one opinion concerning the mode of worshipping God. There are, accordingly, various religions, but they all, nevertheless, acknowledge a God and Creator, who desires but the welfare of his creatures. Our wise men therefore teach us, 'that the pious of all nations have a share of the world to come,' i. e. may enjoy everlasting beatitude." Yet we are by no means left to conclude from this, that the Jew is free to disregard the creed which he inherits, for it is added, "we can in no manner whatever renounce the religion of our ancestors, without infringing the covenant, and thereby drawing upon ourselves the curses which the whole nation pronounced before the Eternal. We must, therefore, be steadfast in the religion in which we were born." As a further

elucidation of this point, the author cites the words of Solomon, "My son, be attentive to the advice of thy father, and neglect not the instruction of thy mother," which, in a manner truly Rabbinical are thus interpreted; *the advice of thy father*—"in heaven, which he communicated to Moses, both written and orally;" *the instruction of thy mother*—"of the church, namely, those precepts which have been adopted as a safeguard to the law." p. 9.

Upon the Divine nature and attributes, the instructions are sound, and the practical inferences useful. In speaking of the immortality of the soul, the writer proves that he is far from being a Sadducee, and acknowledges the belief of a future state of retribution. It is sufficiently obvious, however, that he is disposed to shrink from the subject of future punishment. Of this he says, "the wicked will be punished, who died in their obduracy, without repentance," but no where intimates that this punishment will be endless. His nearest approach to Scriptural truth respecting the destiny of the impenitent, is in these words: "We believe the punishment to consist in a state full of shame and compunction of the soul, which must be to it the most painful and afflicting state imaginable." p. 29.

The evidences of a divine revelation are treated in the fifth chapter, in a manner somewhat singular and perplexed; so much indeed is this the case, that we cannot mistake the apprehension in the mind of the author, of their being successfully retorted in favour of Christianity. After acknowledging that the ancient prophets demonstrated their divine legation by means of *miracles*, he very carefully guards against any application of this test in after times. This is attempted, by denying that the prophet is under any necessity of performing miracles in attestation of his mission.

"But this the prophet is not obliged to do, except where he is compelled to suspend for a time any one of the Mosaic precepts, since in this case it might happen, that he would receive no credit, without performing a miracle."—"Yet even in this case, it is not always necessary that the prophet should perform miracles; as it appears from Maimonides, and from the Talmud. And say our wise men: If God permits wonders to be performed, we ought to view it with a thankful heart, as a particular and extraordinary favour, of which not every age can be worthy. But we are not permitted to ask for wonders, nor to found our faith upon them, because miracles alone can never be of sufficient value to consti-

tute good grounds for argument, either for or against the truth of any doctrine." p. 31.

We shall leave it to our readers to determine how far Mr. Johlson has conformed to the Old Testament Scriptures in framing this distinction, and whether in the last sentence he has not conceded the vantage ground of the Jewish religion to the heathen and the Deist. If the evidence of revelation, both Jewish and Christian, may not be rested on the basis of uncontrolled miracles, we look in vain for any historical ground upon which to meet the infidel. It is true he appeals to the immediate revelation of the Eternal, and "the public legislation, of which more than six hundred thousand persons were witnesses," as establishing "such doctrines and precepts, as should last permanently for all *coming generations.*" To this, the obvious reply is, that the scriptures contain a multitude of doctrines and precepts, acknowledged on all hands to be permanently binding, which, nevertheless, were never sanctioned by any immediate manifestation of Jehovah. The position, that miracles demonstrate a divine commission to legislate "for that period of time" only, is untenable upon any principles of reason or legislation.

The exposition of the Decalogue is judicious, and consistent with truth, so far as it extends. There is no Christian who might not meditate with profit upon what we are here taught from the third commandment: "Not to make a bad use of the divine name; never to use it unnecessarily, and never to utter it, but with a feeling of the deepest veneration. Therefore, even a prayer is a sin, if unaccompanied with real devotion; how much more sinful must an unnecessary oath be, not to mention a false one, which is an unpardonable profanation and disregard of the holy name of God."

The Christian reader will need no laboured argument to convince him that the Jewish, like the Popish doctrine of *traditions*, is an excrescence upon the body of revealed truth, an after thought of such as desired to find authority for their cunningly devised fables. The Judaic belief upon this point may be thus summed up:

"We believe, that God communicated some laws orally to Moses, which he in his turn was only permitted to communicate orally to others; and we explain in this manner the verse in Exodus, (chap. xxxiv. 27.) 'Write down these words alone, for, according to the meaning and intent of these words, I have made a covenant with thee and with Israel.'"—"The Scriptures and tradition constitute

together but one whole, they being the component parts of the Mosaic law." "The chief Rabbi, Mr. Hurwitz," (it is added in the margin) "drew here my attention to the numerical value of the words **בכתב** and **בעל-פה**. The numerical value of the first is 434, and of the second 187, which added produce the sum of 611, which is precisely the value of the word **תורה** (Law)!" "When the learned men of those days (A. M. 3890) saw, that the teachers of the law continually decreased in numbers, occasioned through the intolerable oppressions they had to encounter, and that the law was daily more and more neglected and forgotten, they determined, under the presidency of this pious chief (Rabbi Judah Stanassy) to commit the tradition, which had hitherto been preserved orally, to writing, in short sentences; the book thus composed, they called the *Mishna*; that is, repetition of the law."—"It was afterwards found to be too short and unintelligible without further elucidation: it came therefore to pass, that, two hundred and eighty years after the afore-mentioned period, this *Mishna*, and in fact the whole law, were more clearly and amply explained and illustrated, under the presidency of the pious and learned chiefs *Rabina* and *Rab Ashy*. The work, which was produced under this revision, is called the *Gemara* or *Talmud*, and is divided into 36 books."

The chapters upon Morals contain a variety of just and useful precepts, but nothing which is peculiar to Judaism as a system. It strikes us, however, as a singular feature in the moral code of a *modern Jew*, that it is forbidden (as it is in these expositions of the law) to take any interest for money. After citing the passage in Deut. xxiii. 19. "Thou shalt not lend upon usury to thy brother," &c. it is asked "But suppose the verse had another meaning, and should not refer to the *borrower* but to the *lender*; and that its import be: 'From a stranger thou mayest *take* interest, but not from thy brother;' will this permit us to loan to those on *usury* who are not of our faith?" The answer is, "We can by no means give such a turn to this precept, for, in the first instance, this passage can not allude to *usury*, since we do not find a word of this import in the Holy Scriptures. Secondly, all our fellow citizens, no matter of what faith they may be, are our brothers, and we are accordingly obliged to assist them in their need without compensation." "All kinds of interest, without reference to the amount are strictly prohibited. And as no kind of interest is allowed by law, it is evident that there can be no word, which signifies *usury*," p. 88.

It is due to the author of this book to say that here and in all its pages there is manifested a spirit of kindness and benevolence.

violence, which prejudiced persons are too apt to consider as altogether foreign from the character of the Israelite.

The concluding chapter of the volume bears the title *Of Means to become pious*, and might readily be expected to contain some intimation of the Jewish tenets upon the momentous question, how sinful men may be just with God. Instead of this, there is a careful avoidance of any acknowledgment that mankind are under condemnation, or in need of any divine influence; and what we are permitted to gather concerning justification, leads to the inference that our righteousness is a meritorious observance of the moral and ceremonial precepts. In order "to become daily more virtuous," we are instructed to appreciate the excellence of virtue; to commune with the pious; to read the Scriptures, and to pray; and the chapter is taken up with certain defective, but judicious remarks upon the duty of prayer.

If we had been asked what might be mentioned as the two great, distinctive doctrines of the Jewish faith, as opposed to Gentile or Deistical systems, we should have answered without hesitation, the doctrine of sacrifice as connected with an atonement for sin, and that of a Messiah, promised to redeem Israel. Yet in a work professing to communicate the fundamental points of the Mosaic religion, there is not one syllable enjoining sacrifice, nor a single allusion to the Messiah. The evasion of these subjects, which are so prominent in the Old Testament, is manifestly the result of a deliberate purpose. Various occasions offer, where one would suppose some notice of these great truths could not have been avoided. In speaking of the worship of God, the author divides it into "the inward and the outward service of God," and describes the outward worship as "those acts of piety, through which we prove our love to God, by words and deeds. This worship, however, does not merely consist in the exercise of acts of benevolence and charity, but also in private and public prayers, and the observance of the ceremonial laws." (p. 68.) Here the reader must observe that the fairest opportunity of introducing the doctrine of sacrifices is passed over in studied silence. A manual which takes its name from *Moses* contains no allusion to that which fills so very large a space in the writings of that holy man. How manifest is the implied concession, that the law had but a "shadow of good things to come," when even the shadow is abandoned by this misguided people.

As far as we are permitted to learn any thing from this

epitome, with regard to the method of obtaining pardon and justification, the ancient ground upon which Israel rested is altogether vacated. An Infidel, a Mussulman, or a Christian, with the Bible in his hands, would unquestionably conclude, that these favours were to be obtained, if the Scriptures are any rule of faith, through the medium of sacrifice; and all history evinces that such was the uniform belief of the ancient Jews. But we here find that sacrifices are declared to be no essential part of worship.

“Sacrifices are not a necessary requisite to our worship. Only when the temple yet stood, and the Israelites lived together in their own land, sacrifices were ordered to be brought at the place which God had chosen, “to let his name dwell there” (Deut. 12 ch. 11v.); but on no account, was it permitted to bring them beyond the precincts of the temple. But since our temple is now destroyed, and the Israelites are dispersed in every land, the sacrifices have ceased of necessity; for, to offer them now, would be in direct contradiction to the will of God. And then, even when we were yet in Palestine, *private* sacrifices were not necessary, and a man was not considered as sinning, if he never brought a single voluntary offering in all his life; as a virtuous and religious life is more agreeable to the Deity than any presents we can bring.” p. 70.

The last sentence of the paragraph just quoted is as remarkable an instance of blindness, prejudice, or wilful sophistry, as we have ever detected in the writings of a learned man. In order to prove that sacrifices are not “indispensably necessary at *public* worship,” it is urged that “*private* sacrifices were not necessary.” If this were literally true, it is altogether irrelevant to the argument: for the *public worship* of Israel mainly consisted in offerings which had reference to the whole body of the people. We may instance the solemnities on the great day of atonement, concerning which it is enjoined; “And this shall be an *everlasting* statute unto you, to make an atonement for the children of Israel, for all their sins once a year.” (Lev. xvi. 34.) And further than this, no man could with impunity pass his whole life without making sacrifice, unless he could so live as never to feel conscious of guilt, to be expiated by a burnt offering; or so as never to sin in a single instance through ignorance, when a sin-offering was demanded; or so as to contract no ceremonial uncleanness, which made a trespass-offering necessary; or unless he should never so feel his obligation as to render solemn thanks by a peace-offering. (Lev. i. 2. iv. 27. v. 3. vii. 12.) The expostulation of Jeho-

vah, in the forty-third of Isaiah, plainly shows that even the oblations which might be called voluntary, were no less moral duties than the others, being precisely on the same footing with thanksgiving in general.

It is undoubtedly true, that acceptable sacrifices can no longer be offered; but instead of giving the destruction of the temple as a reason for this, we are to regard both these events, the cessation of ceremonies and the ruin of the visible sanctuary, as effects of the same new dispensation. The modern Jewish doctrine is evidently fabricated to suit the melancholy necessity of their present condition. Their notion at the present day is this: that as there is no longer any temple, their repentance and their death will be sufficient to secure forgiveness, yet at the same time, that this blessing would be much more easily obtained by means of sacrificial rites. "*Hodie victimas offere non possumus, destituti mediis ad hoc necessariis, quæ quando obtinemus, tum remissio illa tanto facilius reddetur.*" (Respon. ad quæst. sept. Brenii.) Here it is assumed, in contradiction to the whole tenour of the Mosaic law, that sacrifices, instead of expiating sin, were merely given to enable them by the use of other means to obtain remission. Our author represents repentance and reformation as in themselves an atonement.

"A man does penance or becomes converted, when he confesses his sins before God, with a sorrowful and humble heart, and prays to him sincerely for forgiveness on account of the fault he has committed; but the chief requisite is, that he make a positive resolution, to become better, to endeavour earnestly to obtain the mastery over his evil inclinations, to be very watchful over his conduct, and to *compensate*, as much as possible, for errors committed, with deeds of virtue and piety." p. 65.

In this there is a total relinquishment of the doctrine of sacrificial expiation, as held by the ancient Rabbins, from whom we quote two passages, as given by Outram. *Abarbenel*, one of their most judicious writers, in the preface to his commentary upon Leviticus, thus states his views on this subject: "Adam and his sons offered sacrifices, supposing that by them they rendered worship to God. For they burned the fat and reins, instead of their own reins and vitals; and made libation of the blood of sacrifices instead of their own blood and life: thinking before God that the blood of themselves who sacrificed deserved to be shed, and their body offered for their sins, but that through Divine benignity, the animal substituted be-

came an expiation; whose blood and life might redeem the blood and life of the sacrificer, and occupy his room." To the same effect R. *Bechai*, upon the first of Leviticus, remarks: "When the guilty himself deserved that his blood should be shed, as sacrificial blood, and his body burned, as the sacrificial body; and when God, (to whom be praise) accepted this victim, *ut rem vicariam*, and his redemption price, behold, how great is the benevolence of God towards him! For, out of the fulness of his mercy and goodness, he has accepted the life of an animal, in the place of his life, that expiation might be made for him." Thus, we observe that these fathers of the Jewish theology, who had not yet a special purpose to answer, read in the unequivocal terms of the ancient ritual, that plain doctrine of *substitution*, which was deeply engraven upon every column and every altar of the Levitical system. It becomes every son of Abraham, therefore, to inquire whether, in abandoning the shadowy rites of the ceremonial law, without embracing the body which is Christ, he does not, in effect, abandon his only hope of expiation.

If, however, we have been surprised at these singular defects, our astonishment has been still greater on observing the total absence of any remark concerning the Messiah, the hope of Israel. It is well known that the Jewish nation, throughout all ages, have anxiously looked for this deliverer. In the time of the prophet Malachi, they were seeking and desiring this "Angel of the Covenant." Towards the time of his actual advent they were strangely agitated with expectation, (so that it became notorious throughout the empire,) and were ready to be led away after every impostor. After their fatal rejection of the Lord Jesus, they were deluded by the pretender Barchocheba into a sedition, which resulted in the destruction of a great part of their nation. Still, however, they clung, as a body, to the hope of such a deliverer, although their ideas with regard to his character and work were discordant and highly absurd. Plainly seeing that their prophecies attribute to the Messiah peculiarities which could not concur in any one mere man; that they foretold at once his reign and his debasement, his triumph and his suffering, his everlasting exaltation and ignominious death; they alighted upon the expedient of imagining two personages in whom these predictions should be accomplished. One of these was to be the sufferer, the other the everlasting king. Still these very fables of Messiah Ben Joseph, and Messiah Ben David, betokened their solici-

tous expectation of the promised blessing. Since they have abandoned the only chronological data which are afforded by revelation, they have been perplexed and disheartened as to the time of Christ's advent, and there have not been wanting some, bold enough to deny that he will ever appear. This opinion is noticed in the Talmud, as having originated with Rabbi Hillel.*

Does the author of these Instructions embrace the doctrine of Hillel, that it is vain to look for the Messiah? From all that appears in his work, we might conclude that he does; or, at least, that he considers the whole subject as unimportant or inexplicable: for this great, characteristic and boasted tenet of his fathers, is absolutely stricken out from the confession of his faith. Whatever the reason for this silence may be, it leads us to a melancholy conclusion with respect to the judicial blindness of this devoted people. It is impossible even to touch on this subject without emotion. There is something hallowed in the name of Israel, from its association with past events and promises of the future, and we lament with peculiar sorrow over the error and misfortune of the Jewish nation. Their mistakes are fatal, "according as it is written, God hath given them the spirit of slumber, eyes that they should not see, and ears that they should not hear, unto this day." "Until this day remaineth the same vail untaken away in the reading of the Old Testament;" a vail which seems to be more opaque than in former years. Then, they excluded the light respecting Jesus as the true Messiah: now, every ray from the promises of Scripture on this subject seems to be shut out.

Upon this omission of so important a doctrine, we take occasion to observe, what has frequently occurred to our minds in surveying the theological opinions of Germany, that what is called *Rationalism*, has not only pervaded all the various bodies of Christians, but has even extended its influence beyond the pale of the Church. It is no longer permitted to Papists to boast of the security afforded by the infallibility of Holy Church. The most careless reader must observe in the words of the Catholic Professors Jahn and Hug, that in every case of perplexity, they plough with the heifer of neology. And in the work now under review, we observe the operation of the same false principles upon Judaism. The author is avowedly an admirer and follower of Mendelssohn, whom Mr. Leeser digni-

* Owen's Exercises prefatory to the Hebrews, vol. i. p. 233.

fies with the title of "the great Rabbi Moses Mendelssohn." This learned philosopher has done for the Old Testament, what Schleiermacher has done for the New. He has distilled Platonism out of the sacred Scriptures, and reduced the theology of the Bible to the form of a mystical philosophy. In both cases it has been found necessary to remove the great corner stone of our faith out of the way. The *new exegesis*, of which we hear so much, has been used as a universal solvent, under the cogency of which, all that is supernatural, mysterious, or miraculous, is made to disappear.

While, however, it is deemed unnecessary or hurtful to maintain any thing concerning the Messiah, no disposition is shown to relinquish any of those weighty matters which regard the ceremonial usages. Such are "the wearing of the fringes and the phylacteries," "the ordinance of the washing of hands," "the lighting of the lamps at the commencement of the Sabbath and holy days," "and the reading of the *Shemang*."

The Appendix to this work relates to the ceremonial laws and customs, and affords much that is interesting and instructive, not only to such as are desirous of learning more fully the Jewish character, but to every student of the Scriptures. It is remarkable that out of the six hundred and thirteen precepts enumerated by the principal doctors, no less than two hundred and forty-four are rendered impracticable by the destruction of the temple: a serious consideration for one who, like the Israelite, contends for the permanency of his ritual. The curiosity of many readers may be gratified by the following statement respecting the articles of dress which the Jews are observed to wear in their Synagogues:

"When we put on that garment on which the fringes ordained by the law are fixed, (Num. 15ch. 37v. and Deut. 22ch. 12v.) we pronounce likewise the following prayer of thanks: 'Praised (be thou, &c.) who hast sanctified us through thy commandments, and commanded us the precept of the fringes.' But when we cover ourselves with the *prayer cloak*, we say in place of the concluding words of the foregoing: 'sanctified and commanded us to *envelope ourselves with the garment of fringes*.' These fringes are to be considered as marks of remembrance and tokens, by which we are always reminded of the commandments of God; as it is written, (Numb. 15ch. 39v.):" p. 115.

The description of *phylacteries*, as coming from a Jew himself, is adapted to throw much light upon our Saviour's words:

“As soon as a boy has reached his thirteenth year, and he has reason enough to keep his thoughts free from evil ideas, as well as his body and dress cleanly; it is his duty to lay every day, with the exception of Sabbath and festivals, the phylacteries. These are two cubic-formed parchment cases, in which the four chapters (adduced below) from the Pentateuch, written on parchment, are inclosed.* Leather thongs are fixed on these two cases; of which one is laid on the left arm, just above the elbow, the other on the forehead. The last is closely fitted round the head, and hangs down on both sides round the neck; the former is wound seven times round the left arm, and three times round the middle finger.” p. 115.

We learn from this summary, that on Monday, Thursday, and the Sabbath of each week, the law is read from the manuscript rolls of the Synagogues. For this purpose, the Pentateuch is divided into fifty-four weekly *Sedroth* or lessons, each of these containing seven smaller sections. An entire *Sedrah* is read upon the morning of the Sabbath; but in the afternoon and the two mornings above mentioned, only the first section or *Parshah* of the *Sedrah* for the next Sabbath. The principal peculiarities of the Jewish calendar are minutely detailed.

After observing this scrupulous adherence to the ritual observances, this zeal for trifles and vain traditions, connected with the rejection of all that gave vitality to their religion, we lay down this volume with a deeper feeling than ever of the Apostle's word: “Brethren, my heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel is, that they might be saved: for I bear them record that they have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge. For they being ignorant of God's righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God.”

* Exodus, chap. xiii. 2—10. x. 16. Deut. vi. 4—9. xi. 13—21.

Select List of Recent Publications.

BIBLICAL.

J. Paré, De Johannis Evangelio, non prorsus dissimili prioribus evangeliiis, nec ob similitudinem repudiando. Utrecht, 1828. 8vo. pp. 168.

H. E. Weysers, Dissertatio doct. de libri Apocalypseo argumento, sententia et auctore. Leyden, 1828. 4to. pp. 84.

A Grammar of the Hebrew Language, for the Old Testament, in compendious form, by G. H. A. Ewald, Professor at Gottingen. Leipsic.

Lingux Hebraicæ litteræ, accentus, pronomina, conjugationes, &c. congescit et disposuit J. G. L. Kosegarten. Jena, 1829. 4to. pp. 16.

Syriac Grammar, with paradigms, praxis, vocabulary, &c. by Dr. Fred. Uhlemann. Berlin, 1829. 8vo.

Winer: Lexicon manuale Hebraicum et Chaldaicum in V. T. libros, ordine etymologico descriptum. Leipsic, 1828. 8vo. pp. 1094.

Rosenmuelleri Scholia : P. VII. Vol. IV. Prophetæ minores annotatione perpetua. *Editio secunda*, auct. et emendat. Lipsiæ, 1828. —P. III. Vol. I. Jesaiæ vaticinia contin. *Editio tertia*, auct. et emendat. 1829.

Translation of the Prophecy of Isaiah, by Dr. Gesenius. Second edition, improved. Leipsic, 1829. 8vo. pp. 167.

Hoseas Prophetæ. Introductionem præmisit, vertit, commentatus est J. C. Stuck. Leipsic, 1828. 8vo. pp. 472.

A concise View of the succession of Sacred Literature, in a chronological arrangement of authors and their works, from the introduction of alphabetical characters to A. D. 1445. Vol. I. Part I. by Adam Clarke, LL.D. Part II. by J. B. B. Clarke, A.M.

Blount's Veracity of the Books of Moses. London, 1830. 8vo.

A Vocabulary of the Principal Words in the New Testament, and a Dictionary of proper names, with remarks, &c. by H. G. O. Dwight.

The Biblical Repository, conducted by Edward Robinson, Professor in the Theological Seminary, Andover. 8vo. Vol. I. No. I. Andover, Flag & Gould. New York, J. Leavitt.

Exegetical Essays on several Words relating to Future Punishment. By Moses Stuart. Andover, 1831.

THEOLOGY.

The Histories and Doctrines of the Old and New Testaments, prepared for the use of Schools, and for private instruction, by the late Dr. A. H. Niemeyer. Thirteenth edition. Halle. 8vo. 1829.

A. Van der Hoeve : *Comm. ad Quæstionem, Exponatur notio, natura et necessitas Resipiscentiæ, quam postulant Jesus et Apostoli.* Groningen, 1829.

A Free Conversation on the Unpardonable Sin, wherein the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, the Final Apostacy, and the Sin unto Death are shown to have been originally distinct. By James P. Wilson. Philadelphia.

The Works of the Rev. Robert Hall, A. M., Minister of Broadmead Chapel, Bristol, England. First complete edition, with a brief Memoir of the Author, and his portrait. New York. 2 vols. 8vo.

Two Essays ; 1. On the assurance of Faith ; 2. On the Extent of the Atonement and Universal Pardon, in which the views of T. Erskine are particularly examined. New York. 1831. J. Leavitt.

The Christian Remembrancer, or Short Reflections upon the Faith, Life, and Conduct of a real Christian. Second edition. By Jonathan Youmans. New York.

Theological Institutes ; or a View of the Evidences, Doctrines, Morals, and Institutions of Christianity. By Richard Watson. Complete in one volume.

The People's Right Defended : being an Examination of the Romish Principle of withholding the Scriptures from the Laity. Together with a Discussion on some other points of the Romish Controversy. By "Wickliffe." To which is appended, A Discourse on Transubstantiation : by Archbishop Tillotson. Philadelphia. W. F. Geddes, 1831.

The Pleiad : A Series of Abridgments from seven distinguished writers on the Evidences of Christianity. By Francis Wrangham, M. D., F. R. S., Archdeacon of Cleveland. Philadelphia. T. Kite, 1831.

A Series of the Most Esteemed Divines of the Church of England : with Lives of each Author, arguments to each Discourse, notes, &c. By Rev. T. S. Hughes, B. D. [This work is not expected to exceed 50 volumes.]

The Evidences of Christianity, stated in a popular and practical manner, in a Course of Lectures on the Internal Evidences of the Christian Religion, delivered in the Parish Church of St. Mary, Islington. By Daniel Wilson, A. M., Vicar. In two volumes. Volume II. Boston. Crocker & Brewster. 8vo. pp. 410.

[To those who have perused the first volume of Mr. Wilson's able and popular work, this volume, which is a continuation of the same discussion, will be truly welcome. In the first No. of the Biblical Repertory for 1830, we expressed our opinion with regard to the excellence of that production. The subjects treated in the

present volume, are briefly these: Lect. 14. The suitability of Christianity, to the state and wants of man; as it speaks a decisive language; unfolds the mysteries of his condition, provides a remedy for all his wants, is calculated for universal diffusion, frowns upon every vice, and is a prospective scheme formed by the wisdom of God.—Lect. 15. The Excellence of the Doctrines of Christianity, which are briefly enumerated. These are simple, sublime, harmonious, ample, humbling and consolatory.—Lect. 16. The unspotted purity of the Christian Morals; which embrace all that is good in Heathenism, are without defect, erecting the only true and unbending standard; omit the false virtues of the Pagan, dwell on the mild and retiring virtues, and constantly refer to God's all-seeing eye. Connexion of the morals of Christianity, with every part of revelation, especially its peculiar doctrines. The sanctions by which Christian morals are ultimately enforced. The morality of the Gospel makes it impossible that Christianity should be an Imposition. Contrast with the wretched systems proposed by Infidels.—Lect. 17. Pre-emiuent character of our Lord Jesus Christ.—Lect. 18. Tendency of Christianity to promote the happiness of individuals and nations.—Lect. 19. Every one may bring Christianity to a certain test, by submitting to its directions.—Lect. 20. Practical directions for the application of the test to which men may bring the Christian revelation.—Lect. 21. Vanity and futility of the objections brought against the Christian religion,—as being inadmissible speculations—contradictory—frivolous; yet to be viewed as trials of our faith.—Lect. 22. Lives and deaths of infidels, compared with those of sincere Christians.—Lect. 23. The faith in which the Christian revelation is to be received.—Lect. 24. Sound interpretation of the records of Christianity.—Lect. 25. Universal obligation to obey.]

A Practical View of the prevailing religious systems of professed Christians of the higher and middle classes in this country, contrasted with real Christianity. By William Wilberforce, Esq. With an Introductory Essay, by Rev. Daniel Wilson. Boston. Crocker & Brewster.

A Vindication of the fundamental Principles of Truth and Order in the Church of Christ, against the allegations of the Rev. William E. Channing, D.D. By Rev. Frederic Beasley, D.D. Trenton. 8vo. 1830.

The Testimony of the Society of Friends on the continent of America. Philadelphia, 1830.

ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY AND POLITY.

Letters concerning the Constitution and Order of the Christian Ministry. Addressed to the Members of the Presbyterian Church in the city of New York. Second edition. To which is prefixed, a Letter on the present aspect and bearing of the Episcopal Controversy. By Samuel Miller, D. D. Professor of Ecclesiastical History and Church Government in the Theological Seminary at Princeton, N. J. Philadelphia. Towar, J. & D. M. Hogan. 1830.

J. H. Stuffken : *Dissertatio doct. de Theodosii Magni in rem Christianam meritis.* Leyden, 8vo. pp. 181.

J. E. Feisser, *Dissertatio de Vita Basilii Magni, Cesareæ in Cappadocia Episcopi.* Groningen, 1828. 8vo.

D. Van Heyst : De Judæo-Christianismo, ejusque vi et efficacitate, quam exseruit in rem Christianam, seculo primo. Leyden. pp. 182. 8vo.

N. C. Kist ; Oratio de Ecclesia Græca, divinæ Providentiæ teste. Leyden, 1828.

Philip Melancthon, in the year of the Augsburg Confession ; as described by himself : being a translation of his Letters into German, by Chr. Niemeyer. Halle, 1830. 8vo.

A Harmonized and Tabular View of Church History. By J. S. Vater. Halle. folio. 1828.

The History of the Christian Church during the three first centuries ; translated from the German of Neander. By Rev. H. J. Rose. London, 1830.

Lectures upon the History of Judaism, delivered in the University of Berlin, by Professor Henry Leo. Berlin, 1828. 8vo. pp. 294.

Universal History of Christian Missions, by Christian G. Blumhardt, Inspector of the Evangelical Mission School at Basle. Vol. I. Containing the Missionary History of the Church of Christ in the Apostolical age. Basle. pp. 528.

NARRATIVE.

Diary and Correspondence of Dr. Doddridge. Vols. IV. & V. London. 1830. 8vo.

The Life and Travels of St. Paul. Written for the American Sunday School Union. By G. T. Bedell, D.D. Rector of St. Andrew's Church, Philadelphia.

The Life of Mohammed, founder of the Religion of Islam, and of the Empire of the Saracens. By the Rev. George Bush, A. M. New York.

The Life and Times of the Rev. Richard Baxter, with a critical examination of his writings. By the late Rev. William Orme, author of Memoirs of Owen, Bibliotheca Biblica, and one of the Secretaries of the London Missionary Society. Boston. Crocker & Brewster.

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. With a Map adapted to the Work. Boston, 1831. 12mo. pp. 334.

[“*Part first* contains a narrative of the tour, including remarks upon the more interesting localities and scenery—the soil, agriculture and productions—the effects of war upon the towns, villages and plantations—and the manners and customs of the inhabitants. The tour in the Peloponnesus is first described ; next that in the Islands of the Ægean ; and next, follows that in the Ionian islands. *Part second* embraces the results of inquiries concerning the territory, population and government of Greece, and concerning the state and prospects of Education. It also contains a view of the decline of the Greek Church ; of the introduction of some of its more remarkable usages ; of its present condition ; of the reasons for anticipating a reform ; and of the measures which should be pursued by Protestants for the benefit of the Oriental Churches.”]

SERMONS AND ADDRESSES.

Murray Street Discourses. The Discourses delivered in Murray Street Church, on Sabbath Evenings, during the months of March, April and May, 1830, by Drs. Spring, Cox, Skinner, De Witt, Miller, Sprague, Carnahan, Woodbridge, Rice, Woods, Wayland, Snodgrass, and Griffin. New York. 8vo.

The Certain Triumph of the Redeemer. A Sermon delivered in Murray Street Church, on the evening of May 9th, 1830, by Francis Wayland, D.D. President of Brown University.

Sermons of the late Rev. William Ashmead. With a Memoir of his Life. Philadelphia. Towar, J. & D. M. Hogan.

The American Pulpit ; a series of Original Sermons, by Clergymen of the Protestant Episcopal Church. Nos. I. and II. Boston.

The Connexion between the duties of the Pulpit and the Pastoral Office. An Introductory Address delivered to the Members of the Theological School at Cambridge, (Mass.) By Henry Ware, jr.

The Sunday Library, or the Protestant's Manual for the Sabbath Day ; being a selection of Sermons from eminent Divines of the Church of England, within the last half century, with biographical sketches and notes. By Rev. T. F. Dibdin. Vol. I. London.

Collection of Sermons delivered in the Court Church at Gotha, by William Hey. Hamburg, 1829.

Sermons of Augustus G. Tholuck, D. D. Professor of Theology. No. I. Containing ten Discourses, delivered at Berlin and Rome. 1830. Hamburg.

Address of Rev. John C. Young, delivered at his Inauguration as President of Centre College, Danville, Nov. 18, 1830. Lexington, Ky. 1830. pp. 12.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Hales' Analysis of Chronology. New edition. 3 vols. 8vo. London.
Der Lauf der Zeit: being a translation into German of Pollok's
 "Course of Time."

[We extract the following remarks from a periodical work, edited by Drs. Ullmann and Umbreit, at Hamburg.—"This poem contemplates the highest and holiest objects. The fall of man, the salvation offered anew, the progressive conflict of sin against God,—then the Judgment, the end of the world, and final retribution, make up its contents. The Poet has not sought to display the greatness of his powers, so much in wonderful creations of fancy, as has been done by his celebrated predecessor in the religious epopee. The unseen world, into which he conducts us, has its foundation, almost exclusively in the Gospel—the source of his inspiration is his Faith. The tone of the whole is naturally somewhat pensive, yet impressively

earnest, and in some places keenly sarcastic, indicating the bitter regrets of a noble spirit, deeply wounded by the corruption of the age. There are not wanting, however, kind and benevolent descriptions from nature, from the external life of men, and from the heart; and as if by way of compensation for those objects of horror, among which he sometimes detains us, these are depicted with the gentlest and most graceful colours:—these passages sound like music in our ears." The Stuttgart *Litteratur blatt* designates Pollok, as "the Dante of Protestantism."]

A Report of the Debates in the Presbytery of Philadelphia, at a special meeting held in the city of Philadelphia on the 30th of November, and continued on the 1st and 2d December, 1830. Philad. A. Claxton.

Psalms and Hymns, adapted to Public Worship, and approved by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. States of America. Philadelphia, 1830.

