

THE
BIBLICAL REPOSITORY
AND
CLASSICAL REVIEW.

THIRD SERIES, NO. XVII.—WHOLE NUMBER, THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
JANUARY, 1849.

699306A
ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS
L

ARTICLE I.

OLD AND NEW SCHOOL PRESBYTERIANISM.

By REV. SAMUEL T. SPEAR, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Differences between Old and New School Presbyterians. By
REV. LEWIS CHEESEMAN, Rochester. Published by Erastus
Darrow.

IN the following Article it is proposed to make some comments on the Book, designated by the above title. The book carries with it the name of John C. Lord, D.D., of Buffalo, for a voucher; besides which, it has already received a favorable notice from the Biblical Repertory, as well as from several religious journals of the day.

It may perhaps be well to inform the reader in the outset, that, although the reviewer is conscious of no special love for the work of criticism, still he need not expect to find many commendations in this article. The book has many faults, and but few virtues; and to review it with justice is to criticise it with pointed severity. In the above opinion we may not agree with Dr. Lord, and some others, who think the work a valuable performance, an important addendum to the religious literature of the age. If so, then this will be an illustration of *subjective* "differences," not *objective*, surely, since the printer has given us but *one* book to read, though the readers be many.

We should be quite willing at once to submit the "doctrinal" points, and join the issue of orthodoxy and truth with the author in regard to them; and this would be our course, were there not some important preliminary matter, whose inspection is requisite to a just understanding of this strange assault upon "New School Presbyterians," and virtually also upon the entire body of orthodox Congregationalists in New England. Some attention to this branch of the subject will be no loss to the reader.

THIRD SERIES, VOL. V. NO. 1. 1

I. The first circumstance worthy of note, is the *personal paternity* of the book under review. It is sometimes interesting to know *where* a thing comes from. It is especially so in the present case, since the paternity of the book is not the least remarkable among its many remarkable qualities; since also when the former is well understood, common minds will be much aided in comprehending the latter. It is true, that this inquiry is somewhat *exterior* to the work itself; and needs light from some other source, very happily and timely supplied by a recent and able review from the pen of the Rev. William C. Wisner. This review tells us *who* Dr. Lord, and the Rev. Mr. Cheeseman, the joint producers of this book, are, by a few fragments of important history; and inasmuch as it may not fall under the reader's eye, we propose to introduce some facts, exegetical of these authors, upon the authority of Mr. Wisner. The *main* fact is, that both of them are *neophytes* in the ways, manners, customs, doctrines, &c., of "Old School Presbyterians," as they choose to style one of the divisions of the Presbyterian Church; in respect to one of whom the Presbyterian thinks this an advantage on the score of "a disinterested testimony." The singular, complicated, and withal strangely involved texture of this main fact, will best appear by a few items of history.

In respect to Dr. Lord, then the Rev. John C. Lord, it may be observed that when the excising act was enacted in 1837, he was a member of the Synod of Genesee; and of course in the *infected* district; and therefore among the number of those to whom that act applied. He was himself excised with the rest of his western brethren. In regard to his views and preferences, touching the well-known controversies and agitations in the Presbyterian Church, prior to the famous act of excision, it is not material to inquire. It is sufficient to observe the Rev. John C. Lord at, or about the time of this notable event. In his introductory chapter, he gives us his *modern* version of a class of Christians, passing under the cognomen, the *proper* name of "New School Presbyterians;" applies to them the most opprobrious and offensive language; denies their orthodoxy; questions their honesty; and most seriously implicates even their right to be called after the name of Christ. This is Dr. Lord's published opinion in 1848, as we shall show when examining the "Introduction." Now we must confess, that such opinions strike us as not a little remarkable in view of their *source*. We wonder that he has so soon forgotten his *former* self; that the oblivious shade of total silence, without the remotest allusion to the past, should have veiled in forgetfulness the events of by-gone time. Any little note of explanation, anything in the shape of an apology, the faintest sign of penitence for former deeds, would have lessened this wonder, but, as it is, we must wonder on till the emotion shall exhaust itself.

He does not pretend that "New School Presbyterians," whom he now castigates in such unmeasured terms, have changed since he was *one of them*. From this hypothesis he has *excised* himself by the chronological era specified in his denunciatory language. No: this is not his idea. Has the Dr. himself undergone any changes in the course of ten years? Let all candid persons consider the following facts:—

In 1837 the Rev. John C. Lord was a member of the Synod of Genesee, and acted as its moderator at a meeting held in October of this year. At this meeting he gave his *apparently* hearty concurrence to the adoption of the report of a committee of which Dr. Bull was a member; in the preparation of which report, it was well understood at the time that these two brethren "were the principal agents." After its unanimous adoption, "brothers Lord and Bull led the Synod in prayer and thanksgiving to Almighty God, for the great unanimity which had characterized their action." This document is inserted at full length in Mr. Wisner's review; and, among other things, is unequivocally declarative of the fact, that the Synod of Genesee is sound in the faith, and maintains an "unwavering attachment to the doctrines and discipline of the Presbyterian Church, notwithstanding the suspicions which have been extensively and industriously circulated against us"—so sound, that the members (Rev. John C. Lord among the rest,) had no idea of being thrust out of the Presbyterian Church by an "unconstitutional" excision. This is what the brother *said* he thought in October, 1837. Be it further observed, that the Presbytery of Buffalo, of which he was then a member, in responding to a *certain* "circular," inviting the Presbytery, or a minority of its members, to be represented in a certain "convention," about to be held in Philadelphia, did also, Jan. 31st, 1837, *unanimously* adopt the report of a committee of which the Rev. Mr. Lord was the *chairman*, and, therefore, presumptively the writer of said report. This is also given in Mr. Wisner's review. From it we learn, upon the authority of the brother himself, corroborated by all his peers, that the charges made against the orthodoxy, good order, and sound Presbyterianism of the "New School" are not true; that the "controversies have not resulted from a *difference in doctrinal belief*," but, among other causes, "*from the love of power, and the disposition to dictate*," on the part of *some* persons, not very ambiguously hinted at, who are fraternally exhorted to practice "the wisdom of confining their efforts to their own charges," namely, their respective churches. We shall have occasion to refer to this report in another connection; we now use it simply to show *who* Dr. Lord once was, and *what* he once thought, and would still think, had not some very material changes happened in his history.

Here, then, are some of the *facts* which excite our wonder;

and the emotion is so peculiar, that we cannot resist the tendency to let it subside into the *interrogative* phase of human thought. Was the Rev. Mr. Lord, in 1837, *mistaken* in respect to his "New School" brethren? If so, then, in all candor, as an act of justice to himself and the world, he ought, *ipsissimis verbis*, to say so; and tell us in 1848 of the ways and means by which his honest, but incorrect impressions have been rectified. We can hardly think he was mistaken; he knew them; and they knew him as they thought. We are the more confident in this view, since we have the authority of the "Presbyterian" to support the opinion, that "an ecclesiastical connexion with one of the excised synods" may be regarded as having furnished "a favorable position" for knowing the whole truth. We will not assume this plea, until the Dr., declaring it, shall claim its benefit; and then we should feel disposed to that mode of reasoning, called *argumentum ad hominem*; and would barely suggest, that if the Dr. has been mistaken *once*, he may be *twice*—yea, not improbably, since such a phenomenon when he was one of them, would be more remarkable than when he is *not* of them, by a very plain law of optics. Being of the number now accused, we want to know how this matter stands; we claim the right to know *who* this accuser is, and whether any changes, and if so, then what, have occurred to himself. Again, was the Rev. Mr. Lord *insincere* (we make the supposition simply to complete the circle of an argument), in his professed confidence in the orthodoxy, &c., of the "New School" brethren in 1837, touching the points in controversy between them and the "Old School?" If so, then we think the stool of repentance his proper place; and that he should bring forth fruits meet for repentance, by a public confession of the fact, since his act was public, before he introduces another such book to the world with his endorsement, himself imitating, *multum in parvo*, its most offensive, unjust, and even *slandorous* qualities. When he so plainly repudiates his own paper, we wish him to explain himself. When he so violently assails his *old* friends, his ecclesiastical kindred, and makes common cause with their and his former antagonists, himself the boldest gladiator in the use of hard words, we feel startled into the interrogative mood of philosophy. Novel events suggest the doctrine of causation; and we must be indulged a moment longer. What did the Dr. think of these "heresies," when the case of Mr. Barnes was fully traversed before the General Assembly in 1836, and he voted to *sustain* the appeal of Mr. B.? What means this strange transition? and how has it come to pass? Did anything occur to make the Dr. uncomfortable, "restive and uneasy," among his former associates? Had he lost their "confidence," and was "his influence" among them for any reasons on the decline? Had he any struggles of mind, any doubtful self-disputations, to settle the question *where* he should

go? Is it that he is a *fresh* hand, that his conversion is so recent, that he must make up for *lost* time? How is it, and what is it? Is there any danger of a re-union between the two sections of the Presbyterian Church? Are there "any in our church, who are disposed to discuss the possibility of a union between the two bodies?" Is the Dr. displeased with the doctrine? Have he and Mr. Cheeseman written to veto it? Would he prefer to *absorb* "New School Presbyterians," rather than *unite* with them? Again, we say, how is it, and what is it? We want light: give us light. Here is a mystery for the Dr. to explain—no less a one than to settle his own accounts with himself. We would respectfully suggest as a thesis for the editor of the "Presbyterian," that he unravel these incongruities, these mysteries over which we have travelled, "in endless mazes lost;" since he thinks, that "the introductory chapter, by Dr. Lord, is in his *usual frank and manly* style, and forms an appropriate preface." The "introductory chapter" is materially embarrassed in the essential quality of *credibility* by the novel position of its author; and be it remembered, that this quality is peculiarly essential, since the "chapter" itself is one of the strangest pieces of composition with which a sensible man ever saluted the public ear. It must receive a mighty impulse from the *author*; or its fate it would not require the son of a prophet to predict. Here is work for the friends of the book, those who blazon its fame. We hope they will attend to it, and not pass it *sub silentio*.

In respect to the Rev. Lewis Cheeseman, the other item in this matter of personal paternity, we also have a synopsis in the review of Mr. Wisner. It appears that he was once a member of the Presbytery of Rochester; and that just prior to the excising act he was placed at the bar of this Presbytery, on a trial of charges preferred against him by a member of his own church. He was unanimously acquitted, "with the exception of a slight censure for indiscretions." Soon after this trial, he "retired" for a season from public labors, as a minister of the gospel. When the excision of 1837, and after this, the division of 1838 came along, he *escaped* from the "New School connexion;" and then came, out, in the language of Mr. Wisner, "a valiant Old School Presbyterian;" his relation with the "New School" being rather "irksome" "*upon far different grounds than unsoundness in the faith*" among these brethren.⁴ Since this period, he also, judging from his book, has given full proof of his change—leaving not the slightest doubt to rest upon any "unprejudiced" mind, that he is *now*, whatever he may *once* have been, an "Old School" man. Whether he will continue remains to be settled by time; the inference from the past is as little favorable to himself as to his co-

¹ See Wisner's Review.—pp. 19–21.

² The *italics* are by the reviewer.

³ Presbyterian.

⁴ Wisner's review, pp. 22–24.

adjutor. Changeable things are very liable to change; and it is not possible always to account for their freaks, or guess with certainty what the next one will be.

The reader will now perceive the propriety and purport of a previous remark, that the personal paternity of the book is not the *least* remarkable among its many remarkable qualities. No one would have supposed that such a tissue of facts was in the rear of these brethren; that they had been so recently matriculated, having hardly had time to shed the *exuvix* of their former state. Their modern repugnance to "New School Presbyterians" is really a curiosity. Dr. Lord tells us, that the "New School" hold "the theological tenets of the Papacy." Did he hold these "tenets" when himself was a "New School" man, and in 1836 gave his vote to sustain the appeal of Mr. Barnes, that is, "the theological tenets of the Papacy?" Mr. Cheeseman assures us, that the "New School" are about the same thing as "Unitarians:—" does he speak from his own past experience?

If the reader shall inquire, why we disinter the decayed and mouldering identity of these once living men? we shall be very happy to attend to the question. That which is simple to some, is not therefore as simple to all. The facts, we suppose, were well known to Presbyterians in Western New York; but they were not so well known to ministers and Christians in other sections of the country. Among many the inquiry was current: *Who is this Mr. Cheeseman?* Even the editor of the "Presbyterian," though receiving "an intimation that such a book was in preparation," "had but little personal knowledge of its author," and therefore "felt some solicitude on the subject."¹ The simple truth is, that in respect to a very large circle, the book was an *advertisement* of the author's existence, ministerial and personal. It is, therefore, due to a just estimate of the spirit and tone of the work, that the history of the *Old Schoolism* of these brethren, as well as their modern aversion towards the "New School," should be known. The Rev. Mr. Wisner, being on the ground, has performed a service in this respect, with which no candid mind ought to be displeased, in letting the *remoter* public look a little into the interior of this matter. We thank him for the use of his eyes. Could his historical facts be added to the "Introduction," as a note of explanation, they would greatly perfect the work. "New School Presbyterians," having some sensibilities, have felt themselves injured, so far as this book can harm any one—grossly "caricatured"—vilified and aspersed, not treated with Christian candor or decency; they have felt this injustice on account of the endorsement not only of Dr. Lord, but of others; and it is but natural that they should desire to know *whose* lips have uttered these strange responses with such oracular infallibility. The history of the oracle itself is a

¹ The italics are added by the reviewer.

very pertinent inquiry in this discussion. We have seen enough of this *one-sided*, small, not to say, *mean* business, for which some think themselves so well-fitted, that when we see a new specimen, we like to know where it comes from; and if we are not remarkably obsequious, it is because we have no very great relish for the thing. The "Presbyterian" thinks the book a very discriminating and "thorough investigation"—"a desideratum"—not rendered unnecessary even by "Professor Wood's book on the same subject," distinguished by "acuteness" and "heartfelt earnestness," too profound for a newspaper "analysis"—"worthy of being read by every Presbyterian clergyman," "not as a matter of curiosity," but of deep study—"irresistible and unanswerable" by "those who may feel irritated at its conclusions," but who, nevertheless, must give the author "credit for sincerity"—"especially" important "to be read by those, if there be any such in our church, who are now disposed to discuss the possibility of a union between the two bodies." But, as all this is merely a matter of opinion, and as freedom of thought is one of the glories of the age, we choose to say that we differ not a little with the editor of the Presbyterian, and in due season expect to give our reasons. The production is anything but a candid, fraternal, and well-sustained statement of the "differences" in question. It is rather a *Cheesemanism sui generis*. Such a work ought to be willing to tell *where* it came from; and as this information was not supplied, we confess our obligations to Mr. Wisner for his labors in this department of the public service. His explanatory note we cordially adopt as our explanation of the foregoing remarks. "We regret exceedingly to be compelled to make even the slightest allusion to these painful circumstances; but, when an individual assumes the attitude of a *public and wholesale accuser* of his brethren, it sometimes becomes necessary, in self-defence, to show the *quo animo* of his course, by exposing his real position." If not necessary, it is lawful. Such an "accuser" has no right to complain. He makes himself public property; invites inspection; and is the last man to read lessons of charity to the accused, gracious in him according to the ratio of his own arrogance. We do not propose to let him *pilfer* the logical advantage of saying to us "you are heretics." in order that we may try our skill in dialectics to convince him, and such as himself, to the contrary. Some men have the talent to get on the safe side of the *onus probandi*—to play the game of accusation, so that the accused must appear as *respondents*, while they, the *plaintiffs*, of course are not to be questioned, since to question them is by no means *the* question. Not at all; it is not *their* question. The labors of Dr. Lord and Mr. C. furnish a very luminous specimen of this kind of skill; and not even Dr. Beecher himself can escape their "insatiable thirst" to find

¹ Page 23.

heresy; yea, more than this, for President Edwards, that prince of theologians, and acute metaphysician, by his "treatise on the nature of virtue," infected New England with the fundamental principle of the "New School" heresies. Since all depends upon the authority of these brethren, candid men, who have no *party* purposes to serve, or spleen to gratify, wish to know what is the degree of *credibility* properly belonging to that authority. This is a vital question in estimating testimony; and for its solution we are compelled to study the history of the witnesses. The reader, perhaps, has enough of this history, to answer all the purposes of a practical judgment.

II. The next circumstance, claiming attention, is the *local and special mission* of this modern attack upon "New School Presbyterians." It appears from a correspondence between the *principal* author and Mr. Gabriel Longmuir and others, that what is now a *book*, was originally delivered as a series of "lectures" to his own people in Rochester. Those, who having heard them requested their publication, declare that they had listened to them "with no little degree of interest;" also express the opinion, "that their publication at *this* time will do great good to the cause of truth in *Western New York*,"¹ The lectures impressed these gentlemen, in one respect, as the work will, doubtless, the general reader, that the author had *Western New York* particularly in his eye—primarily, perhaps the Presbytery of Rochester, and, by a little elongation of his vision, the Synod of Genesee. The book is a production about matters and things professedly general, yet bearing very distinctly the imprint of *locality*.

What occasion there was for these "lectures" in *Western New York*, what was the special purpose they were to serve, the "great good" they were to accomplish, we shall show at large, when examining the *quo animo* of the author himself. To avoid repetitious quotation of the same matter, we will for the present state a conclusion, and ask the reader to note our pledge to prove its truth in a future stage of this review. The conclusion is simply this; that Mr. C., being an "Old School" Presbyterian, by some means received an impression, that there were here and there scattered in the Synod of Genesee, individuals, churches, and perhaps ministers, who, though according to Dr. Lord "sound in the faith," were, nevertheless, strangely obstinate or ignorant in remaining in the "New School connexion;" and, furthermore, that these said individuals, churches, and ministers were susceptible of being sifted or *warned out*; in which event they would "at once unite with the Synod of Buffalo," the "Old School" banner in *Western New York*. This objective appearance was the *outward* circumstance, the occasional cause, which called the

¹ The *italics* are added by the reviewer, as in very many other passages to be hereafter cited—simply for greater perspicuity.

author from his comparative retirement. And that there is more truth than poetry in this view, we expect to show in due season, taking the book for our sole authority. It is a book for the *times*, and for *Western times*, revealing its birth-place by other evidences than the residence of the author.

If the "lectures" and the book contain the same matter, then the author, when the preacher, must have supposed, that "these brethren," these "decided Presbyterians," were within *hearing distance*; for surely he would not have lectured them so gravely over the backs of a little congregation in Rochester, by an arrogant misnomer styled the "*First Presbyterian Church*:" or, he must have had a hint, perhaps a dream, at least a faint suggestion, that what was "at first prepared for the *pulpit*, and not for the *press*," might, having done some service in the first, also do another service in the second capacity. He certainly *preaches* as if he expected to *publish*—addressing his own people and at the same time "these brethren"—confirming the one, and inviting the other to connect themselves with "*our cause*." All this may be in admirable congruity with the plan; but, in view of the nature of the "subject," we exceedingly doubt its wisdom, if truth be the object, and light the medium. The subject of "differences" is one having so many sides, attended with so many difficulties—requires such elaborate argument and acute discrimination—that, if not merely a popular impression, but a clear *eclaircissement* of the truth be the object, most men would choose at once to make a book, and not preach a series of "lectures." It may be a very fair question, also, whether such a discussion is not likely to be very much embarrassed by the *local* and *peculiar* purpose it is to serve. To argue the "differences" under the influence of such a moral *diathesis*, to say the least, is not favorable to the equilibrium of the logic. The author has chosen for himself an unhappy position to accomplish his *professed*, though it may not be in view of his *real*, object. A wider induction, a broader sweep of observation, more extended research and reading, the citation of authorities, "Old School" as well as "New," their minute comparison, definitions and distinctions, proofs and not mere assertions; all this might have so modified and increased the *space-penetrating* power of the author's vision, that, instead of seeking out "these brethren" wandering by a mistake in the "New School" Presbyteries of Western New York, and providing for them a safe ingress into his own ecclesiastical encampment, where their "position," "efforts," and "influence" will be favorable to "*our cause*;" instead of this merely local work, he might have given us a book on "Differences" for the country, if not for the world—a book convenient for future use, a light to shine long after his "cold remains" shall have mouldered "underneath the clods of the valley."¹ We

¹ See page 21.

deny not the author's ability to execute this Herculean task; but he has not done it—not even *tried* it; he did not start right. It is very plain, that his book is not destined to immortality; it comes into the world with the ghastly omen of death upon it; and like much of the merely *readable* literature of the age it must run a short race. It requires a writer of no ordinary parts to convert a *past* into a *present* tense; and keep up the pleasing illusion from age to age. He must have a great subject, and do it ample justice.

III. We come now to an examination of the "Introductory Chapter" by Dr. Lord. This chapter is an endorsement, and recommendation to the public, of Mr. Cheeseman's labors; so that although the latter should have prepared the work without any *fraternal* aid, it goes forth with all the authority which the name of Dr. Lord can impart. He does not criticise a single passage; but makes the whole his own by a legitimate construction. He tells the public to take it for truth, adding much that is spicy upon his own responsibility. We hold him *morally* answerable to God—*logically* to the world for this service. As compared with Mr. C., he is the more public man; and inasmuch as this business of recommending books is really a very serious matter, where not personal favoritism, or party affinities, but truth and righteousness ought to reign, we propose to give the reader a somewhat extended exegesis of the "Introduction."

A small part of it (namely, the first sentence and the last paragraph) is *directly commendatory*; and the analysis of this, somewhat in the way of item by item, will be our first work.

The *first* idea in his commendation of a book professedly treating of things as grave as "doctrinal differences," things which have taxed and even embarrassed the soundest and strongest understandings, strikes us as a singular conception. We would not notice it if it were not the vertebral column, on which his commendation mainly rests, whether consciously or unconsciously on his part we cannot tell. The idea is that of the "MANNER" in which "Mr. Cheeseman has presented his subject." The attribute of this manner is, that it "appeals to the pious *feelings*, to the Christian *emotions* of every renewed heart." We have no objection to such appeals in their proper place; on the contrary, we think very much of them; yet, we had been in the habit of supposing, that in regard to the matters contained in Mr. C's "subject" the appeal was to be made, not to *feelings*, to mere *emotions* of any kind, but to the understanding. We suggest the question, Who is right, the Dr. or the reviewer? For example; is it a question to be settled by "pious feelings," "Christian emotions," whether our Saviour literally suffered the penalty of the law; or, what is the connection between Adam and his posterity in the matter of sinfulness; or, on which side of the "*doctrinal*

differences" is the truth in respect to the constitutionality of the excising act? These, and such like, belong to Mr. Cheeseman's "subject;" and are we in this nineteenth century to erect "feelings," "emotions" of any kind, into a tribunal for the trial of such causes? We take the liberty to deny the jurisdiction of the court. This mode of settling theological questions, we know, is a very convenient way to prove one's orthodoxy, provided the "feelings" are of the right stamp—a very short route to find heresy; it saves the trouble of that tedious work some people call *argument*; and compensates for the absence of the capacity to reason, whether hermeneutically or otherwise. It is, however, a mere *trick*, where the question is essentially one of thought and biblical exegesis, not of feeling. We grant that Mr. C. has a somewhat *pious* way of saying very hard, and sometimes very *bad* things; but we have lived too long in the world and seen too much of the different phases of human spleen, to be caught with such a "manner." The Dr. is quite certain, that Mr. C's. "manner" appeals (we suppose he means *favorably*) to the pious feelings "of *every* renewed heart." "EVERY RENEWED HEART" is a large idea; and taking him as he writes, we infer that those to whom the "manner" does *not* thus appeal, either have no hearts, or if so, then not *renewed* hearts; a new test of human nature on the one supposition, and of Christian character on the other. We will not mutilate the sentence by any deductions or unauthorized interpolations; but suggest, that it had better be returned to its author for farther consideration, and, perhaps, improvement.

The Dr. continues his commendation by informing us, that Mr. C. "*may* not have avoided *all* the severity which controversy engenders, but he has succeeded beyond *my expectations* in giving a *practical* character to the work." This is a curious passage in its relation to the labors of Mr. C. Let us see:

Who are the controversialists liable to be decoyed into "the severity which controversy engenders;" and into which Mr. C. himself "*may*" have fallen? They are Mr. C. on the one hand, and the "New School Presbyterians" on the other. It is admitted that two such personages exist, and that between them there *might* be a "controversy." Well, *was* there any such controversy when the Dr. penned his hypothesis? The simple truth is, that, to a very great extent, the latter did not know that the former, namely, Mr. C., had lighted upon this mundane sphere, until they heard of his coming under the banner of Dr. Lord, and in the most furious gladiatorial array—a *recently* enlisted champion of "Old School Presbyterians," as proved by a light (Mr. Wisner's Review) that burst upon his rear—engaged, at his own charges, in the amiable work of aspersion. The Dr's. implied assumption that the "New School Presbyterians" were under *arms*, is false. He must not think that all are men of *war*, because he is. The

“New School” did not know this modern Achilles; they had no “controversy” with this *persona incognita*. What the Dr. calls a “controversy” we call an *attack*, an *assault vi et armis*, for a purpose about as lovely as the mode is ingenuous and honorable. Yes; after the Dr. has himself imitated the very worst features of Mr. C.’s “manner”—going along as an *endorser*, while holding a sword in both hands, he very graciously tells the public, that his fellow-laborer “*may* not have avoided *all* the severity,” &c. Be patient, gentlemen; you know it is *our* privilege to have a “controversy” when, and where, and with whomsoever we will; it is only necessary for us to begin the work of *accusation*, and then any hard things we may say, are to be imputed not to a bad spirit, but the heat of debate. Yes; “New School Presbyterians” can, of course, afford to be patient; for, although they did not call off Mr. C. from the *onerous* cares of the “*First*, Presbyterian Church,” of Rochester, to make an attack upon their orthodox, still the Dr. has consented to console them with whatever comfort there “*may*” be in a bare possibility. In plain words, we do not like his *salve* any better than his *false assumption*.

The passage is also a little *mysterious*. What does the author mean by the declaration, that Mr. C. “has succeeded beyond *my expectations*?” Has the Dr. accidentally *leaked* out the idea, that besides the “Introduction,” he has had something to do with “the work” itself? How much? Something, we conclude, else we cannot understand why he should have had any “expectations” in regard to it. To what extent is he modestly recommending himself? It does seem as if a *part* of a fact were rising above the surface. We know not what it was that troubled his expectations; but, if it were something in the *author*, then Mr. C. must settle the account with his endorser; if it were something in the “*subject*” itself, then for once, at least, even Dr. Lord is not perfectly clear, as to the “*practical character*” of such a “*subject*.” What was it?

Again, the passage contains what is to us, at least, quite a *novelty*. We have no bias or troubles on the score of previous “expectations;” but we must confess, that if we take “the work” as embodying the Dr.’s conception of a “*practical character*,” here, also, we have another *new* idea. The “*practical character*” of the work relates to the effect it is intended to produce, and having read it with some care, we judge this to be the effect; namely, the practice of having “these brethren,” these “*decided Presbyterians*” leave their “*New School connection*,” and come over to the benefit of “*our cause*.” This would be *one kind* of practice, no doubt. How much of this practice Mr. C. “has succeeded” in generating we cannot tell; but we venture the opinion that the *adaptations* of “the work” for such results will depend quite as much on the *condition of the subject*, as upon the

skill of the author. If any of "these brethren" should happen to think Mr. C. right, because he speaks so *positively*, has so little occasion to fortify his opinions by argument, and can quote Scripture without showing its application; if they should think "New School Presbyterians" about the same thing as "Unitarians," because Mr. C. says so, though they had not conjectured it before; then possibly such persons will adopt the practice of not leaving "their names, their property, and their offspring" to "be lost to *our* church." Beyond this circle (we hope for the credit of human nature, it is not very large) we apprehend "the work" will not be as "practical," as a strong fancy and perhaps as strong a *wish* have led the Dr. to imagine. In what *other* sense it has a "practical character" we confess a total inability to understand. It is not an exhortation to repentance or faith; but, from first to last, a direct attack upon the orthodoxy and honesty of "New School Presbyterians"—a *wholesale* accusation of a large class of ministers and Christians, for a purpose that is as obvious as the sun at noon-day. The author begins with this object, and he ends with it in a very grave and earnest "Plea for union among Presbyterians." Really, in plain words, it is a species of "barefaced" sectarian *Jesuitism*, not uncommon among Romanists, but quite a curiosity in the habits and manners of Protestants. If the reader think this a severe remark, he may be assured, that "all the severity" lies in its *truth*; let him read the first, ninth, and tenth chapters for the *quo animo* of the author, and, after this, the intermediate chapters for the *modus operandi*. To dignify such a production with the honor of a "practical character," is a misnomer. In the good and usual sense of this phrase it has no such "character." The sense in which it is "practical," may be a very captivating charm to Dr. Lord; ye,t probably, but few men will sympathize with all his idiosyncracies.

The Dr. closes the commendation by observing: "He makes the practical power of the doctrines of grace and redemption so manifest, that the eyes of all *unprejudiced* persons can hardly fail to be opened, and if I *mistake* not, there will be left upon the mind of every reader, an impression of the importance of *these* great truths for which *we* stand in a day of darkness and rebuke." We ask the reader to pause and sift this language in its *intended* application. "These great truths for which *we*" (Dr. Lord and Mr. C., certainly, and how many others he does not say,) "stand in a day of darkness and rebuke:" What are they? Why, the truths in controversy between "Old School and New School Presbyterians," according to the *modern* version of that controversy by these brethren; in regard to which truths the "New School" being a "corrupted" "portion of the Presbyterian communion," "*artfully*" concealing "under various *disguises* from the eyes of multitudes of pious persons" their real sentiments, rejecting the

“distinctive doctrines and features of the Westminster confession,” while *nominally*, and therefore *hypocritically* retaining it as their symbol of faith—the “New School” are entirely *wrong*, bloated with heresy to a perfect plethora; while “we,” who are “in a day of darkness and rebuke”—yes, “we,” being orthodox, as a matter of course, are as certainly right. They have all the heresy—and “we” all the orthodoxy! A very modest strain of bigotry and arrogance, decked in pious phrase! We must say it, because we think it; yes, this—just this, after the Dr.’s poem of accusation. The *self-complacency* of the passage will do for a specimen in a cabinet of moral curiosities. Besides this, it is instructive to see how some men can nurse their fury, and grow both wise and certain, when they have the privilege of saying what they please. The Dr.’s first idea was, that “the doctrines of grace and redemption,” namely, “these great truths,” &c., shone so brightly in the hands of Mr. C., “that the eyes of all *unprejudiced* persons can hardly fail to be opened.” If therefore some, or all of “that large and respectable body of members of the Presbyterian church, who, though sound in the faith, yet remain in the New School connexion,” (their “eyes” being *shut* while they so remain,) should have the misfortune *not* to have their eyes “opened,” so as to embody the Dr.’s idea of the “practical character;” if this should be, then they might plead *prejudice*, that darkest of mental opacities. No; not even this; for the Dr. has just caught a *second* thought, and fastened all such characters beyond the possibility of escape. Unless he is *mistaken*, this new and bright light will leave its impression “upon the mind of *every* reader”—piercing the thickest veil of prejudice, disclosing to all “these great truths for which *we* stand in a day of darkness and rebuke.”

We are not prompted by any *hypercritical* spirit in these strictures upon the Dr.’s commendation. We think we understand him. It is not the first time “New School Presbyterians” have had occasion to observe this *peculiar* style of certain men, very mild, and even sometimes evangelical on the *surface*, yet having an *under-current* that is acid and corrosive. When a minister of the gospel gravely, and in a public manner, as the Dr. has done, assails his brethren, attacks their orthodoxy, impugns their honesty, attempts the *odium theologicum*; when he does this, his language deserves to be sifted, its purport well weighed, and its intended use carefully searched. We like such proceedings none the better, because couched in pious phrase; and choose to express ourselves without any of those “disguises” which he thinks to be so congenital among “New School” men.

The *commendation* of Mr. C. is perhaps the least offensive part of the “Introductory Chapter.” Besides this, the author adds very many things upon his own responsibility. Some of these may be fitly characterized, by calling them *revelations of his state of mind*

in regard to "New School Presbyterians." The knowledge of them will aid us in settling the question, with what degree of forbearance, allowance, and charitable construction we ought to contemplate the Dr.'s *modern infirmities*. For this purpose let a few passages be cited:—

After adverting to the design of Mr. C., he informs us that these "differences," in respect to the "New School" side of the same, are not *modern* errors, but substantially "*the ancient heresies* which have been privily brought in, and which have corrupted so large a portion of the Presbyterian communion," that these heresies "are still *artfully* concealed under various *disguises* from the eyes of multitudes of pious persons who, could they be made to see them in their true deformity, would not tarry a night under their shadow."—p. 7. Again, "With a strange yet characteristic inconsistency, they *caricature the doctrines of grace and of the confession of faith as though they embodied all that was inconsistent, perverse, and monstrous.*"—p. 7. Again, "The foundation of the atonement is subverted, the work of the Holy Spirit is despised, and man is *brought to himself*, and to *his own efforts and works* for salvation, rather than to God and to Christ."—p. 10. Again, "As in Germany, France, Switzerland, and England, the formulas of the Reformation are still professed by churches which are either Arminian or Socinian, and have long been known to be such; so the Westminster confession is still retained by those who *reject its distinctive features and doctrines*. There are two reasons for this: the one is, error does not appear well in the consecutive order of a confession of faith; it does not bear exposure, and so shrinks from the light. The other is found in the *advantages gained by assailing truth under the shelter of an orthodox creed.*"—p. 11.

There is much more of this same kind of matter in the "Introduction;" let this, however, suffice on the score of *revelations*. We hardly know in what way to make a comment upon such language. Without at all touching the question of the Dr.'s *moral veracity*, we say in respect to its *objective* truth, that greater *untruths* were never published. Will the reader carefully examine the passages? The attack is made upon the orthodoxy not only, but also the honesty and sincerity of "New School Presbyterians;" yea, it even seriously implicates their Christian character. He charges them with artful "disguises;" understands perfectly the *baseness* of their motives; is acquainted with their *perjury*, and its wicked reasons, when they adopt and continue *nominally* to retain the confession of faith. Theirs, according to him, is the horrid deed of caricaturing the precious "doctrines of grace," despising "the work of the Holy Spirit," and sending a sinner to "his own efforts," rather than to Christ, for salvation. They are, in fact, no church of the living God, except in the

name. They do not believe their own standards; they *profess* this faith, only that they may more effectually deceive the pious public, and secure "the advantages gained by assaulting truth under the shelter of an orthodox creed." In the ear of earth and heaven, Dr. Lord proclaims these allegations—these *subjective* phenomena of *himself*. The moral question of *evil-speaking* we shall leave his conscience and the judgment-day to settle; we simply say, that he has uttered these *calumnies*, without the slightest effort to prove their truth. Though bitter, they are very *harmless* words. The speaker has once upon his oath of office and character disaffirmed them all. They much more surprise than grieve us.

We are well aware, that the Dr. may say that all these charges are supported, because the "New School" do not explain every word, phrase, and sentence of the Confession of Faith, according to *his* ideas; because they do not adopt his philology and philosophy as part of the word of God. When he will give us suitable proofs of his *inspiration*, or his infallibility as a philosopher or a philologist, then we shall be prepared to take things upon his authority, asking no questions. When he will show his right to speak *ex cathedra*, in expounding the standards, we shall try to pay all due respect to the same. Is it necessary to be in *exact* conformity to him, in order *not* to be justly the subject of his accusations? Has not the General Assembly, the final judge of the standards, in more than one instance, decreed judgment against the Dr.'s *present* self, his *former* self once aiding in that decree? Is it indispensable to an honest subscription to the standards, that we take the *ipse dixit* of Dr. Lord for their import? Alas! which of his *ipse dixits* must we adopt? History informs us that he has uttered more than one. Must we assume, in the outset, that his version of the Westminster confession is the Westminster confession; or be justly obnoxious to the charges of heresy and dishonesty? If we will not adopt the Dr. as our exegetical oracle, will he indicate his displeasure by resorting to the old game of a hue and cry? To illumine his perceptions on this subject, we propose to make a brief extract from the Biblical Repertory, an authority he will not call in question.

Speaking of a subscription to the standards, as contended for by some, who "are disposed to interpret it so strictly as to make it not only involve the adoption of all the doctrines contained in the confession, but to preclude *all diversity* in the manner of receiving and *explaining* them;" the authority thus proceeds: "They are, therefore, disposed to regard those who do not in *this* sense adopt the Confession of Faith, and yet remain in the church, as guilty of a departure from moral honesty. This, we think, an extreme and a mischievous one. Because it tends to the impeachment of the character of many *upright* men, and because its application would split the church into innumerable fragments." "It

is making the terms of subscription imply more than they literally import. Two men may, with equal sincerity, profess to believe a doctrine, or system of doctrines, and yet differ in the mode of understanding and explaining them. Such a degree of uniformity never was exacted, and never has existed. The Confession, as framed by the Westminster divines, was an acknowledged compromise between two classes of theologians. When adopted by the Presbyterian church in this country, it was with the distinct understanding that the mode of subscription did not imply strict uniformity of views. And from that time to this, there has been an open and avowed diversity of opinion, on many points among those who adopted the Confession of Faith, without leading to the suspicion of insincerity or dishonesty. It is clearly impossible that any considerable number of men can be brought to conform so *exactly* in their views, as to be able to adopt such an extended formula of doctrine *precisely in the same sense.*" From the same high authority we learn, that there is a distinction to be made between the *leading* or *essential*, and the merely *explanatory* parts of a confession. "There are, with regard to every doctrine, certain *constituent*, formal ideas, which enter into its very nature, and the rejection of which is the rejection of the doctrine; and there are certain others which are merely *accessory*, or *explanatory*," that is to say, the *human philosophy* pertaining to the doctrine, in regard to which a subscription does not "imply strict uniformity of views." It may serve further to elucidate this subject to the Dr.'s perceptions, if we refer him to what President Davies says of the *practice* in his day. "We allowed the candidate to maintain his objections against any part of the confession, and the judicatures judged whether the articles objected to were *essential to Christianity*; and if they judged they were *not*, they would admit the candidate, notwithstanding his objections." A farther elucidation of this subject may be drawn from what is historically known as the "Adopting Act," of the synod of Philadelphia, in 1729. "And we do, also, agree that the Presbyters shall take care not to admit any candidate but what declares his agreement in opinion with *all the essential and necessary* articles of said confession. And in case any minister or candidate shall have any scruples with regard to any article of said confession or catechisms, he shall declare his sentiments to the Presbytery or Synod, who shall, notwithstanding, admit him to the exercise of the ministry within our bounds, if they shall judge his *scruples* or mistakes to be only about articles not *essential* and necessary in doctrine, worship, and government. And the Synod do solemnly agree, that none of us will *traduce, or use any opprobrious terms*,

¹ Bib. Rep., vol. iii., p. 521, 522, 523, cited in Barnes' Defence, p. 130, 131.

² Cited in the Christian Spectator for March, 1835. Article: "Remarks on the Act and Testimony."

towards those who differ from us in those *extra-essential*, and not *necessary* points of doctrine, but treat them with the same friendship, kindness, and brotherly love, as if nothing had happened.”¹ As observed by Dr. Parker, “the collisions” between the “Scotch party” and the “Puritan party,” in the Presbyterian Church, happily subsided by the force of this “Adopting Act;” to be renewed again, however, on the part of the former, leading to a “schism of the Presbyterian church in 1741, and to the formation of the Synod of New York in 1745.” These two Synods were united in 1758, agreeing “to adopt the Confession of Faith, Catechisms, and Directory, as they had been adopted in 1729;” so that, as Mr. Barnes correctly observes, “the act of the Synod” (the “Adopting Act” of 1729) “was the basis of union in 1759; and this proviso has never been withdrawn or repealed; and is, in fact, an essential part of the standards of the Presbyterian Church.”²

We have indulged in this brief digression, not to concede or deny that Dr. Lord is nearer the *true* meaning of the Confession, “as containing the *system* of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures,” than are the “New School Presbyterians.” He *thinks* he is much nearer, no doubt; he evinces a *new* theory on this whole subject, embracing the following assumptions: namely, that he has exactly the *animus imponentis* in subscribing to the standards, and that all who do not adopt them precisely after him as a model, are heretics and insincere, against whom it is lawful for him to launch accusations at his pleasure. Were he to apply his theory to his “Old School” brethren, it is quite likely that “the General Assembly” would need another “dismemberment;” and were he to pursue the work, he might in the end constitute himself into “the Presbyterian church,” *solus in loco*. It is the Dr.’s heresy in regard to the *animus imponentis*, coupled with a little item of self-assumption, that in these modern days has opened his battery. Cure this disease; and his diction will at once be more lovely, while the ideas will not be the less luminous. If we must be in exact conformity to him, though he gives no proof of his inspiration, no evidence of his infallibility, no acts of the General Assembly authenticating his interpretation of the standards; or bear the weight of his accusations; then between two evils, one of which we must suffer, it will be wise to choose the least. If logical gravity will turn the other way, to give the Dr. a full opportunity to have his *say*, then of course mundane particles must take care of themselves, and the “New School” among the rest. If “New School Presbyterians” refused to subscribe to the Confession, then, of course, the Dr. would cite the refusal as proof of heresy. If, on the other hand, they adopt it, then they do so only

¹ Taken from the “History of all the Religious Denominations in the United States.”—p. 612.

² Barnes’ Defence.—p. 125.

in name, and that too on account of "*the advantages gained by assaulting truth under the shelter of an orthodox creed.*" To say that we look with a profound abhorrence upon this part of the Dr.'s performance, is no greater sin than simply to speak the truth.

Here we should be glad to pause, and let the reader exert his fancy for the balance of the "Introductory Chapter," if we could, and do justice to the work we have undertaken. Duty, however, requires us to go on; and we proceed to subjoin to the *revelations* some specimens to which we will apply no severer epithet than that of *mere mistakes*. We design to look at three of these.

The *first* mistake we attribute to the Dr. is that the "New School Presbyterians" are *theologically* the same sort of people as the Romanists of the sixteenth century. He informs us, "that the theological contest between the Reformers and the Romanists in the sixteenth century is the *same* now waged between Old and New School Presbyterians." "The doctrines maintained by all the reformed churches have been *rejected* by them (the "New School," for the *theological tenets of the Papacy*." This is the Dr.'s thesis; and upon his authority we proceed to infer, that "New School Presbyterians" hold to the supremacy of the Pope, the doctrine of apostolic succession, transubstantiation, canonization of the saints, penance, the seven sacraments, the use of images in Christian worship, &c., &c.! All "under various disguises!" A curious secret to be kept secret so long! Let us see how the Dr. makes out this wonderful discovery.

Be not surprised, reader, (let nothing surprise you,) when you learn that "The ability for which Eck and the Romanists contended against the Reformers, is precisely, both in *form and substance*, the same as that insisted upon by the New School divines." —p. 8. To say nothing of the *matter*, observe the beauty of the *formal logic*! The "New School" agree with Eck and the Romanists of the sixteenth century in maintaining "*the ability*;" therefore, the "New School" hold "the theological tenets of the Papacy!" *General principle* :—whoever agrees with another in *one* particular, agrees in all particulars. *Specific example* :—Dr. Lord agrees with Leo X. in having eyes; therefore, Dr. Lord agrees with Leo X. in being the Pope of Rome, or exactly like him. Alas! for the Reformers, the Dr. himself not excepted, when such logic fulminates in their rear! The Dr. has not told what is the nature of this "*the ability*," whether *natural* or *moral*, whether "*the ability*" to be justified by works of self-merit, or to comply with the terms of the gospel, so as to be justified through Jesus Christ, that proves the theological identity of Romanists and "New School Presbyterians." It is "*the ability*!" The "New School" are Romanists; there you have it! Distinctions are very troublesome, where ambiguities will better serve a turn.

¹ Page 8.

¶ To clinch this modern discovery, and make it sure, the author, in the manner of a *rhetorical flourish*, refers to one or two short passages in D'Aubigne's History of the Reformation. Had he consented to give us the volume and the page where said passages could be found, it would have saved us the trouble of looking for them in vain. We presume they are *there*; but we have not succeeded in finding *where*, after some time spent in the search. We ask, why did not the author tell us, in precise and accurate terms, what "*the ability*" was for which the Romanists contended? also, what "*the inability of man*" was which Luther and the Reformers asserted in opposition to the Romanists? This knowledge plainly is indispensable to the proof of the doctrinal identity of the "New School" and the Romanists, even on this single point. Was it a *legal, meritorious* ability? an ability to be justified by self-merit? The Romanists, we know, greatly mutilated the gospel on this point, and the Reformers shed the true light, in teaching the scriptural doctrine of justification by faith in Christ, without creature-merits of any kind or grade. Well, does the Dr. mean to imply, that on this point the "New School" are identified with the Romanists? We hope not, simply for his own credit. He has the most ample means of knowing that such an implication would be grossly false; and for such a blunder the most elastic partiality could hardly consent to hold him innocent. "The substitution of a scheme of merits in place of the grand truth of grace and amnesty" by Jesus Christ, the "New School" repudiate with as much earnestness and honesty as Dr. Lord himself, even in his most orthodox moments. They hold to the absolute "inability of man," touching this vital question, and we challenge him for the shadow of a proof to the contrary.¹

Again, was "*the ability*" in question, *the ability* of free agency? We will not distress the reader's patience with an historical or metaphysical account of the doctrine of free-will, as developed in the contest between the Romanists and the Reformers. We have a more appropriate place for the discussion of this subject. Suffice it to say, that the "New School," with the orthodox divines of New England, and nearly all Presbyterians in all past time, hold to

¹ The Dr. informs us that "New School" men "seem to think the whole gospel is in the dogma of human ability, as though the atonement was a free, full, and sufficient sacrifice, *not in its own nature*, but in the nature and ability of man himself."—p. 11. This *fling* (for it is nothing more,) depends upon the Dr.'s confusion of ideas. "New School" men do not hold, that "human ability," in the strict sense, is any part of the gospel. If it be a reality at all, it is a reality in the *nature* of man; and however perfect or imperfect it may be, it cannot avail for his salvation, for two reasons; first, the fact that he is a sinner; secondly, that no sinner, immaterial what are his powers as a moral agent, can be justified by the works of the law. However strongly "New School" men may hold to *an ability*, in opposition to Dr. Lord, they hold to no ability of *self-justification*, superseding the atonement; they teach no such doctrine.

the reality of the distinction between natural and moral ability and inability.¹ In respect to *natural* ability, they hold with the Confession of Faith, that "God hath endued the will of man with that *natural* ability, that it is neither forced, nor by any absolute necessity of nature, determined to good or evil." In respect to *moral* ability, they hold that "man, by his fall into a state of sin, hath wholly lost all ability of *will* to any spiritual good accompanying salvation; so as a *natural* man, being altogether *averse* from that which is good and dead in sin, is not able, by his own strength, to convert himself, or prepare himself thereto." In behalf of "New School" men, we affirm these two points of faith; since this is their profession, and we have no disposition, without evidence, to impeach their sincerity in that profession. Has the Dr. any objection to this part of the "New School" creed about "*the ability*," in application to free-will? Will this convict them of holding the "theological tenets of the Papacy," in opposition to the Reformers? If so, then even the Dr. himself is a Romanist, or a "New School" man, or a heretic. It is quite immaterial to this issue what were the psychological conceptions of the Romanists and Reformers about "*the ability*," since "New School" men are satisfied with those of the Confession of Faith? Is the Dr. himself also satisfied? When he asks, with a triumphant air, "Who stands with Luther now?" we feel like asking, who stands with the Confession of Faith now? Does he mean to join Dr. Wilson,² and deny what the Confession plainly affirms—namely, the *natural ability* of man, for the sake of being with Luther, and not with the Romanists, as he seems to imagine might be doubtful, unless he took this course? This perhaps is, for the present, sufficient on the score of "New School" Romanism.

Before passing to other mistakes, we cannot forbear to allude to the peculiar grace with which some men, for certain purposes, are in the habit of referring to the *Reformers*. The Reformers said so and so! namely, all infallibility is in the *past*, and all fallibility in the *present*! We yield to no one in a reasonable respect for those noble and holy men; but we have no sympathy with stupid rhapsodies over any form of uninspired humanity. We remember that they were but *men*, just emerging from the darkness of *Papacy*, liable to err; and that in many things they did err. We suppose no one but an insane *traditionalist* is ready to shut his eyes and adopt all the opinions of the Reformers, without thought, investigation, selection, or discrimination. This *cant* about antiquity is neither scholar-like nor Christian-like; it is rather the *small* ammunition of *small* minds, or great minds *doing* small

¹ We assume that the reader is familiar with the *nature* of this distinction; and will attend to the question of its *truth* hereafter.

² Chap. ix., sec. 1.

³ Beecher's Views in Theology.—p. 17.

things. For want of space to do more than simply allude to this subject, we commend to the reader some very valuable observations by the author of "The Triangle."—p. 56-79.

A *second* mistake, worthy of notice, relates to the act of excision in 1837, and the division in 1838. In a very dolorous strain, he informs us, "that the principles for which *the* General Assembly contend, and in the defence of which they intended to bear their testimony in the excision act of 1837, are the same maintained by Paul, the apostle, against the gainsayers of his day, the same afterward defended by Augustine against Pelagius, and the same which were revived by Luther, and with which, as with a battle-axe, he smote the gates of the great apostacy;" and farther, that could "that large and respectable body of members of the Presbyterian Church, who, though sound in the faith, yet remain in the New School connexion," be made to see this, "they would not, and could not give support and countenance, aid and comfort, to the enemies of the truth by remaining an hour within the ecclesiastical walls of the New School General Assembly."—p. 7, 8. Again: "Here was the cause of the division in the Presbyterian Church." "The act of the General Assembly" "was believed to be necessary to a suitable defence of the faith once delivered to the saints." "It was upon *doctrinal* questions, deemed fundamental, that the Presbyterian church consented to the dismemberment of nearly one half her entire connexion."—p. 9. The *accusatory* strain of these observations, though justly obnoxious to the most scorching criticism, we shall pass without comment. The subject is confessedly a very large one, having many items; and, for the purpose of saving time, we propose to let the Rev. John C. Lord of 1837 manage the cause with Dr. Lord of 1848.

Will the reader refresh his recollections in regard to that report, unanimously adopted January 31st, 1837, by the Presbytery of Buffalo, forgetting not that the Rev. John C. Lord was *chairman* of the committee making said report, and therefore, by a

¹ The last sentence is a rare instance of the Dr.'s accuracy in making statements. If by "the dismemberment," he means the *excision*, then it was nothing like "one-half her entire connexion;" it was *only* 4 Synods, about 500 ministers, 600 churches, and 60,000 communicants! If he mean the *division* in 1838, then whom does he mean by the Presbyterian Church. If the "Old School" party, when was it that "*the* Presbyterian church consented," &c. ? The truth is, "*the* Presbyterian church" were satisfied with excising in 1837 four Synods, as this would ever afterwards secure a majority on one side; whereas, if all this was founded "upon *doctrinal* questions deemed fundamental," a number of *other* Synods and Presbyteries ought to have fallen by the same blow, with the proviso that any *orthodox* members would be welcomed back again. How is this ? Was the consent to "dismemberment" a plan first to secure a permanent majority in the General Assembly, and then afterwards to sift out "New School" men by the process of discipline ? This is a strange way to settle "*doctrinal* questions." The sentence is justly liable to exceptions upon any construction of which it is susceptible.

fair presumption, its *writer* ! Among other things, he, acting with others, did solemnly publish and declare the following:—namely, “nor do we believe that the *controversies* which have arisen in our church, have resulted from a *difference in doctrinal belief* ; but, in our opinion, they have arisen partly from a diversity of views in relation to the policy to be pursued by the benevolent operations of the day, and partly from *the love of power and the disposition to dictate*, which, we are constrained to believe, has been manifested for many years by a *portion* of the Presbyterian Church ;” also that there is no truth “in the complaints of the *spread of false doctrines* ;” also that “the great doctrines of grace, as held by Edwards, and Bellamy, and Dwight, are *uniformly received* ;” also that “*we should be found false witnesses for God, were we to bear a different testimony.*”¹

These two classes of perceptions, in such palpable contradiction of each other, suggest the Latin adage:—*Tempora mutantur, et nos in illis mutamur*. We feel, though for a different reason, somewhat as did Cicero, when opening his first oration against Cataline:—“*Quousque tandem abutere, Catalina, patientia nostra?*” When Dr. Lord of 1848 shall satisfactorily explain the conduct of the Rev. John C. Lord of 1837, we shall be ready to call additional witnesses to settle the question at issue: until which period we claim the privilege of looking on very quietly, not seeing the Romanism, the perversion of these “principles,” &c., which he *now* thinks he saw, though *when* he saw he thought otherwise. He is an admirable witness against himself. To those who place any confidence in his modern testimony, we commend his testimony in 1837 ; we do this with the more assurance, since in 1837 he was an eye-witness, and had as yet undergone no *metamorphoses*.

To reply to what the Dr. *now* says of the causes of the excision and division, would be to write a volume. It is a plain fact of history, that the excision was concocted in an extra-constitutional convention ; and that one of the chief leaders of this measure did on the floor of the General Assembly urge its adoption upon the ground, that it was necessary to secure an “Old School” majority in future Assemblies. As to the division, it is also historically true, that its ground, so far as the “New School” had any participation in the act, was the refusal of the officers of the previous Assembly constitutionally to organize the body, by admitting to their seats all the commissioners ; but for which refusal there would have been no division by their action. The Dr. calls this division “a dismemberment ;” according to the diction of Mr. C. it is “*that secession*”—“a new organization.” It were well if these brethren were a little more *modest* upon this tender point. Have they forgotten, that *the only tribunal where this subject was ever tried*

¹ Wisner's Review.—p. 12.

upon its naked merits, decided that the act of the "New School" was no "secession," or "division," but a *constitutional organization of the General Assembly*? Have they forgotten, that though the court in Banc did grant a motion for a new trial, yet, in the case of the Presbyterian Church of York, Pennsylvania, this same court, by the lips of its Chief Justice, did refer to its previous action in the following *explanatory* manner: "It was not because the minority were thought to be anything else than Presbyterians, but because a popular body is known only by its government, or head.

* * * * Indeed, the measure (the excising violence), would seem to have been as decisively *revolutionary*, as would be an exclusion of particular states from the Federal Union, for the adoption of an *anti-republican* form of government. * * * That the Old School party acceded to the privileges and property of the Assembly, was not because it was more Presbyterian than the other, but because it was stronger; for had it been the weaker, it would have been the party excluded." Have they forgotten that after the order for a new trial, several suits were instituted by "Old School" minorities in "New School" churches, with a view to take the church property by force of law; and that every one of these was decided in favor of the "New School?" The above are matters of fact: and when Mr. C. shall have leisure to read page 209 of his work, we commend to him the consideration of these facts. "Here," (that is in the Papacy of the "New School"), says the Dr. "was the cause of the division in the Presbyterian Church." No: say history and truth; this cause was the excision (pronounced "revolutionary," by Chief Justice Gibson), with other measures as unconstitutional as itself. "On the one side," (the "New School") says Dr. Lord, "were numbers, wealth, and power, on the other, the truth," but not "numbers, wealth, and power," to make the contrast symmetrical. If so, then, according to Chief Justice Gibson, the "New School" would be "*the General Assembly*." It is very true that "the controversies" led to the excision; but we have the authority of the Rev. John C. Lord for referring to "*the love of power, and the disposition to dictate*," in explanation of those controversies, a theory not unsuitable to the painful and mournful facts of the past. We should be very glad to omit any reference to these things; and would do so, if the Dr. did not compel the reference by the grossness of his mistakes. His *modern* theory of "the division," is not only not his *former* theory, but it lacks the essential element of truth. It is *unfortunate* that the Dr. should have been the man to write the "Introduction." This work might have been committed to one in less embarrassed circumstances.

We proceed to charge him with a *third* mistake. "Yet with some reservations, evasions, and apologies, the New York Evan-

¹ History of all the Religious Denominations in the United States.—p. 622.

gelist, *the organ of the New School Presbyterians*, (!!) substantially vindicates this denial of "the faith once delivered to the saints," and caricatures, after the manner of the Romish divines, the very doctrines which are plainly taught in the Confession of Faith, which every Presbyterian minister subscribes at his ordination."—p. 13, 14.

In the trial of a cause, entitled "Dr. Lord *versus* the New York Evangelist," we have no disposition to meddle with the one or the other. What the plaintiff says, the defendant may take as he pleases, and treat as he likes, having evinced a sufficient degree of editorial ability not to be in any special need of foreign help. We desire, however, to say in his behalf, one thing; namely, of whatever offences he may be guilty, he is not guilty of being the editor of "*the organ of the New School Presbyterians*." He speaks not upon their, but upon his own authority. The simple and plain truth, without any poetry, is, that they have no "organ," and never have had, unless it be the Confession of Faith. They do not own the value of a dollar in the New York Evangelist, or control a paragraph, any more than the Congregationalists of New England. They have never made it *their* "organ" by any act. It does not speak by their authority, or responsibly represent them. If, therefore, the Dr. in his *weekly* reading of this paper shall find anything wrong, we hope he will settle the account with the editor, and leave the "New School Presbyterians" to answer for themselves. We do not like such a *fruitful fancy* in the grave matters of orthodoxy and honesty. We would not notice this, if it were not the way in which some men throw out *hints*, intending that they shall answer as a substitute for facts.

Having noted three of the Dr.'s mistakes, we now propose to look at his *anecdote* about Massachusetts, Andover, &c., and having done this, we shall bid the "Introduction" farewell. We will give the anecdote to the reader just as the Dr. gives it to the public. It is an extract from the Presbyterian. As it appears in the Introduction, it seems that *somebody*, without a name, whether a minister or not, or even a Christian, is not said—only *somebody*, no less a personality than one certain "Me," happened to witness, *somewhere* in Massachusetts, the examination of a candidate for the ministry, by a certain "council," also without a name; in which were developed "views of theology," "generally understood to be the same as now taught at Andover." This Mr. "Me" narrates these "views," as he "understood" them, with his comments; namely, he gives his *impressions*, not the questions of the council, or the answers of the candidate; he submits "this bold denial of the faith," not, as he affirms, "without note or comment," for the whole story is nothing but note and comment. The Dr. *picks up* this newspaper rumor with avidity, and introduces it to the pub-

lic with the following *premonitory* symptom: "But that all may see that we are dealing with realities, and speaking of things not of a former age, or among another generation, the following account of a recent examination of a candidate in theology is extracted from the Presbyterian;" and then closes with an expression of horror: "The Romish doctors who resisted Luther, never departed so far from the truth. The theology of the Council of Trent is hardly so corrupt, or so barefaced a denial of the doctrines of the gospel."—p. 12, 13.

How shall his case be met!! Suppose it to have been much worse than it was, according to the impressions of this *unknown observer*; we would respectfully ask what has all this to do with heresy among "New School Presbyterians?" Where are we in this nineteenth century, when men are themselves not only, but almost everybody else, if they happen to be "New School" men? We might dismiss this anecdote by simply saying, that it is about the *weakest*, though not the *worst*, item in this notable "Introduction." We feel, however, inclined to suggest, for the consideration of impartial men, the equity of picking up a *hear-say* story, that has not even the name of a responsible author, and *blazoning* it abroad as a *specimen* fact. We apprehend that the "new professor of theology at Andover," the council and the candidate, would much prefer to state their own opinions, and be judged by them. It is no wonder that a man who takes this course, can see heresy; the wonder is that he can see anything else. The Dr. does not seem to dream that the views may have been discolored, and even caricatured by the *medium* through which they came. If he wants such proofs that Andover is unsound, and "the new professor" worse than the "Romish doctors," we can put him in the way of getting them to almost any extent; yet we will not pledge him the public confidence in the use of them.¹ We would suggest, also,

¹ In the "Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review," for Oct., 1848.—p. 619, the reader will find some very appropriate comments, touching the very point, in reference to which we think Dr. Lord not free from a just censure. The comments appear in an editorial notice of two sermons, entitled, "The Fathers and their Children," preached by the Rev. W. W. Eells, of Newburyport. "In a prefatory note," the author of the Sermons observes, in regard to the doctrinal defections of orthodox Congregationalists in New England, "the doctrinal defections set forth have been taken from the notes of lectures delivered by a most popular professor of theology." Upon this mode of gaining "evidence," the Biblical Repertory remarks, "We must express our disapprobation of any such method of attaining evidence. No man should be held responsible for the notes of a hearer. Every teacher knows that he is liable to be misapprehended even from notes literally correct. Much depends on the connexion, and much on the explanations given at the moment. It is, however, not merely on account of a liability to error that we object to this method, but we regard it as unfair to the lecturer." It is a striking coincidence, that the correspondent who furnished for the columns of the Presbyterian the story about "Theology in Massachusetts," over the initials "W. W. F.," and who was subsequently

that this terrible fire against "New School Presbyterians," by no very equivocal signs applies equally to the orthodox Congregationalists of New England. They come in for a share in the *therapeutic* efficacy of this modern western panacea.

Had we the time, it would be an interesting work to draw up a schedule of the Dr.'s ideas of orthodoxy, by taking the opposite of the "views" stated in this anecdote, and by him pronounced to be heresy. This would be too long a work. Take a specimen or two of the heresy. "The law of God will stand forever a broken law, having never received the obedience which it demands, nor the penalty which it denounces against the transgressor." This said the candidate, as saith the reporter. Is it heresy to affirm that when a man has broken God's law, *he has broken God's law*, and that this fact will forever remain a fact; and that if he is pardoned he will not be punished? Then common sense is heresy. Give us the chapter in the Bible, or the Confession of Faith, to prove the heresy of such an affirmation. Again, "sin was defined to be actual transgression exclusively," though the candidate held to "original sin," in the sense of "a disordered state," "a *bias*" to sin. Not to discuss this matter in the present connection, we will submit to the Dr. an "Old School" definition of sin. "This is what we mean by sin. I know of *no other sin* in the empire of Jehovah except this. When we say that men are *sinner*s, we *mean* to say, they are the *doers and perpetrators* of this foul deed.¹ This is one of the points in the candidate's "barefaced" denial of the truth; and in the "dissertation" of Dr. Spring it is presented more strongly, than by the candidate himself, according to the reporter's impressions. Is Dr. Spring also a heretic? We will not follow this analysis; we only wish to show what *might* be done, if this were the place for it. It is really a logical misfortune that the Dr.'s eye met this anecdote. It makes up nearly one-fourth of the whole "Introduction." But we are done with this "Introduction;" the reader may now take it, and form his own opinions, dissenting or agreeing with the thoughts of the reviewer, as shall best suit his sense of truth.

announced as the Rev. W. W. Eells, of Newburyport, is the identical man, whose second performance of a similar character is the ground of the preceding rebuke. We would respectfully commend the language of this rebuke to the attention of Dr. Lord.

¹ Dissertation on Native Depravity by Gardiner Spring, D.D. New York, p. 9. In this "Dissertation," Dr. Spring holds, that all sin is resolvable into the *actions* of moral agents; that there is "no other sin in the empire of Jehovah except this," differing from Drs. Hopkins, Emmons, Dwight, Woods, Professor Stuart, &c., in maintaining that infants *act sinfully* from the *first moment after their birth*—agreeing with the New Haven divines as to the *nature* of sin, but asserting a proposition as to the *period of its commencement*, which they neither affirm nor deny; also rejecting the doctrine of *original sin*, as held by a *certain class* of Calvinists. We commend this "Dissertation" to Dr. Lord and Mr. C., as a very good theme for another book on "Differences."

IV. The next field upon which we purpose to enter, is the *QUO ANIMO* of this entire performance. This will be sufficiently ascertained by attentively studying the first, the ninth, and tenth chapters. That the reader may have a fair opportunity to judge for himself, and not trust to the impressions of the reviewer, we will submit these chapters in the form of an abridgement, adding some exegetical remarks to make the text more lucid.

Chapter I.—Assuring us, that “the divisions” between “Old and New School Presbyterians,” are very properly the occasion of painful “emotions,” the author concludes, that “whatever can be done to *unite in one body* those who are already united in their views of Church government, and of doctrinal and experimental religion, ought to be done by the friends of Zion.” Passing from this very liberal posture, he explains the nature of the excision in 1837; where we learn that though supposed to involve the excision of “four synods,” still, “it really separated no single Presbyterian minister or church from the General Assembly.” The “secession,” as he terms the constitutional Assembly of 1838, “cannot be believed to have” resulted from “the act of 1837.” Commenting upon this “new organization,” with other incidental matters, he hastens to give us a pretty bold *hint* of what we shall hear more in due season. “What great and good end has been attained by these various novelties in Presbyterianism? and what can we expect to gain by that other proposed novelty, an *independent* Synod in *western* New York? If brethren are dissatisfied with their present connection with the synod of *Genesee*, why do they not at once unite with the synod of Buffalo?” Accompanying this inquiry with a little of his peculiar logic, he then tells the “brethren,” that they will never “join *us* in a body.” “If they ever resume their connection with *our* church, they will do it as others have done it; they will do it as individuals and as churches.” “If they wait until the *Rochester Presbytery*, or any other Presbytery in the Synod of Genesee, shall, as a *body*, correct its errors, abandon its Pelagianism, and resume its connection with *the* General Assembly, they *may* wait till their cold remains and mine shall moulder underneath the clods of the valley.” Diverging for a running comment on “organizations,” “excision,” “secession,” “truth,” and “error,” the state of things once in “Judea,” “the Church of Rome,” “the council of Constance,” the respective policies of “Whitfield” and “Wesley,” *et cetera*; he returns to his task. “Those Presbyterians, who *remain* in the *New School* organization to reform it, or who unite with it from *our* body for that purpose, are worse than dead to *us*, and to the cause of reform.” Arguing this thesis from the history of the past, and “the impropriety of the course itself,” he observes, “no enlightened friend of *our* church can pursue it long, with an *honest* design to benefit *our* cause; which thought he enforces by adding, that “he places

himself at once in opposition to it (our cause) by his *position*, his *efforts* and his *influence*. Disposing of the first two reasons, he comes to the *third*, the one of "influence." "Those also who are in an *unsound* connection by this influence will remain there from the same cause, and their *names*, their *property*, and their *offspring*, will be lost to *our* church. In a few more years, the present incumbents of these (western) pulpits will be no more; and however useful they may have been in their personal ministry, they cannot control the succession. That is in other hands, and will be much more likely to take its complexion from the living than from the dead; from the body in which they have left their churches than from the *pastor's* remembered wishes." Having thus exploded the insane policy of "these brethren," whether laical or clerical, who remain in the "New School" connection, and do not "at once unite with the synod of Buffalo," he is prepared to blow the trumpet of war. He declares, that "the churches" are deceived, having in Western New York heard but "one side of the question;" that they do not know where they are, *ecclesiastically*, thinking themselves to be in the Presbyterian Church, when they are not, but in "a new organization," and that did they know this, "there are many *decided* Presbyterians who would not long remain where they are, but would avail themselves of the earliest favorable opportunity of carrying out the provisions of the act of 1837, and would resume their connection with *our* church." He then presents a fearful object: namely, "men (ministers we suppose), who tremble in their places lest the truth should be known on this subject;" and having lectured them for suppressing "inquiry," and deceiving these "decided Presbyterians" by "scandalous imputations," and "false issues," himself disclaiming the use of all "such weapons," he bringeth his first lesson to a close.

To say nothing of mistakes in regard to facts, false reasonings, and "scandalous imputations" against "New School Presbyterians," we feel inclined to ask the reader this simple question;—*What do you think Mr. C. very much wishes to accomplish, if he can?* Is it not apparent, that his eye is turned especially towards *Western* New York; that in this region there is a Synod called "the Synod of Buffalo," "Old School," by an unquestionable presumption; that in Mr. C.'s opinion there are ministers, churches, and private Christians, who, though connected with the Synod of Genesee, might perhaps be persuaded to join the Synod of Buffalo? Unless Mr. C., endorsed by Dr. Lord, has become a strange dreamer, the affirmative of these questions must be true? All this may be very simple to *Western* Presbyterians. What then is the burden of this song about "Pelagianism" and other heresies of the Presbytery of Rochester and the other "New School" Presbyteries? In plain speech, proceeding solely upon the authority of

Mr. C., we would express our conceptions in the following paraphrase:—

Gentlemen;—"decided Presbyterians" that you are—members of the Synod of Genesee, or of churches under its care; you are not where you ought to be, since said Synod is neither Presbyterian, nor orthodox, but connected with a "new organization," and that, too, heretical. If you stay where you are, then your *names*, your *property*, and your *offspring* will not accrue to the benefit of our cause. The Synod of *Buffalo*, though a modern growth, yet, being connected with THE Assembly, and, therefore, presumptively and by *our* authority orthodox, is your proper home. Being dissatisfied with the heretical and Pelagian Synod of Genesee, why do you not at once unite with the Synod of Buffalo, especially since the former did not rebuke their Moderator for preaching in his Synodical Sermon, the awful heresy, *that Christ did not suffer the penalty of the law?* You have been told, that the act of 1837 put you *out* of the Presbyterian Church; but this is a mistake: you are not *out*, but *in*; and that you are *in*, you can easily prove by *coming in*; namely, by resuming your connection with THE General Assembly; namely, by at once uniting with the Synod of *Buffalo*, not waiting to come as a body, but being contented to come as individuals and churches. In this way you will control the *succession*. It is very important that *we*—namely *you* and *ourselves*—not differing in doctrine, should be united in one body. Come, and you shall have *our* confidence; otherwise you shall not.

What of all this? says the reader. *Nothing—just nothing, in one sense.* If the author wants these "decided Presbyterians," and they want him or his "cause," we have not the least objection to their mutual gratification in the use of fair means. We have no zeal for "our cause" that would be offended, if there were *forty* Synods of Buffalo, and as many Mr. Cheesemans, provided they would attend to their legitimate work. We could rejoice in their prosperity, with not the slightest pleasure in their adversity, if they were founded upon Christ. But, should they assail us as a means to a *sectarian end*—should they write a book bearing this mark as plainly as it did a title page—should *third* persons choose to commend this lovely performance; then, peradventure, we might deem a reply appropriate, and in that reply some exposure of the *quo animo* not out of place. This will help all candid and honest men, not excepting these "decided Presbyterians," to judge a righteous judgment in the premises. "New School Presbyterians" have been made the objects of a certain kind of *slang* from certain sources, quite long enough to establish a good reputation for *patience*. Some of their accusers have been far more famous for preaching against *heresy*, than for preaching the *truth*; for *alarming* the churches, than for *winning* souls to

Christ ; for making a *noise*, than for exerting a *sanctifying* power in the community. The *spirit* of these accusations is not an immaterial matter, though we shall not forget in due season to notice the sublimated pseudo-orthodoxy of their authors.

Chapter IX. Having waded through seven chapters on "Doctrinal Differences," the author at length reaches the "Basis of Union among Presbyterians," which is the theme of Chapter IX., containing the following index of matter—"What it is—The New School have departed from it—A return necessary to union." With some diffusiveness of thought and irregularity of logical gait, extending from page 204 to nearly the bottom of page 208, we are brought to the conclusion, that the Confession of Faith is the "Basis of Union among Presbyterians;" and that an *honest* subscription to the same is the duty of every one who professes to adopt it. All we have to say upon this work is, that it is labor *lost*. No one denies either proposition. If the author's logic was meant to imply any doubt on these points, in respect to the "New School" brethren ; then as we did not need the logic, so we cannot thank him for the unjustifiable and false insinuation. Gravely to prove for the hearing of third persons what an opponent does not deny, is a very mean subterfuge. It is manufacturing a man of *straw* for the sake of shooting him, that somebody may hear the thunder of arms.

We admit the author's basis, and claim it for our own, and wish also to ask, Why he could not, in a scholar-like and Christian manner, state it, without on pp. 206, 207 mingling with that statement a gross caricature of "New School Presbyterians?" Whether the "Old School" will take his exposition of their faith, we shall leave them to decide ; but his picture of the "New School," if not untrue in *all* respects, is yet untrue in so *many*, that it is a *slander*. We do not choose to have Mr. C. state our faith ; if he does it, he must do it in *our* words, and not his own. We ask again, Why he could not give the "Basis" without the following *contemptible* aspersion. "If the New School *desire* a union with us, *they ought first to retract their errors, and make an honest subscription to our standards?*" p. 207. Very spicy seasoning to relieve the insipidity of an argument about union! Has it come to this, that there is no *decency* among professedly Christian men, even though they are writing for *sectarian* purposes? We let this pass, knowing as we do *where* it came from.

Having found the "Basis," the author seems to have picked up a *stray* thought (we wonder it did not occur to him in the first chapter); namely, that perhaps "these brethren," these "decided Presbyterians," may have a little *prejudice* against at once uniting with the Synod of *Buffalo* on account of the unceremonious manner of their excision in 1837. The memory of this event may not make them as hopeful subjects as could be desired. This

cause, according to Mr. Wisner, liked to have lost to the "Old School" the services of Dr. Lord himself, and carried him, *toto corpore*, into the Dutch Reformed Church.¹ Here is a difficulty, a real one; it must be met; Mr. C. is equal to the task. "To approve or condemn it (the excision) is not, with us, an article of faith, or a condition of union. We do not believe in the infallibility of Ecumenical Councils, or of General Assemblies," &c. "But whether our views on this subject (the excision) are correct or not, can be but of *small moment*," since "each one has but to comply with the order and direction of the Assembly, and avail himself of the provisions made for him in the act itself, by uniting with the nearest contiguous presbytery, and *every difficulty is overcome*." This special pleading takes counsel from the late war with Mexico, and cautions patriotic feeling not to be treasonable, though it condemn the war. These "decided Presbyterians" must do likewise; namely, so far as Mr. C. is concerned; think what you please about the excision; we shall not be particular upon this point, if you will only come to the "benefit" of "our cause."

Thus, we understand the allusion to, and argument upon the excising act. For what other logical purpose he could bring it into this connection, than to prepare a plausible *cataplasm* to soften the rigidity of some Western prejudices, we are not able to see. A man's logic sometimes shows his heart. Whether the remedy will be equal to the disease, we cannot tell; yet, as a gentle modifier of its action, we commend to these "decided Presbyterians" the other doctrine of Mr. C., namely that a man should seek to occupy such an ecclesiastical position, as will most faithfully express his views; leaving them to decide whether the excision be a suitable case for the application of this rule.

The reader will be patient, for we are coming to the point; all this is to get the door open, to get the difficulties out of the way. The door is open—"already thrown open as wide as it ought, and as wide as it can be." Mr. C. having by much labor found the "Basis," and having vanquished the western prejudice by kindly consenting to accommodate it, is ready to carry all before him. He lets off a whole *broadside*, going on nearly to the end of the chapter, against the "New School Presbyterians." They have done almost everything that is bad; made "breaches;" "entered the bosom of our peaceful family, and bred heresy, strife, and debate in it;" "*trodden in the dust the rose of Sharon, and the lily of the valley*;" "broken down our [hedges, *led away our children, and decoyed our people*;" they have done evil;" "they have departed;" have gone out from us; they are "the aggressors," "their suit at law" "originated wholly with themselves," and in it they were not "brotherly or peaceable;" "their cause is wanting in integrity;" let them repent; "to make reparation

¹ Wisner's Review, pp. 20, 21.

belongs to them," &c., &c. Read page 209, and onward, for a declaration of grievances; and if you have tears to shed, prepare to shed them now.

But, be calm; let us ask, What does all this mean, as part of a chapter upon the "Basis of Union among Presbyterians," and after such cautious preparation for a thorough cannonading? We have been watching this *manouvre*, and trying to catch the *animus* of this *portentous whine*, and being somewhat collected, have perceived, as we think, the order of battle. Mr. C. now proposes to *scare out* these "decided Presbyterians," by telling them once more among what an *awful* people they are ecclesiastically living. Of course, they can no longer maintain a union with such a people; neither need they do so, for Mr. C. is before them with the "Basis" in one hand, and the compromise of prejudice in the other, and *the Synod of Buffalo is not far off*; the whole "difficulty is overcome." There never was a clearer case! For fear, however, they may not come, he sweeps down "Drs. Cox, Beman, Beecher, Duffield, and Mr. Barnes;" and when these *chieftains*, some of them *venerable*, are no more, then a regular enfilading fire scatters dismay and death among the "New School" Presbyterians; opening wide their agitated columns; all for the benefit of these "*decided* Presbyterians!" Surely now they can get out, and they *will* get out. They have the combined advantages of concussion and light. Being themselves "sound in the faith," though by a mistake caught in a "new organization," and, withal, not upon the "Basis," as they had supposed, they will at once take up their departure. They stay there! Not they, until the will ceases to be determined by the greatest apparent good. This mighty war of words is not a converting benediction to win these "New School" heretics, though, peradventure, they would all be orthodox if they would only come. These "decided Presbyterians" are the men whom the author, by his own showing, wishes to help into the Synod of Buffalo. If they can once be separated from the "New School," and then taught to avoid the foolish novelty of "an *independent* Synod in Western New York," the way will be clear for them to "resume their connection with *our* church." And as to the "New School" themselves, if they "desire a union with us," the plan is very simple; they must "retract their errors, and make an honest subscription to our standards." Mr. C. surely has one merit; *he tells us very plainly what he wants*—for what he wrote his book; giving us the opportunity to take this knowledge into the account for the benefit of all parties, *himself not excepted*. We ask those who have commended his labors in somewhat flattering terms, whether they have read Chap. IX., and if so, whether they really mean to make themselves parties to the slanders of his pen?

Chapter X.—This is a "*Plea* for union among Presbyterians'

—the next thing in the order of nature to a “Basis of Union.” The preliminary matter goes back to first principles; and is designed to illustrate two propositions; namely, “A union desirable—Division among Christians an evil.” We shall not burden this paper with all the *sundries* of this argument; for we have no special objections to urge, at least, in the present connection. The author finally reaches “the grand remedy” for divisions, which is “to elevate among *ourselves* the standard of orthodoxy and piety.” Having become somewhat familiar with his *ecclesiastical pathology*, we at once supposed this idea was to be turned to a special purpose, and by reading on found that the conjecture was not far from the truth. Let us then listen to the “Plea for union among *Presbyterians*.”

To the first thought, as an abstract thesis, we are disposed to say, amen. It is the general principle, that when practicable and not prevented by higher considerations (conditions omitted by the author) “every minister and every communicant ought to express truthfully their respective (we suppose he means *peculiar*) views, by their position in the visible church.” For the application of this thought, he observes—“No man can, without a change in his sentiments, be an Old School Presbyterian in one end of the State, and a New School Presbyterian in the other, and be an honest man.” Many circumstances may make it *expedient* for a man who has been connected with an “Old School” church in one end of the State, to be connected with a “New School” church in the other, and *vice versa*; and we would not in all cases declare such a transition to be a breach of honesty. The fact is, *theologically* considered, there are a great many “Old School” men in the “New School” connection, and perhaps as many “New School” men in the “Old School” connection. They are passing and re-passing from the one to the other. We will not, as does the author, assume the responsibility of a *condemnatory* judgment in all these cases; nevertheless, we ask no favors for those who make the transition merely as a matter of selfish policy, who are “in the market to be bought for a piece of bread.” They are a class of men with whom we have no sympathy, and for whom no respect—a *genus* of humanity, whose principles do not bear transportation. It becomes the author, however, to speak very *modestly* of such men, lest he may be justly involved in the same condemnation; for, as saith the Biblical Repertory, he “was once a zealous New School and New Measure man;” and has, therefore, once, *at least*, turned his coat. A man who had never been guilty of the transition, might, perhaps, have cleaner hands, and speak of “these pliable consciences” with more authority.

Having proposed the above thesis for the hearing of these “decided Presbyterians,” Mr. C. is now ready to give them a hint in very general terms, with a very pithy reference to a *local* allusion.

"Those Old School Men who come into places where the New School have the *majority*, in wealth and influence, and unite with them on that account, must expect to lose *cast* with their former brethren : if they claim that they have changed their friends only, and not their sentiments, they publish their own shame." After more of the like, excepting that some of it is a little more *pathetic*, especially the reference to "their *suffering* brethren" (a sad thing to be an "Old School" man living where the "New School" have the majority !!), he observes—"it is a blessing to any denomination, to be quit of all such unstable, not to say unprincipled adherents." So far the "Plea" is a mixture of pathos, indignation, denunciation, moral appeal, with the addition of the doctrine of "*cast*"—to borrow Ovid's description of chaos, a very "*rudis indigestaque moles*." All this applies to "those Old School men who come"—whether he means who *have* come, or *are* coming, or *will* come, or all three, is not exactly clear. At any rate, they "come into places where the New School have the majority."

We think the inside of this whole matter may be seen without the gift of *clairvoyance*. Mr. C. lives in a region in which, if we are correctly informed, the "New School" have a very decided "majority" over their brethren of the "Old School," in the important article of ministers and churches, as the latter have over the former in other regions. We state this as a fact, without any special joy or grief. We suppose in this age, it is no uncommon occurrence for "Old School" men to "come into places where the New School have the majority;" and, not thinking as badly of the latter as does Mr. C., to connect themselves with "New School" churches; since they cannot find those of their *first* preference within a convenient distance. This common practice of both Schools is a living proof of their mutual confidence. We of the "New School," having no piques or prejudices against these migrating brethren of the "Old School," are willing in all charity to receive them, if this be their desire—hoping, in the meantime, that they will not join us, because we "have the majority in wealth and influence." We act on this principle because we believe that the *essential, substantial* Christianity of the two Schools is one. It does not, however, seem to have occurred to Mr. C.; that these "Old School men" could unite with "New School" churches for any reason, but the *contemptible* one he names: or that possibly they might not agree with him as to the orthodoxy of said churches; forgetting on the one hand that even "Old School men" have *bodies*, and cannot, therefore,

¹ It is a circumstance that will not escape the notice of the careful reader, that the author's reasoning respects the transition from Old School to New. What would be the nature of a transition from New School to Old, he is not so particular to consider. What position of mind this indicates, let every man judge for himself.

move over long distances on the Sabbath; and assuming on the other, that they are all upon the identical line of himself. We offer the above suggestion slightly to abate his horror at the obliquity of the deed. For ourselves, having less disposition to strain denominational lines, or make a foolish glorification over our excellent standards of doctrine and polity, we have less occasion to send thunderbolts after those who leave us. We will not guess evil of their motives; but bid them God-speed if they stay, and God-speed if they go—hoping to meet them all in heaven in either case.

Among the arguments presented in this wonderful "Plea," is the doctrine of "cast." This seems to have peculiar charms with the author, as he takes no little pains to press it home. "If we unite with the New School body, or *remain* in it, and expect to be *regarded* as Old School men, our expectation is no compliment either to our understanding or to our integrity; our motives will be duly appreciated in the end, and our moral worth weighed in the balances." Rather a *low* level of argumentation with these "decided Presbyterians!" Politicians might, perhaps, do something at this level—hinting that the dispensation of "spoils" was yet to come, and that a *name* might then be worth something to a man; but it will not be easy to corner *Christian* men in this way. It is a kind of argument that proves best when not uttered *too loud*. The better way is not to publish, but to whisper it. Suppose that "we" care very little about the *name* of "Old" or "New School," that we are ashamed of neither, and do not specially glory in either, that "we" have not excogitated any particular expectations about the mere name, that "we" are too old to be caught by theological *cant*; then, alas, the author will have spoken in vain; he may then weigh us in whatever "balances" he chooses. "We" shall not be particularly anxious to know how many *ounces* of "New School," or "Old," he detects in our composition.

The author has a closing word for a certain "*third party*," claiming to be "no party," favoring "an independent Synod in Western New York." He gives them a short lecture. They "are not believed to be what their professions imply," they "are regarded as embittered partizans." They are not working for a "union of Presbyterians," but for "a new division of the *church*," for which there is "no demand." He tells the "*third party*," that there is "no call for the organization of an independent Synod in Western New York;" and explains his motive for saying this—"I say this to take away the apology from those who profess to be Old School Presbyterians, and yet refuse to unite with us, because they expect to have a third organization. I do not say it to *prevent* such an organization—it needs nothing to prevent it, for it will never exist. The very idea itself has almost ceased to amuse the fancy of any sober man, in the shape

of a rational probability." It is amusing to see how some men can contradict themselves, almost in the same breath. The author began as if this "third party" was really a formidable affair, and, yet, after taking a turn or two, he virtually says: Nonsense! Why, the "third party" is dead! yes, dead! "the very idea itself has almost ceased to *amuse the fancy of any sober man*, in the shape of a rational probability!" The nature of his objection to this "third party," that is, and is not at the same time, is quite as clear as the objection itself. He does not like it, because, peradventure it might absorb some *material* which he wishes to work into the Synod of Buffalo. "I say this to take away the apology from those who profess to be Old School Presbyterians, and yet refuse to *unite with us*, because they expect to have a third organization."

We have now finished the analysis of the three chapters, in which we proposed to seek the *quo animo* of this whole performance. It is nothing more or less than a new crusade against a large and respectable portion of the church of Christ, for a *local, sectarian* purpose. If this be not the fact, then it is perfectly unaccountable that it should carry with it so many evidences of such a fact. These chapters, properly speaking, have no more relation to the subject of "Doctrinal Differences," than to the nebula in Orion, except as such a relation shall be created by the author's state of mind. Himself is the connecting link. We do not complain that he is an "Old School Presbyterian;" we know very many such whom we love and admire; but we do complain of his *abuses*. Even these, bad as they are, might have been passed *sub silentio*, had they not been *seconded* by others, who had they studied his work more, would perhaps have commended it less. If any *other* denomination of professing Christians, "occupying an independent position, and not necessarily involved in the controversy between the divided branches of the Presbyterian Church," though "by no means an uninterested spectator," is prepared to make itself *particeps criminis* in this matter, by commending the book to the "friends of truth," on account of its "able discrimination and sound reasoning;" we hope such denomination will first *read*, and then inwardly digest; and if after this the commendation is to be continued, we can only say, but not without much grief of heart, and vivid sense of the injustice—*so let it be*. Those who hold "the theology current in the New School body," will perhaps by and by conclude themselves to be *lawful* prey, at least, so far as their "hidden evasions and indirections, and concealed and guarded opposition to truth" may be concerned.¹ The endorsement of such a book, if intelligently made, made after a thorough reading and full understanding of its contents and design, is not merely a *discourtesy*; it is the infliction of a serious wrong upon

¹ Remarks in the Christian Intelligencer.

those whom the book accuses. The author's production is, from first to last, an acrimonious philippic against, and misrepresentation of, "New School Presbyterians," as the *modus operandi* of a purpose, which he has had neither the modesty nor the wisdom to conceal. The Biblical Repertory fails to perceive "any acrimony of style or bitterness of spirit in this composition." We suppose there were none in the exhortations of the Romish inquisitors; but *that all was very pious*. For ourselves we love *calumny* and *sectarianism* neither more nor less, because wrapped in a holy envelope.

In offering the foregoing strictures upon the "Introductory Chapter," of Dr. Lord, and also the first, ninth, and tenth chapters, by Mr. Cheeseman, we desire to be distinctly understood as not meaning, even by the remotest implication, to apply them to "Old School" Presbyterians, as a *body* of Christian men. We are well aware that there are many *kinds* of "Old School" Presbyterians, as well as "New School;" that none of them are perfect; and that some of both classes seem much farther from this desirable state than others. We belong to that comparatively retired class of Presbyterians (we think it includes the great majority both of ministers and laymen in the two sections of the Presbyterian church), who do not, and never did believe, that there were any "doctrinal differences" of so serious a character, as to demand the painful rupture which has occurred. We are prepared to admit that there were, and still are, "differences," greater or less according to the particular specimens of "Old and New School" men that shall be taken as the basis of comparison. The time never was, and perhaps, in this world, never will be, when all these "differences" shall cease to exist. In the language of the Biblical Repertory, we say, "The Confession, as framed by the Westminster divines, was an acknowledged compromise between two classes of theologians. When adopted by the Presbyterian Church in this country, it was with the distinct understanding that the mode of subscription did not imply strict uniformity of views. And from that time to this there has been an open and avowed diversity of opinion, on many points among those who adopted the Confession of Faith, without leading to the suspicion of insincerity or dishonesty."—vol. iii. These diversities, to a great extent, have related to "the decision of some point in mental or moral science." Hence it is that they "are in a great measure confined to *professed* theologians, clergymen, or laymen." Hence we should learn "to separate the *human* from the *divine* element in our theology; and to be careful not to clothe the figments of our minds with the awful authority of God, and denounce our brethren for not believing him, when they do not agree with us."—Bib. Reper., vol. ii., new series. Not *all* differences, though real, are fundamental. We suppose that the members—ministers

and laymen, that constitute the "Old School" portion of the Presbyterian church, would be found to differ very considerably, upon a minute and detailed comparison of views. The same is true of the "New School"—true of any denomination that ever did, or ever will exist on the earth. A mere title, however much it may be coveted by some, or repudiated by others, makes no difference as to the facts. Men are men: and they have their ideas; and no system of ecclesiastical consolidation and congregation can destroy what is peculiar and specific in those ideas, or make that which is common any *more* common than God's grace has already made it. Christians of the same sect, and of different sects, though not liberal against the truth, need to look at this subject with catholic minds and charitable hearts. Those who are polemical, who become leaders of a party in the church, who write books to magnify "differences," are in great danger of striving about "words to no profit." Leaders are of great service when they lead in the *right* direction, and of as little service when they lead in the *wrong* direction. They have the infirmities of men, and the dangers of position; and they need great grace to do good, and not harm. Believing, as we do, that the real differences between "Old and New School Presbyterians" should never have alienated and separated brethren from each other, we are compelled to believe that the *manner* in which those differences have been treated, perhaps by both parties, is capable of great improvement. The want of a proper spirit of moderation and Christian charity led to the division of the Synod of Philadelphia, resulting in the formation of the Synod of New York, in 1745. The two Synods continued separate till 1758, when they were united in one body, taking the name of the "Synod of New York and Philadelphia." In the plan of union agreed upon between the two Synods, they speak of "*compromising* those differences, which were agitated many years ago with too great warmth and animosity." They earnestly recommended to all under their care, "that instead of indulging a contentious disposition, they would love each other with a pure heart fervently, as brethren who profess subjection to the same Lord, adhere to the same faith, worship, and government, and entertain the same hope of glory."—Records of Presbyterian church, pp. 286, 288. These, we think, were their "sober second thoughts," creditable alike to their wisdom and piety.

Cherishing the views expressed in the above paragraph, we confess we have felt a sense of grief and sorrow, while reading Mr. Cheeseman's book. His purpose we have endeavored to expose; and if in our construction of that purpose we are mistaken, then we should despair of ever learning from a book the design of its writer. His argumentative skill, his fidelity in the statement of facts, his copious use of authorities to prove what are the doctrinal sentiments of the respective schools; these are matters for

future consideration. Had we no means of judging besides that furnished by Mr. C., we should suppose that the two Schools were as wide apart as the poles—that they hardly held anything in common, not even the grace of Christian honesty. How diametrically opposed, however, is his picture to the plain facts! The translation, by certificate, of church members from one section to the other of the Presbyterian church, is a matter of daily occurrence. The exchange of pulpits is a very common practice among the ministers of these respective branches of our once united church. We have known repeated instances, in which candidates for the ministry have been licensed to preach the gospel in one School, and ordained in the other, without the slightest change of theological sentiments. These facts testify loudly, very loudly, against the clamorous cry of heresy, Papacy, Unitarianism, Pelagianism, &c., in vociferating which a few brethren spend so much of their time and breath. The fact is, the great majority of both Schools, ministers and laymen, act, and always have acted, except in the heat of controversy, as if there was not a word of truth in all this noise. That there are some “differences” we have already confessed; but that they are not incompatible with an honest subscription to the same standards, and the saving power of Christianity in the heart, is what both parties (with a few exceptions), *practically* confess, in a great variety of ways. If theologians would learn to distinguish the divine from the human element in their doctrinal tenets, and assign to each its proper place; if they would learn that their interpretation of a creed, as individuals, has just as much authority, and no more, as the reasons they can furnish to establish its correctness; if they would learn not to impute to others sentiments they do not hold; if they would treat each other’s opinions with perfect candor in the sight of God, keeping their hearts free from the spirit of party; they would, without any laxness of doctrine, disturb the piety of the church less, do less harm, and much more good in this ruined world. We hope, in the progress of human thought and sound piety, the day will come when sectarianism, and differences in the church of Christ will have fewer bigots and narrow minds to vaunt their inglorious excellence. We close this article by expressing a deep-seated disapprobation of Mr. Cheeseman’s performance.

(To be continued.)

THE
BIBLICAL REPOSITORY
AND
CLASSICAL REVIEW.

THIRD SERIES, NO. XVIII.—WHOLE NUMBER, LXXIV.

APRIL, 1849.

ARTICLE I.

By PROF. H. N. DAY, of Western Reserve College, Ohio.

ELOQUENCE A VIRTUE.

Die Beredsamkeit eine Tugend, oder Grundlinien einer systematischen Rhetorik; von Dr. Franz Theremin. Ziveite, verbesserte auflage. Berlin, 1837.

THE first edition of this work appeared in 1814. The author, who is Court-preacher at Berlin, has published a number of volumes of Sermons, Poetry, &c., besides an elaborate work on Eloquence, entitled "Demosthenes and Massillon; a contribution to the history of eloquence," which appeared in 1845.

He is a writer of considerable power and originality. His mind is clear, philosophical and vigorous. His style is remarkably simple, terse, and expressive.

The occasion of the production of this work was a conviction in the author's mind of the radical imperfection of existing theories of eloquence, and a corresponding imperfection in the existing treatises on rhetoric. The author has the happiness of witnessing a remarkable change in the views which prevail in Germany, in respect to this art, since the first publication of his treatise.

As well from the character as from the number of works which have recently appeared in Germany, the inference is a lawful one that the art is no longer regarded there as incapable of being reduced to strictly philosophical principles. It is no longer regarded as a mere contrivance—a jugglery, whose highest aim is to subvert the judgment, supplant the reason, and set aside the moral feeling by insidious play with blind passions, or by the glare of sophistry and the dissimulations of false logic, and therefore, from its very nature, unable to rise above a mere collection of arbitrary

adamant, which is yet invested with all the gloom and glory of the middle ages ; or to quote his own words,—

“ the sacred song which heaven and earth
Have lent a hand to frame—which
Maay a year hath kept me lean with thought.”

In a word, the *Divina Commedia*, is one of those old Gothic edifices of the dark ages, with its many chambered cells, and even dungeons, its dim aisles and massive towers, fretted ornaments, old tombs and blazing altars, illumined by the rays of the setting sun, and echoing the soft tones of the vesper bells, a thing at once of dread and beauty, of stern asceticism and celestial devotion. In that old temple, “ that great supernatural world cathedral,” a modern, and a Protestant even, may linger in hallowed worship. There his spirit, subdued by solemn thought, may rise to the home of glory beyond the spheres, where the good of all creeds finally mingle ; and if, by the grace of God, he should himself finally reach “ the highest heaven of uncreated light,” he will not be much surprised if, notwithstanding all the errors and imperfections of Dante, he should meet there the glorified Florentine. Would to heaven that in these days of skepticism and pride, of hollow religion and lofty pretension, when we scarce believe in heaven, to say nothing of hell, we had one half the clear vision, the steady faith, and the all-conquering love of the immortal poet. With our better views and softer piety, we might then set our foot upon the world, mount into the clear empyrean, and bathe our spirits in the very light of the eternal Sun.

ARTICLE III.

OLD AND NEW SCHOOL PRESBYTERIANISM.

By REV. SAMUEL T. SPEAR, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Differences between Old and New School Presbyterians. By Rev. Lewis Cheeseman: Rochester: Published by Erastus Darrow.

(Continued from page 41.)

THE Eighth Chapter of the “ Differences,” contains the following table of contents: “ Tendencies of the new divinity—The new divinity rests upon one, or, at most, two assumptions, both of which are false—Tends to infidelity.” This does not present a very

lucid idea of what the author intends to accomplish. The main purpose, however, of this chapter, is to trace the "New School" heresies back to their "*fountain*," or source. In the estimation of the author, these "errors" sprang from the "Dissertation on the Nature of true Virtue," written by the Elder Edwards, *clarum et venerabile nomen*. He tells us that he has "MET with a treatise on the nature of virtue"—meaning the above "Dissertation." President Edwards did the mischief; he presented "a theory on this subject," which, by a process of philosophical and theological incubation, has proved the source of all this evil. The seminal error of the great metaphysician passed into the hands of Drs. Hopkins, Emmons, Edwards the Younger, Taylor, Mr. Finney, &c., infecting the theology of New England, and spreading its baneful influence over the Presbyterian Church. "After this manner, an error apparently harmless at first, and scarcely one hundred years old, and originating with a sound divine, and one of the greatest and best of men, has been gradually, and in various directions, evolving different and cardinal errors, which have ultimately mingled and spread into vast systems, and which now float, with their dark, pestilential vapors, upon Mount Zion, distributing everywhere the elements of decline and death." p. 187. These are terrible effects of one mistake.

What then is the "theory," the "error" of President Edwards? "True virtue most essentially consists in BENEVOLENCE TO BEING IN GENERAL. Or perhaps, to speak more accurately, it is that consent of the heart to being in general, which is immediately exercised in a general good will." "When I say true virtue consists in *love to being in general*, I shall not be likely to be understood, that no one act of the mind, or exercise of love, is of the nature of true virtue, but what has being in general, or the great system of universal existence, for its *direct and immediate* object: so that no exercise of love, or kind affection to any one particular being, that is but a small part of the whole, has anything of the nature of true virtue. But that the nature of true virtue consists in a *disposition* to benevolence towards being in general, though from such a disposition may arise exercises of love to *particular* beings, as objects are presented and occasions arise." Edwards takes special pains to discriminate between natural sentiments, affections, self-love, conscience, &c., and that love of which he is speaking in the definition of true virtue. The latter is not an *instinct*, but subsists in connection with *reason*, and the grace of God producing it. It comprehends "being in general," as it is capable of application to all beings; in respect to whom it seeks whatever is their *summum bonum*, a question which not it, but reason and revelation determine. In eight consecutive chapters, Edwards elaborates, qualifies, and establishes this view—showing

¹ Edward's Works, New York edition, vol. iii., pp. 94, 95.

himself to mean what Paul and John mean by "*ἀνάγκη*." This is the cardinal "error," unattended with the arguments and explanations of its illustrious author.

What Edwards intended to say, and did say, will not be clearly understood by a mind that fails to appreciate the wide distinction between two different departments of spiritual ethics. We doubt whether Mr. C. apprehended this distinction. All ethical inquiries belong to one or the other of two great provinces of thought. The first is the province of *objective principles* or truths: the second is that of *subjective facts*, existing in the bosom of a moral agent. In the first, we ask, what is right objectively? in the second, what is that in a moral agent which conforms to the law of right. In his "Dissertation," Edwards has the latter question in view. He applies his discriminating analysis to this single point: *What is that subjective condition of a moral agent, whose presence constitutes that agent truly virtuous, and whose absence determines it to be vicious?* The ultimate objective grounds of moral distinctions formed no part of his inquiry; his research was limited to the *phenomenal* fact of true virtue as a state, condition, or exercise, of a moral being. What is that state? Edwards answered—*Love*—defining its qualities and its objects.

Our author, not pleased with the doctrine of Edwards, had before him a very fine field for argument, embracing two demonstrations; namely, that the "theory" was an "error; and that this "error," in the downward tendency of error, has generated the "New School" heresies. He does not, however, seem to have thoroughly comprehended the logical wants of his subject.

In regard to the first question, whether Edwards was wrong in his analysis of subjective virtue? he offers no argument, not one solitary proof. He does not condescend to tell us what is the true light on this vital point. Had he given us *his* definition, we might then have compared notes with him. He has left us to see an error, without the benefit, either expulsive or attractive, of the opposite truth. The only relief from this uncertainty is to gather his theory by inference. If the theory of Edwards is totally wrong, then is the exact opposite of his affirmation right? If so, then Mr. C.'s theory of true virtue is, that it consists in not loving being in general. This is the only clue by which we can imagine what is the view of the author. Would it not have been respectful to the "sound divine" to have paid to his error the compliment of a "sound" refutation? The name of President Edwards is a "tower of strength" among those who appreciate talent and piety. Most men would think a little proof not out of place, when attacking the opinions of such a divine.

The author informs us that this theory is "scarcely one hundred years old." On this point we think he is not a little in "error," as to a matter of fact. Those acts or exercises, or

states of mind, which God requires must contain the *essence* of all true virtue; in them it consists. What are the fundamental principles of the Divine requirement? We give the judgment of the great Expounder: "Thou shalt *love* the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it: Thou shalt *love* thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets."¹ We subjoin the authority of an inspired apostle as to the nature of true virtue: "Love is the fulfilling of the law."² We recommend the brother to read his Bible once more, especially I. Cor., chap. 13, and the I. Epistle of John entire. We need not fortify the views of Edwards with any reasonings of our own: the above authorities with Christian men will be sufficient. We cannot, however, withhold the expression of our astonishment, that a Christian writer should describe such a doctrine, as containing, consequentially "the elements of decline and death." The picture he means to give is truly hideous. Strange coloring for such a hallowed groundwork! Where were his recollections of the Bible! His thoughts of the well-established tendencies of true love in the universe of God! We feel offended, for truth's sake, that he should so caricature this grand *sum* of human virtues. If it be a great "error" to place virtue in true love, so great that the idea leads to all forms of heresy, then there must be something very bad in true love.

Let us, however, attend to the other point, i. e. the question of fact, whether these "heresies" sprang from the treatise of Edwards? Our first remark is, that Dr. Lord, the endorser, and Mr. C., the author, are not agreed as to their source. The Dr. informs us in the "Introductory Chapter," that they are "the *ancient* heresies"—revived—extending back as far as the days of Luther, Augustine, and even Paul himself. Not at all; says Mr. C. He has "MET with a treatise on the nature of virtue," containing an error "*scarcely one hundred years old*," which has done all this work! Who is right? Where did these "heresies" come from? We hope these brethren will try to be a little more harmonious—remarking that when men draw on their fancy for facts and relations, they ought to be exceedingly cautious in the exercise of it.

Our second observation is, that the author's principal difficulty with the "Dissertation" of Edwards is, not that virtue consists in benevolence or love, but that this love is an *exercise*, a preference, an *active* state of a moral agent. In his conception, it carries along with it the theory which "commences all moral distinctions with the commencement of moral preferences;" the admission of which idea in respect to holiness or virtue, would

¹ Mat. 22: 37-46.

² Rom. 13: 10.

imply the same admission in respect to unholiness or sin, and thus leave no opportunity for his peculiar views in respect to the *nature* of sin. He observes that if this theory be granted, "then no moral distinctions can exist back of intelligent mental preferences, and neither holiness, nor sin, can belong to the nature of a moral being, but must always belong to his acts." Hence it must not be granted; it must be called an "error," the root of all error. Mr. C. we suppose, is one of those who hold to the doctrine, that it is a sin for a man to be born as he is, with those constitutional and created endowments which are derived directly from the Creator's hand; that sinfulness, with all its moral qualities and legal liabilities, is as true here, as of the actions of men. So we understand him. And, because the "theory" of Edwards in his view inferentially repudiates this doctrine, he repudiates the theory. But why does the Edwardean view repudiate the favorite doctrine of Mr. C.? Simply because the assumption is made, that benevolence is an *active* state of the soul, an *exercise* of its powers, and that consequently "moral distinctions" are to be predicated, not of faculties as such, but of mental phenomena. This is the fatal sin of the theory. Now, we suggest, that by a little ingenuity the author might have spared himself the trouble, as well as peril, of this attack upon Edwards, and equally upon the Word of God. He might have done so in either of two ways; namely, by not assuming that love is an active state of the soul; or by facing the naked question, whether sin and holiness as moral predicates, go back of the operations and active states of the mind. He had no occasion to call Edwards into this issue, more than any other man whose position implies, that "moral distinctions" relate only to *active* conditions of the soul. He might, for example, have taken John's definition of sin, and referred the "New School" heresies to this source, contending that the definition is not accurate, or at least not sufficiently adequate to be an orthodox description: "Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law: for sin is the transgression of the law." The virus of not going back of active mental states for the matter of "moral distinctions," as really inheres in this definition as in the "theory" of Edwards.

For our third remark we submit a specimen or two of the manner, in which he traces the "New School" errors back to the fundamental mistake of Edwards. Here he evinces the most extraordinary insight into remote relations. We felt while reading him as we remember once to have felt, when endeavoring to fathom the mysteries of Kant's Critick on Pure Reason. As an example, he traces the "New School" error, that Christ did not suffer the literal penalty of the law, but did suffer its legal equivalent, to the theory of Edwards. The mode of derivation or *nexus* between two errors, if we are able to understand him, is this: that God as

¹ Page 189.

¹ I John 3: 4.

a benevolent being, and in the sovereign exercise of that benevolence, did, according to the "New School" exposition, choose to substitute the sufferings of Christ for the punishment of the sinner, realizing in the former all the purposes of the latter, while providing in specified cases for the remission of the threatened penalty. God did this in *love*; therefore, (mark the logic) since Edward's theory is that virtue consists in *love*, this "New School" view of the atonement having the idea of *love* in it, grew out of that theory! This of course is the reviewer's statement of the author's argument: if it be not correct, then we confess a total inability to understand what he means to say. It is difficult, as it is needless, to reply to an argument so ærial; that finding the word or idea of love in two sentences, proceeds to infer that the *matter* in the one sentence is a philosophical derivative from the matter in the other. Give us this license of thought, and we pledge ourselves to find *anything in anything*. We should have felt obliged to the author, had he referred us to some "New School" divine who had reasoned from the nature of virtue in man to the nature of the atonement by Jesus Christ. We might add other specimens of the manner in which he traces "New School" errors back to a "single fountain;" but we forbear. It is sufficient to say, that he not only mis-states their sentiments in almost every instance in which he undertakes to describe them, but also fails to give the shadow of a proof showing their consequential connection with the theory of Edwards. It is altogether a *fancy* sketch. Surely he cannot complain that we have no faith in his words, when he gives us no proof, historical or metaphysical, that verity lies in his language. It must be amazing to candid and thinking men, that he could have found any respectable endorsers to commend such a mass of puerility, under the appellation of "able discrimination and sound reasoning."

What the author says on the subject of "man's ability," as another error affiliated to the one in regard to virtue, we pass in silence; since this point will be considered in another connection. We leave this chapter by quoting and commenting upon a single passage in its address to the *unregenerate*. "We call upon you, therefore, by the truth of your total depravity, and by your righteous and hopeless condemnation in your present state; by the blood of atonement so long neglected, and by the expostulations of the Spirit so long resisted; in view of the resurrection morn, the judgment seat of Christ, and the retributions of eternity, TO AWAKEN AT ONCE TO RIGHTEOUSNESS AND TO CAST YOURSELF TO-DAY upon the bosom of your blessed and only Redeemer." We do not object to this exhortation, though we confess not a little surprise in view of its source. Does he *really* mean to tell wicked men "to

¹ Christian Intelligencer.

² Page 202. The under-scoring is by the reviewer.

awaken at once to righteousness," and cast themselves "to-day" upon Christ? Suppose one of them, having read his philippic against the "New School" error of "man's ability," should reply thus: "Sir, we have no ability to do this. If we take your advice, we must *act*, we must act at once, we must act rightly too. True, you say, our inability to love God belongs to our moral constitution; but this does not mend the matter; for, according to your own explanation, it is not only real, but in every sense *total* and *absolute*, and always has been so. We have no *capacities* "to awaken;" we never had; there is no sense in which we can do anything in obedience to your advice. You are orthodox, and so are we." Now if the author met this reply in conformity with the views expressed in this and other chapters, he would have to answer: "All right: but remember that ability in relation to *ethics* is in no sense indispensable to obligation. Your duties and capacities as moral agents, have no relation to each other; the absoluteness of your inability to love God is a crime; you sinned before you did anything. Moral distinctions, character and desert of hell, apply to the very faculties God gave you; infants are responsible subjects of God's government as soon as they are born, and deserve the woes of the second death for *being born as they are*; all humanity is *summed up* in Adam. Though you have no ability of any kind except to do evil, yet you must awake to righteousness, you must do it at once. If you object to this, recollect that your inability is not "*chemical* or *agricultural*," but one that belongs to your "*moral constitution*," that is to say, you have not the capacity of mental sight, preference, affection or faith in the direction of holiness, and yet you must exert a capacity which you have not, and never had. By the truth of the *absoluteness of the inability of your moral constitution*, I call upon you to awake." To prate about heresy, and then make an exhortation which, if sincere, implies that very heresy, or is sheer nonsense, is a specimen of inconsistency those may explain who can. If the sinner really has no ability of "*moral constitution*," as the author teaches, to love God, or believe in Christ, why exhort him to either act? If his inability be that of "*moral constitution*," it is not "*a crime*," but a misfortune; and we can no more awake under the pressure of such an inability than we can "*create a world*." To urge it as a duty is to belie all common sense. Orthodoxy of this kind is not in the Confession of Faith, or in the Bible.

Chapter vii. p. 150-184, is devoted to the consideration of "*Revivals of Religion*." Almost the whole chapter is occupied with a running sketch of revivals from the earliest periods down to the present time; upon which we make no comments. If the author judged such a sketch desirable, we shall not quarrel with his preference, though we are not able to see to what argumentative use he applies the history.

He is very careful to disabuse the public of the "impression" which he thinks somewhat prevalent, "that Presbyterians of the Old School" are opposed to true and genuine revivals. He has no objections even to "meetings which last several days," and does not, with any particular emphasis, criticise what are called *measures*. In the course of his reflections we learn what are the *characteristics* of true revivals. "True revivals, then, result from a divine and supernatural agency." "True revivals occur in connection with means divinely appointed." "When true revivals occur, believers, some of them at least, are greatly quickened and divinely led to seek after them as blessings inexpressibly great and desirable." "True revivals are attended with alarming apprehensions of sin and misery." "The *miraculous* changes which a true revival of religion supposes, must be common to the Church in all ages." It had been well to have added with greater distinctness, that in "true revivals," *sinner*s are generally converted to God. We can assure the author that we do not deny, and we know of no "New School" man that does, any of the above conceptions of a true revival, if we except the last; and in respect to this we charge him with using the term "*miraculous*" in a manner contrary to the *usus loquendi* of the word. If this description is meant to imply, as we fear it is, that "New School" Presbyterians do not hold to "true revivals," according to the above model of ideas, we can only say that it is a gross misrepresentation. It would be a testimony than which nothing can be more foreign to the truth.

Passing by these incidental matters, we present the author's *main* idea in regard to "revivals" in "New School" churches. It is, that these so-called revivals are *spurious*, the "work of man and not of God." This he infers from the assumed fact, that the "New School" are *heretics*. Hence revivals among them are nothing but "a revival of old heresies:" "they are not the result of divine influences." His position is, not that there are some *false* conversions, but that the *revivals* themselves bear this character. He more than intimates their affinity with "Mormonism," "Christianism," and "Popery." If, among them, there happen to be a few "genuine conversions to Christ," this fact is not to be considered as having any connection with "New School" men or doctrine. They do not hold gospel doctrine enough to have a revival of true religion, that is to say, in plain words, *they are not Christians*. When the martyrs shall be re-produced in the persons of the millennial witnesses, "Finney, and Barnes, and Beman, and Beecher, will surely make but a sorry appearance in the hands of these sons of Abraham." This, in the compass of a *nut shell*, is what he tells the world about revivals among "New School" Presbyterians.

¹ p. 156-159.

² p. 167.

His chapter on "Revivals" is not a narrative of *facts* showing the alleged spuriousness, but purely a process of *a priori* reasoning from the pseudo-orthodoxy of his own mind, against the clear evidences of God's grace. It is a repudiation of the Holy Spirit in the *fruits* of that Spirit. Confident in the assumption of his own exclusive orthodoxy, he gravely concludes, that the rumored works of God's grace are not what they appear to be. We are not mistaken in imputing to him this style of reasoning. "The new divinity, being a most glaring and wide departure from the ancient faith, is undoubtedly an *apostasy*, not a progress—is a revival of false religion, and not of the true."¹ "The new divinity then is another gospel, an apostasy from the faith, and the revivals connected with its progress, are revivals of a spurious Christianity."² At the close of the chapter he sums up his views by declaring, that these revivals "are a revival of old heresies," "not the result of divine influences." The converts, if they think they love Christ, and trust him for salvation, are certainly mistaken: for Mr. C. has an orthodox way of telling *a priori*, whether, they are Christians or not. First, to assume that all orthodoxy is with himself; next, that there is not enough of truth among "New School" Presbyterians to have a revival according to the truth; and finally, to declare that the appearances of such a revival, are all deceptive; this we deem a very singular mode of settling a plain question of fact. Its injustice must be palpable to every eye.

The author's sole argument is the *doctrinal* one, and that too as it exists in his *own* mind. He seeks to disprove the *possibility* of a true revival among "New School" Presbyterians, by the doctrinal test. To show then, his total want of truth, his gross misrepresentation of others, we take a single point—a point very intimately connected with the subject of revivals. One of his assertions is, that "New School" Presbyterians teach "*that a supernatural agency is not necessary to produce them:*" and since this is an error, and God does not promote works of grace by error, therefore the revivals "are not the result of divine influences."³ The proof of the aforesaid teaching is, that "God," according to Mr. Barnes, "requires a service strictly according to our ability, and to be measured by that;" that Dr. Duffield does not hold that a total and absolute natural inability to obey God (for this is the point and the only point of the Dr.'s allegation) is the ground for the necessity of divine influences; and that, Mr. Finney, who is not a *Presbyterian*, and is no authority one way or the other, has said, "if the sinner wants a new heart, he must go and make it himself." The author fails to make the distinction, which he ought to know is made by Mr. Barnes and Dr. Duffield, between natural and moral ability and inability: and because of this failure, he imputes to them a

¹ p. 167. ² p. 172. ³ p. 183

sentiment they do not hold. This is the amount of his proof. He does not quote their language denying "a supernatural agency;" but *infers* the denial, and makes them hold all the inferences he chooses to make. This is a violation not less of the laws of reasoning than of candor and justice, in stating the sentiments of others. The very least he could have done, was to furnish the denial in their very words.

The assertion as to what the "New School" teach on this point, is a great departure from the truth. We might show this by an indefinite array of authorities. Even Dr. Taylor of New Haven, that *heresiarch* in the true line of heresiarchs from President Edwards, holds no such sentiment as the one imputed. We quote his own words: "I believe—That this moral change, (regeneration) is never produced in the human heart by *moral suasion*, i. e. by the mere influence of truth and motives as the Pelagians affirm, but is produced by the Holy Spirit, operating on the mind through the truth, and in perfect consistency with the nature of moral action, and the laws of moral agency."¹ See the heresy vitiating all the revivals in which Dr. Taylor preaches; namely, that God converts men by His Spirit, using His own truth as the instrument of the same, in the language of the Confession of Faith, "enlightening their minds spiritually and savingly to understand the things of God;"² that men in being "born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God," are "born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by *the word of God* which liveth and abideth forever."³ If regeneration occurs in revivals, then Dr. Taylor does not hold or teach that so far revivals do not proceed from divine influences, but exactly the contrary sentiment: neither does he hold that they are "effected" simply "by moral suasion," as Mr. C. represents "New School" men to believe.

Dr. Beecher has shared quite largely in the castigations of the author's pen. Let us see what he believes in regard to "supernatural agency." "The author, or efficient cause of regeneration is *God*." "The power of God concerned in regeneration is *supernatural*; as compared with the power of any created agent; as above the power of any law of nature, or natural efficacy of truth and motive, in the ordinary operation of cause and effect, natural or moral; as distinguished from the stated operations of divine power; as being an interposition to accomplish unfailingly a change in the will and affections of men, which never takes place without it; as it is an act of God's *almighty power*."⁴ Is this venerable patriarch in Israel at fault on the question of "supernatural agency?"

¹ Dr. Taylor's Letter to Dr. Hawes, in the *Christian Spectator* for March, 1839. p. 172.

² Chap. ix. Sect. 1. ³ John 1: 13. I. Pet. 1: 23.

⁴ Beecher's *Views in Theology*, p. 200-202.

and are all the revivals with which God has honored his former days, to be set down as "a revival of old heresies?" We feel that our common Christianity is insulted by the author's impeachment. And if this be his "able discrimination and sound reasoning," we hope the day is far distant when we shall see the like again.

Mr. Barnes is also in the list of those who deny the "supernatural agency." Let him speak for himself. "This doctrine, that God by his Spirit prevents or goes before a sinner in his efforts, or *commences and carries forward the work of his own power*, I deem of cardinal value in the work of religion. If it be true, then it is of the utmost importance that it should be *seen and felt* to be true, and that the Holy Ghost should have the glory. I have no sympathy with any scheme that divides the honor with man." If this be denying the "supernatural agency" of God in the production of revivals and the regeneration of men, then it is difficult to see what it would be to affirm it. But, it may be said, Mr. Barnes holds, that "God requires a service strictly according to our ability, and to be measured by that." This is very true; and God Himself holds the same doctrine in the most explicit manner: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with *all thy* heart, and with *all thy* soul, and with *all thy* mind." Does it hence follow that Mr. Barnes does not believe "a supernatural agency" necessary to conquer the *aversions* of depravity, and bring sinners to love God with *all* their heart, soul, strength and mind? Just as if a man, in order to believe and preach the great fact and necessity of Divine influence in revivals, must take every iota of Mr. C.'s strange metaphysics!

Again, Dr. Skinner, an eminent "New School" divine, who has labored much in revivals, and is now one of the Professors in the Union Theological Seminary, in a volume entitled "Preaching and Hearing," devotes two chapters to "Preaching on Ability." Although he holds most distinctly to the doctrine of man's *natural* ability to obey the requirements of God, and vindicates the same with a strength of argument not easily answered; yet he as distinctly holds the doctrine of man's *moral* inability or *total aversion* to true holiness, so great that nothing but the Divine influence and operation of the Holy Ghost can ever subdue his heart and make him willing to serve his Maker. "When the call to repentance is obeyed, it is obeyed indeed under the renewing influence of the Spirit of God, whose work herein is doubtless one of the most glorious of all the instances of divine power and goodness; but still, it is obeyed by the human mind itself, in the exercise of its own faculties." "The work of divine power and grace, which has human obedience as its result, is one of surpassing glory and

¹ Barnes' Defence, p. 30. It is worthy of notice, that these statements, *cum multis aliis*, of the same type, were preached in a revival, and not drawn out by the exigencies of a doctrinal controversy.

² Matt. 22 : 37.

excellence, which excites angelic admiration, and will be celebrated for ever in the praises of eternity. All that God does in performing this work, no one beside himself can know." Here, also, without further quotation, we ask, Is Dr. Skinner to be denied the benefit of his own solemn and explicit language? to be judged by what he says, or by what Mr. C. chooses to infer?

We refer the reader to an article by Erskine Mason, D. D., entitled "The Promise of the Spirit," in the *Bib. Repository* for Jan. 1848. From it we select two or three passages, as specimens of a large number. "The best method, perhaps, of arriving at the meaning of the promise, and the nature of the agency it respects, is to turn our attention to some scenes which the Bible represents as proving the fulfillment of the promise, and to some facts which are admitted to be the results of the agency in question." "The point which seems established from this analysis of Pentecostal scenes, is, that the office-work of the promised Comforter consists in giving new and spiritual views of truths already revealed, and in bringing the heart and life under their controlling influence; and what was needed *then* to secure these views and their results, is no less needed now." "Of the reality of this agency, and its absolute necessity in order to anything like spiritual apprehension, we can never have too distinct or firmly-settled ideas." "Upon this influence, as promised by Jesus Christ to his disciples, is dependent the success of the gospel in the world." "No mere exhibition of truth, no outward means or appliances, no system of external instrumentality, however wisely constructed and faithfully used, can, independently of this direct and special agency of the Holy Ghost, avail to build up the kingdom of Christ, or change a human being from a carnal into a spiritual state." And yet, Dr. Mason is a "New School" Presbyterian, holding, contrary to the representations given by Mr. C., to the doctrine of the "direct and special agency of the Holy Ghost."

We might in the same way take up every item of his *a priori* argument against the soundness of "New School" revivals, and convict him of mis-stating the opinions of "New School" men; or, what amounts to the same thing, of making inferences which neither they nor their published sentiments authorize. We cannot, however, devote more space to this chapter. The reader has before him its main point, namely, that Mr. C. is orthodox; that the "New School" are heretics and apostates; and therefore that the revivals among them are nothing but "a revival of false religion," like the revivals of "Mormonism." The thousands and tens of thousands who have professed their faith in Christ, some of whom are now preaching the gospel in our own country, and others in pagan lands; some of whom have already rested from their labors, giving good evidence of piety in their last moments: these

¹pp. 196, 203.

²*Bib. Rep. for Jan. 1848, pp. 67, 70, 75.*

were the dupes of a *spurious* Christianity. If the revivals are spurious, then the converts are spurious. They have no consciousness of the love of Christ, no evidence of piety! What an attack upon their experience! What a shameless effrontery! We wonder whether his endorsers mean to commend the sentiments of this chapter to "the friends of truth?"¹ If so, we can only express our deep sense of the injustice and injury.

We proceed to give some exposition of the author's *general method* of conducting the doctrinal comparison between "Old and New School Presbyterians," with a view to exalt the one and disparage the other. Some knowledge of the *way* in which he does this work, will aid our judgment, and especially serve to regulate the degree of our confidence in his labors.

What is the subject-matter of this comparison? DOCTRINE. What, then, is doctrine in the Christian and Biblical sense? The author does not answer this question, and this is one of the features of his method. He undertakes to compare the views of different men upon doctrine, with not the slightest explanation of the *term* itself. This we regard as a serious defect. It is, however, no uncommon practice with those who append their philosophy to doctrine, and then claim for the compound the credit of inspired authority. They palm off *their* ideas for inspiration, by associating them with inspiration; and insist that not only the doctrine must be received, but also their auxiliary and explanatory modes of thought. It is a heresy not to adopt *seriatim* the Shibboleths of their philosophy. A vast proportion of the controversies among Christians has arisen in this way, and been related to matters in regard to which the Bible is silent. Such controversies will exist, and there will always be some croakers about "Differences," unless men learn to distinguish between the essential parts of a doctrine and the mere *appendices* of human philosophy. Its essential parts are those which God gives in His Word, since the doctrine is simply some truth which He teaches for the belief of men. This is a *real* and an important distinction. "There are, with regard to every doctrine, certain constituent, formal ideas, which enter into its very nature, and the rejection of which is the rejection of the doctrine; and there are certain others which are merely *accessory* or *explanatory*."² These "constituent, formal ideas" are given by God upon his own authority, and are to be implicitly received and faithfully expressed in the symbols of the church. If it be difficult for men always to agree as to what these "ideas" are, let it be remembered that the elevation of human philosophy to their high rank of authority will not relieve that difficulty, but increase it ten fold.

The *effect* which this important distinction should have upon

¹ Christian Intelligencer.

² Biblical Repertory, for Oct. 1831.

theologians, has been well stated by another. "At the same time, the undeniable fact, that systems of philosophy have been as changeable as the wind; that each, in its turn, has been presented, urged and adopted with the utmost confidence; and each in its measure perverted the simple truths of the Bible, should teach us to be modest; it should teach us to separate the human from the divine element in our theology, and to be careful not to clothe the figments of our own minds with the awful authority of God, and denounce our brethren for not believing Him when they do not agree with us. It should teach us, too, not to ascribe to men opinions, which, according to our notions, may be inferred from the principles which they avow." These very sensible observations belong to a strain of remarks, in which we find that the *isms* of the church have been the *isms* of this or that "particular system of religious philosophy;" that "the questions which now alienate and divide Christians in this country" are nothing "but questions in mental and moral science." These remarks were made in a review of Dr. Cox's Sermon on "Regeneration and the Manner of its Occurrence;" and were, perhaps, *primarily* intended for "New School" philosophy. If so, we most cordially welcome the application; and would ask whether they be not as good for "Old School" philosophy, indeed for all philosophy?

It ought to be remembered, that a man may hold the essential, "constituent, formal ideas" of a doctrine, and at the same time hold a *bad* philosophy; or that he may connect those "ideas" with a *good* philosophy; or that he may hold them without *any* philosophy but that of the *plainest common sense*, which is the real condition of the great proportion of Christians. If he fasten his faith upon the doctrine, embracing its constituent idea or ideas, as set forth in the Word of God, he does not *doctrinally* differ with another who does the same thing, though they may not be altogether similar in their philosophy. If this is not a true position, then it is absolutely impossible that any considerable number of Christians should ever be united in adopting any formula of faith. The *practical* rejection of this position "would split the church into innumerable fragments." Diversities of mental capacity and educational influence always have, and always will involve some "differences" among good men as to those ideas, which are merely *human* theories of revealed truth. We do not say that these theories are unimportant, or that a good is not better than a bad philosophy; or that a man may not substantially destroy the vital nature of a doctrine by his mode of explaining it; but, we do say, that the doctrine as given in the Word of God, is one thing, and its philos-

¹ Biblical Repertory, Vol. II. New Series, p. 252.

² The author alludes to the controversies then existing in the Presbyterian Church. It is a very important concession, and from the "Old School" side.

³ Biblical Repertory.

ophy as originated by the thoughts of men, is another. He who fails to recognize this distinction, is in danger of confounding a divine doctrine with its human philosophy; and not this merely, but also of assuming God's authority for *his* philosophy.

The pertinence of these general observations we might illustrate very fully by the *manner* in which Mr. C. treats the whole subject of "doctrinal differences." Though he professes a great abhorrence of all philosophy, yet he is a great admirer of *his own*. Were he to treat his "Old School" brethren as he has the "New," he would find not a few heretics, and perhaps apostates, even among them.

As one example, we refer to his philosophy of the atonement; for, say what he will, he still has a philosophy on this subject. One of the grounds of heresy among the "New School" is, that they do not hold that Christ, "in the strict and literal sense," suffered the penalty of the law. The opposite of this heresy is, that Christ did suffer this penalty, which is the doctrine of Mr. C. For not agreeing with him in this mere speculation of his own mind, he denounces the "New School" as heretics. Now, as a matter of fact, neither the Bible, nor the Confession of Faith, affirms the truth of the author's theory; and what is worthy of special attention, the highest "Old School" authorities, though *nominally* adopting the theory, upon a full explanation of their meaning, repudiate its essential parts, and reduce the controversy very much to a mere question about the proper use of a term. And yet the "New School" are heretics for not believing what neither the Bible nor the Confession declares, but what is simply Mr. C.'s philosophy of the doctrine.

Again, the author is very plainly an advocate of the theory of *physical* regeneration, physical in the sense of a change in the constitutional properties, *pura naturalia* of the human mind. He calls it "a change of nature," in contrast with what the "New School" affirm, and therefore, if he mean anything, he means a *physical* change. Here, then, he is without the authority of the Bible, or the Confession, or human consciousness. It is nothing more than the author's theory of a truth, held in common by himself and his "New School" brethren; namely, that sinners are regenerated and converted to God by the Holy Spirit, and never without this Divine Agent; not disagreeing, so far as we know, as to the phenomenal facts of human consciousness when a soul is born into the kingdom of Christ. He must put in his not altogether harmonious metaphysics with the doctrine; and the "New School" must take it *all* as he makes it, or reject it all, and therefore be subject to the charge of heresy.

It would be easy to fill a long paper with specimens of the above

¹This is the very sense in which they make the denial. The qualification often occurs in Beman on the Atonement.

character. A greater theorizer, without unity or the acumen of metaphysics, we have seldom seen. He goes beyond the Bible; beyond the Confession of Faith in some things; and arrogates infallible interpretation in others; and then says: "See! how 'we' and the 'New School' *doctrinally* differ! How orthodox 'we' are! How heretical they are!" He omitted to mention the little circumstance, that his philosophy was not *inspired*; and that Bible doctrine had an existence long before he was born. Had he turned his philosophical battering-ram upon his "Old School" brethren, as for example, upon the theory of the nature of sin set forth in the "Dissertation on Native Depravity" by Gardiner Spring, D. D., it is quite probable that he would have made not a little scattering in that direction; it is not certain, that even his principal endorser might not have received some severe contusions. No orthodoxy is safe, when put on trial before a man who does not discriminate between the mere figments of his own mind, and doctrine, as given in God's Word. He can make heresy when he chooses: and where he shall locate the *virus*, may be dependent on his ecclesiastical position; and the *degree* of its poison, upon the intensity of his own bigotry.

We have another question, which will help us to some farther perception of the author's method: *What are the personal terms involved in the proposed comparison, and the criteria of a correct conception of those terms?* They are "Old School" Presbyterians, and "New School" Presbyterians. What are they? Well known religious denominations, of about equal size, exchanging fraternal courtesies, once united as a single denomination, but now in the providence of God separated. What are they in the *theological* and *doctrinal* sense? Are they Arminians, Arians, Pelagians, or Calvinists? What are they? This is a very material question, to be correctly settled, as preliminary to the possibility of a just comparison.

In looking at this question, the first and natural inquiry is:—Have they any published creed, any confession of faith, "containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures?" No one disputes, that they have the *same* confession; and that, notwithstanding their alleged "differences," neither has evinced the slightest disposition to modify that confession in a single particular. Both subscribe to the same standards, as embodying a human and systematic statement of scriptural doctrines. They license and ordain ministers, and try heretics by this system. They use it for all the purposes for which any creed can ever be used. It is known as the Calvinistic system, in distinction from Arian, Armenian, Pelagian, and other systems of belief. It derives its authority, not from the learned men who compiled it, but from its conformity to the Word of God. It is a rule of faith, because it contains "the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures."

We inquire what disposition does Mr. C. make of the fact, that both "Old and New School" adopt the same standards? He treats it as of no moment, so far as the latter are concerned, only to prove their dishonesty; for he fraternally exhorts them to make "an *honest* subscription to our standards." He is a very zealous advocate for the standards. But, alas! they are worth nothing to settle the faith of "New School" men; they only show what "Old School" men believe. If the former adopt the confession as a "system of doctrine," this makes no difference; for they do not believe it. "New School" men, are not entitled to the benefit of their creed; they may use it if they choose, but this hardly creates a *presumption* as to the nature of their faith. Creeds and catechisms must indeed be very useful things, or "New School Presbyterians very *dishonest* men, according to the abounding charity of Mr. Cheeseman! The truth is, Mr. C., *cum aliis sui generis*, assumes in the very outset that *his* interpretation of the creed *is* the creed; and that those who may not choose to use his mind as a prism to dissolve its light, are, therefore, rejecters of the creed itself. Hence he but seldom refers to the Confession. When he quotes its language, he does not argue the question of its meaning, thus dodging his logical duty in the very moment of its professed performance. It is enough to tell what "we" hold, since what "we" hold is what the Confession teaches, and that, too, exactly as "we" hold it. As a specimen of downright insolence, we have never seen anything that went beyond Mr. C.'s treatment of "New School" Presbyterians in the matter of their subscription to the standards. As a specimen of argument, we have seldom witnessed a more shabby and perfectly rickety structure, than that of the author in relation to the meaning of the Confession. The celebrated John Foster, in his journal, observes, "There is a great deficiency of what may be called *conclusive* writing and speaking. How seldom do we feel, at the end of the paragraph or discourse, that something *is settled and done!*" "We are not compelled to say with ourselves—Yes, it is so! it must be so! that is decided to all eternity!" We think if Foster had been favored with a sight of Mr. C.'s book, he might have had a new illustration of these ideas.

If the author desired to settle points by a manly and candid mode of argument, his course was a very plain and simple one. First, upon the statement of a doctrinal point he should have quoted the Confession of Faith, chapter and section, showing, by a thorough exegesis of its language, and the history of its interpretation, what the confession taught in regard to that point. Secondly, he should have cited in their *very words*, "Old School" authorities and "New School," touching the same point, not distorting or partially representing their sentiments. Thirdly, upon compar-

¹ Life and Correspondence of John Foster, pp. 117, 118.

ing them with the Confession, the common standard of both schools, he should have candidly considered the *character* of their differences, if any existed; whether they were or were not such as existed when the Confession was formed,—and were fraternally compromised that it might be formed,—when it was adopted by Presbyterians in this country as the basis of union; such as have existed during the whole history of the Presbyterian Church in these United States; such as have been acknowledged from time immemorial in admitting the orthodox Congregationalists of New England into the Presbyterian Church; such as were not deemed grounds of suspicion, alienation, and separation among brethren while a good spirit prevailed: in short, whether these differences are fundamental—differences as to the essential and constituent parts of doctrine, or the mode of explaining that doctrine. The author ought to have performed a work of this kind, if his purpose was to make a fair case for the consideration of men. As a substitute, however, for all this, he assumes that “we” understand the Confession; and that because the “New School” do not in every particular understand it as “we” do, therefore they are heretics, though they subscribe to the Standards, and swear a solemn oath of honesty before God. They are dishonest men; and you need make no account of their creed, as any proof of their doctrinal faith! This, then, is another feature of the author’s method; namely, the unrighteous manner in which he treats the solemn profession of “New School” Presbyterians.¹

¹ The Christian Intelligencer of New York City, in an editorial notice of Mr. C.’s book, and in obvious allusion to “New School” Presbyterians, speaks of “those who, under the specious appearance of an orthodox creed, are seeking to introduce another gospel.” With the same allusion, the editor adverts to their “hidden evasions, and indirections, and concealed and guarded opposition to truth;” for bringing which “to light” he commends the work to “the friends of truth;” and assigns to it “able discrimination and sound reasoning.” He also implies, that “whatever may be the established creed” of these Presbyterians, still “the theology, *current* in the New School body,” is not in accordance with that creed. We confess we read these passages with a deep and painful sense of their injustice. Did the editor mean to say, that “New School” Presbyterians “do not heartily receive” their standards? that “under the specious appearance of an orthodox creed,” they “are seeking to introduce another gospel?”—that they are practising “hidden evasions and indirections, and concealed and guarded opposition to truth?” that “the pulpit and the press,” “the fountains of real sentiment,” as to “the theology *current* in the New School body,” prove that body dishonest in the retention of its “established creed?” All this fairly lies in the language. Is this the sentiment of the Protestant Reformed Dutch Church of this country? Then we are not a little astonished that they should hold any fraternal intercourse with the members of the “New School body;” that they should pay any respect to their certificates of dismission; that, in efforts to evangelize the world, they should mingle “with those who, under the specious appearance of an orthodox creed, are seeking to introduce another gospel;” that they should ever enter their pulpits, or receive them into their own. The implications are of the gravest character; they strike down the common Christianity of “the New School body”

But, it may be asked—Is it never lawful to undertake the proof, that a denomination has abandoned its standards, though professing to retain them? We answer: It is never lawful to set out with this assumption. A man is to be presumed innocent, until he is proved guilty. So a Christian denomination has a right to refer to its Standards as an exposition of its faith. Those standards are good and conclusive evidence, until overruled by stronger evidence. In the present instance, if “the current theology of the New School body” is hostile to the standards, why does not that body *formally* abandon them, and at once make a new Confession? The very terms of the supposition assume, that there are no difficulties *in* the body, in the way of taking this course. Where, then, are the difficulties? In the state of public opinion; which solution is the same thing as to say, that “New School” Presbyterians are *dishonest* men, holding one set of sentiments and professing another. But *who* says this? Dr. Lord, Mr. Cheeseman, and other champions of a certain kind of orthodoxy, who, begging nearly every question in dispute, perverting the sentiments of those they attack, substituting assertion for argument, and their philosophy for the Word of God and the Confession of Faith, violate all the just laws of reasoning; first, in making themselves orthodox; and secondly, in assailing others, who must silently and patiently bear their sundry impeachments, or be subjected to the necessity of a reply. They do this under color of zeal for the faith, in circumstances and ways that do not reflect much glory upon the character of that zeal. They make themselves *religious partizans*; and then ask the public to presume their orthodoxy, and equally the heresy of “New School” Presbyterians, until the latter is disproved by the sternest demonstration. We are well aware that the great mass of “Old School” brethren—ministers and laymen—take no such ground. We do not apply these remarks to them. But, where they fit, we are frank in saying, we mean that they shall apply; for they are nothing but the simple truth—truth, too, that has cost our Zion the loss of much peace and prosperity. These are the men who throw the “New School” subscription to the Standards out of the account, when weighing this class of Presbyterians in their strange balances. This is what Mr. C. does, to all intents and purposes: it is the very thing of which we complain, as an act of injustice, both logical and moral. We claim as good a right to be heard through our Standards as he has; and will not consent to have them torn away, without lifting a note of remonstrance against the violent deed. The mere circumstance that he is the accuser, not in an ecclesiastical

to its very foundation. It is on account of such—we know not what term to use, more than for any other reason, that we have undertaken to review this book, and expose it to the observation of men. In itself considered, we do not regard it as worthy of notice.

court, but in the court of the world's judgment, creates no presumption, that the Standards do not as faithfully represent the accused, as they do the accuser. We have dwelt upon this point, because we have felt the deep injustice of the course to which we have alluded.

But we will not stop here. We fully accept the author's challenge to seek, "in the widely circulated writings of their leading and influential divines," for a "criterion" of "their denominational theology." He need not suppose that we will "shrink from this most reasonable test," or "attempt to evade it," and thus give "evidence of conscious weakness and guilt." If it is legitimate to seek "in the widely circulated writings" of "New School" men, for "their denominational theology," it is equally legitimate to take the same course in respect to the "Old School." We propose, therefore, to look at the facts; to see, if we can, what the author has really done in the way of the "ultimate criterion" of "denominational theology." We will take a rapid glance at the witnesses, from whose testimony we are to ascertain the "denominational theology" of the two Schools. And here the reader may get a third idea of the author's method.

First: what are the authorities referred to by Mr. C., giving us the theological sentiments of "Old School" Presbyterians? We have searched his book carefully to collect these authorities, and present the result, as a specimen of his theological erudition. In all, he has taken a single extract from Owen's *Death of Death*; another from Symington on the Atonement; another from Junkin on Justification; and still another from Dr. Spring's *Dissertation on Native Depravity*. We have passed through the book, page by page; and these, so far as we have been able to discover, are all the "Old School" authorities with which he has favored the public. We have two questions: Who are the witnesses? What is the substance of their testimony?

As to the first witness, Dr. Owen, we take the liberty to inform the author, that he was neither an "Old," nor a "New School" Presbyterian, but attached to the Independents in England. His researches led him to think that the Presbyterian system of church Government, was not conformable to the Scriptures; he lived about two centuries since. He is of course no authority to prove what is the "denominational theology" of "Old School" Presbyterians in these United States. He belongs to that class of witnesses whom our discipline characterizes as *incompetent*. The work of Owen, from which the author quotes, is not in the "Catalogue of the books published by the Presbyterian Board of Publication." The second witness, though cotemporaneous with these times, is *trans-atlantic*; and furnishes no authoritative proof of "denominational theology" in this country. The third and fourth, namely,

Drs. Junkin and Spring, we acknowledge to be "Old School" authority, so far as ecclesiastical position is concerned; though judging from the "Vindication" of the former in the trial of Mr. Barnes, and the "Dissertation on Native Depravity," by the latter, we have the most serious doubts about their harmony in all respects. So much for the witnesses.

What is their testimony? The first three are cited to prove, that "Old School" Presbyterians believe in the *all-sufficiency* of Christ's atonement. This is the only point to which they testify. Do the "New School" disagree with them on this point? We believe not. The testimony of the last witness is, that "they" (alluding, obviously, to the New Haven divines,) "*could not tell,*" touching certain abstruse questions, more or less related to "the native character" of man. This, then, is the whole of it, namely; *four witnesses, two of whom are incompetent to testify; three of whom prove that "Old School" Presbyterians believe in the all-sufficiency of Christ's atonement; and one of whom, that the New Haven divines "could not tell!"* We ask the reader, if this is not an exceedingly brilliant illustration of the author's doctrine of seeking "in the widely circulated writings of their leading and influential divines," for an "ultimate criterion" of the "denominational theology" of "Old School" Presbyterians? Such light as to points of faith is seldom seen! The author does indeed occasionally quote the Confession of Faith, and generally without comment; but this is not to the purpose, since the question to be settled is, Which of the Schools is in best conformity to the Confession, equally adopted by both? The Confession, by the very terms of the trial, is not a witness, but a judge—and a judge too, not of *all* questions, but such only, as lie within the province of its doctrinal teaching.

True, the author, on a great variety of points, says, that "we" believe thus and so. But who are *we*? Mr. Cheeseman, speaking for the "Old School" without appointment, and at the time when he spake, without the least authority; and since he has spoken, the Biblical Repertory does not wish to commit itself to the work of "endorsing every sentiment," without informing us how much may be excluded by this cautious precaution. Has it come to this, that a Christian minister will compare "Old and New School Presbyterians," for the professed purpose of showing their "doctrinal differences," with such meagre authority, as to the real character of the *first* term? Does he suppose that reasoning has no laws? He was as much bound to quote "Old" as "New School" authorities, on all the points at issue. He might have done it; their standard writers, the Christian Advocate, the Biblical Repertory, the books of the Presbyterian Board of Publication, would have supplied him with ample materials, and perhaps a few qualifications as well as arguments, that did not occur to him. This was

especially appropriate, since his Old Schoolism is of but *recent* date, and liable, therefore, not to have all the finish which more time would give. His "Old School" brethren have just cause of complaint against him. He had no right to speak for them, without showing his authority. He was bound to say to the world: *This is merely my opinion*; I give you no proof: you may take it for what it is worth: this is what I think orthodoxy *ought* to be, and therefore what Old Schoolism *is*. His failure to give us, by authority, the "denominational theology" of "Old School Presbyterians," is a death-blow to the whole work, and needs only to be stated to make it look logically contemptible. How can two terms be compared in respect to their differences, until the question is first settled, what are the terms? We wonder, that his endorsers did not see this weak spot. We are quite willing to hope that, in the multiplicity of editorial engagements, they might have penned their notices, without that mature reading which they commend to others. By no sophistry is it possible to remedy this defect; it is absolutely fatal to his argument, and turns it out of a court of candor as an intellectual humbug. Should it be said, that the quotation of "Old School" authorities was not necessary; we ask, Why not? Is it, that the Confession of Faith is sufficient authority? Ah! this is to enter a judgment before you have tried the cause! Why was it necessary, then, to quote "New School" authorities? Any effort to relieve the author from the logical blameworthiness of his position, goes so far to turn his whole performance into a mere newspaper *slang*.

We turn to the author's "New School" authorities, to show the "denominational theology" of this branch of the Presbyterian Church. The *leading* authority, the one most frequently used, and on which he mainly relies, is Mr. Barnes in his Notes on Romans, II. Corinthians, Galatians and Ephesians. His principal citations are from the Notes on Romans. He also refers to Beman on the Atonement, Beecher's Sermon on the Native Character of Man, Duffield on Regeneration, Finney's Lectures, and Dr. Dewey. The reader will see that we have a greater array of authority on this side of the question, than upon the other. We propose to take a view of these several witnesses, in order to estimate the real character of the case the author has made out.

We begin with Mr. Barnes. He is arraigned by the author, charged with heresy, and through him all "New School" men likewise. Let us see how the case stands. In 1836 the question of Mr. Barnes' orthodoxy in his Notes on the Romans came up by appeal before the General Assembly, the ultimate and highest tribunal to settle such a question in the Presbyterian Church. He was then pronounced orthodox, and restored from his suspension by the Synod of Philadelphia, Dr. Lord, Mr. C.'s endorser, voting to sustain the appeal, with others then and now occupying high

places as "Old School" Presbyterians. What used to be familiarly known as "the Princeton party" in the "Old School" ranks, had not as yet been constrained to go to the full lengths of the "Philadelphia party," another cognomen for another subdivision of these ranks. Upon this trial before his peers, Mr. Barnes was not pronounced to be the heretic and apostate from the faith, which Mr. C. represents him to have been, and still to be. He made a full and explicit statement and vindication of his sentiments in reply to the charges of Dr. Junkin, which were subsequently published, entitled "Barnes' Defence," and of which Mr. C. has taken no notice, which is strange, if simple truth were his object. Mr. Barnes had his attention called to the doctrinal points by the charges and plea of his prosecutor; and was therefore placed in circumstances to bring out his views with great distinctness. He did so bring them out; the General Assembly heard them, and told him to keep on preaching the gospel. It had been well, and but an act of candor, if Mr. C. had used this "Defence" in connection with his use of the Notes.

The plain fact, then, is, that the leading authority to show the heresy of "New School" Presbyterians, turns out to be just *no heretic at all*, in the judgment of the General Assembly. The collected wisdom and piety of the Presbyterian Church, as then represented, are at variance with the author on a question of fact. It may be said that the General Assembly also was heretical in 1836. Ah! why so? Because it did not condemn Mr. Barnes. Would it have been orthodox if it had condemned him? What! the General Assembly, the supreme judge of the Standards, orthodox when it votes one way, and heretical when it votes the other! The General Assembly heretical, when Dr. Lord himself and other men of unquestionable orthodoxy, voted with and helped to make the majority! What kind of Presbyterianism is this! But, who says this? Mr. Cheeseman, if he says anything. Well, is Mr. C. an appellate court, authoritatively to review the decisions of the General Assembly? Aside from the question of authority, whose judgment is probably the best? The brother must be remarkably modest, and withal actuated by a profound respect for the Standards, a *thorough going* Presbyterian, if he wishes the privilege of reversing the decrees of the highest tribunal in the Presbyterian Church. This would place him in that strange genus of ecclesiastical humanity that virtually says: All *right*, if we have the majority; but if not, then all *wrong*. Dr. Junkin, in bringing his charges, professed a wish to obtain a decision of the "proper tribunals" upon the doctrinal points, and was gratified; and had before him either of two alternatives; namely, quietly to respect that decision as a good citizen of the Presbyterian commonwealth, or, if he could not conscientiously do this, then peacefully to withdraw. On the whole, we think Mr. Barnes' orthodoxy will outlive

the severe castigations of Mr. C. The fact that he sat unharmed beneath the orthodox ægis of the General Assembly, Dr. Lord himself holding up the shield with both hands, will be taken, we apprehend, by the generality of mankind as a tolerably fair answer to Mr. Cheeseman's charge of heresy. He is a very good witness to prove, not the heresy, but the orthodoxy of "New School" Presbyterians.

But lest the author may think this a kind of special pleading that forces him into an unhappy position, we will place his witness before the "Old School" Synod of Philadelphia, at whose bar he was condemned by a decided majority, and whose decision was reversed by the next General Assembly. We have read the history of his trial before this Synod, "with all the pleadings and debates as reported for the New-York Observer." There were some very severe things said by many of the members well known to be "Old School" men. But not all "Old School" men thought and spake as did the majority, by any means. And as a specimen of several speeches somewhat similar, we give that of Dr. M'Dowell: "I can vote with a good conscience that Mr. Barnes is guilty of holding great and dangerous errors, but not that he holds fundamental errors. I believe that he holds to the doctrine of total depravity as firmly as any man in this house, and that he believes this depravity to be derived from our connection with Adam. I believe he holds that there is no salvation for a sinner, but through Jesus Christ, and that he is saved only on the ground of the merits of Christ, and that he becomes interested in these merits exclusively by faith. And I believe further, that he holds to the absolute necessity of the influences of the Holy Ghost to convert and sanctify the soul. I have long known that he differed from me in his mode of explaining some of these points, but I am satisfied that on the great fundamental doctrines of our religion he preaches in this way. I stand before the public in the expression of this opinion, and I shall act accordingly." We leave this witness, endorsed by his own Presbytery—as to the fundamentals of religion endorsed by as good an "Old School" man as Dr. M'Dowell in the heat of a warm controversy—then endorsed by the General Assembly. We are not at all dissatisfied with his introduction, especially since we cannot learn from Mr. C. either what is the "denominational theology" of "Old School" Presbyterians, or what the Confession of Faith teaches. All we learn from him is what "we" hold. For aught that appears in Mr. C.'s book, Mr. Barnes is as sound an "Old School" divine as there is in the land. This is not lightly said; for, be it remembered, that what an "Old School" divine *is*, Mr. C. has no where shown us. We see very distinctly what *he* is; but more we do not see.

Dr. Lyman Beecher is another of these "New School" witnesses.

'Trial of Rev. A. Barnes, for Heresy, p. 255.

He also is one of the "leading and influential divines;" venerable in years—honored by God, with a long and very useful ministry—and having some evidences of the high esteem and confidence of the churches. It will be remembered, that he was called to pass through the fiery ordeal of an ecclesiastical prosecution for heresy, upon charges presented by Dr. Wilson, of Cincinnati, and that he came out orthodox in the judgment of those whom the Constitution made judges in the case. His cause was first tried by his own Presbytery; and afterwards by an appeal of his prosecutor, it went up to the Synod of Cincinnati; in both of which courts, he was declared sound in the faith. At the request of the Synod, he soon after published his "Views in Theology," embodying the substance of his defence when on trial. Of this book, Mr. C. has taken no notice. We commend it to his special attention. We recommend him to read the *authorities* therein cited, that he may see how many good and great men must stand or fall with Dr. Beecher. He will find the Dr. to be a very orthodox divine, if the Word of God, the Confession of Faith, and an almost endless series of authorities on doctrinal points, can prove such a claim. Perhaps the testimony of this witness, if thoroughly studied, will give him a better opinion of "New School" Presbyterians.

Dr. Beman is also in the list. The author makes a somewhat free use of his little work on the Atonement. The alleged "New School" heresy of this book, is narrowed down to a single point; namely, that Christ did not suffer the *literal* penalty of the law threatened against the sinner. We answer, the Confession of Faith does not affirm what Dr. Beman denies. The author has made no attempt to prove that it does: and he would have failed, had he tried the experiment. Dr. Beman's heresy consists in believing that the sacrifice of Christ was a substitute for the penalty, and not the identical penalty due to the sinner. It may, perhaps, be well to relieve the author's horror of this heresy, by giving him the language of Dr. Lightfoot, who was a member of the Westminster Assembly, and contributed his learning and piety to the compilation of the Confession of Faith. "Was Christ so much as punished by God? Much less, then, was he overwhelmed by the wrath of God, damned by God. Was a lamb punished, that was sacrificed? He was afflicted, but not punished: for punishment argues a crime or fault preceding. Were the sad sufferings of Christ laid on him as punishment? Certainly not for his own sins: no, nor for ours neither. He suffered for our sins, bore our sins; but his sufferings were not punishments for our sins." Thus, we see that even the Westminster Assembly was not orthodox. The author might write another book to show the existence of heresy in that august body.

The next witness is Dr. Duffield, in his work on Regeneration.

¹ Lightfoot's Works. London Edition, 1822, vol. vi. pp. 22, 24.

The first extract is from Chap. xx. entitled, "The moral certainty of Human Depravity." The quotation reads thus: "It is a question alike pertinent and important, whether in the incipient period of infancy and childhood, there can be any moral character whatever possessed, * * * properly speaking, we can predicate of it neither sin nor holiness."¹ Our first remark upon this quotation is, that the author has taken fragments of two distinct sentences, and united them so as to make one. Our next remark is, that he has mutilated the last of these sentences by a defective quotation. Compare the two readings: Mr. C.'s—"properly speaking we can predicate of it neither sin nor holiness." Dr. Duffield's—"properly speaking, THEREFORE, we can predicate of it neither sin nor holiness, PERSONALLY CONSIDERED." He has equally mutilated the *first* sentence, as will appear from the following comparison:—Mr. C.'s reading: "It is a question alike pertinent and important," &c.: Dr. Duffield's: "WE SAY FUTURE, for it is a question alike pertinent and important," &c.² We charge Mr. C. with unfairness in quoting his author. In the chapter from which these *garbled* extracts are made, Dr. Duffield maintains, as he does also in others, the *FACT* of the consequential derivation of human depravity from the sin of our first parents. He discards certain human theories, philosophies of men, which have been offered in explanation of this fact. He observes—"Our object is simply an observation of facts, so far as they tend to shape or affect the *future* moral character of the child. We say *future*, for it is a question alike pertinent and important, whether in the incipient period of infancy and childhood, there can be any *moral character* whatever possessed." Upon this "question," the Dr. proceeds to remark, explaining the *sense* in which he uses the phrase, "*moral character*." "Moral character, is character acquired by *acts* of a moral nature. Moral acts are those acts which are contemplated by the law, prescribing the rule of human conduct." Taking this view of the phrase, the Dr. then holds that we cannot predicate "personal sin" of an infant before it has *acted*, when it "has not committed *acts*, which can be considered *violations of the law of God*. It has no *personal* sin; for it has not *morally* acted." "Properly speaking, therefore, we can predicate of it neither sin nor holiness, (a moral character,) *personally* considered." The *substance*, then, of the heresy, is simply this: That an *infant* that does not know its right from its left hand, "neither having done any good or evil," is not a sinner, "*personally* considered." This conflicts with the author's theory of *physical* sinfulness; and therefore Dr. Duffield, and by imputation "New School" Presbyterians also, are heretics. We purposely avoid a discussion of this subject in the present connection; and will hand Mr. C. over to the tender mercies of one of his "Old School" witnesses; namely, Gardiner Spring, D. D., in

¹ p. 110.² Duffield on Regeneration, pp. 377, 379.

his "Dissertation on Native Depravity." Dr. Spring holds that there is "no other sin in the empire of Jehovah, except this," (p. 9,) namely, the sin of *actual* transgression. It is fair to cross question his own witness to learn the "denominational theology" of "Old School" Presbyterians; and quite sure are we, that if Dr. Duffield is a heretic for rejecting Mr. Cheeseman's theory of *physical* sinfulness, so is Dr. Spring. The latter holds, that whatever constitutes "the human soul a sinner at the age of three-score years-and-ten, essentially constitutes it a sinner from its birth." What is this, according to Dr. Spring? The violation of God's law—moral action—this, and this only. Very true, the Dr. maintains, that this commences at birth; and as true that he avows the offensive heresy of Dr. Duffield: even more than this, for what the latter says is not inconsistent with the doctrine of original sin, understanding by this, something different from what we mean when we speak of sin in application to moral *actions*. Is the same opinion orthodoxy in one man, and a glaring heresy in another?

We refer to another quotation. "Shall we suppose that God cannot do with sinners, in reference to himself, what one man has done with another; that a physical efficiency is necessary to make the sinner willing to confide in him. * * * It would be, in effect, to say that man can subdue his foe, and, by an appropriate moral influence, convert him into a friend, but that God cannot convert his enemy, and bring him to believe, except he puts forth his physical power, and literally creates him over again." The amount of this testimony is, that Dr. Duffield does not believe in the theory of *physical* regeneration, such as would imply that God "*literally* creates" the sinner "over again." If this is heresy, then orthodoxy is to believe that God does "*literally* create him over again!" Dr. Duffield holds, that the Spirit, by a "special and immediate, or supernatural influence," secures the conversion of sinners, maintaining at the same time, that this "efficient agency of the Spirit, is in perfect unison with the moral influence of the truth;"—that the Holy Spirit overcomes the sinner's aversion to holiness, and makes him willing in the day of His power; "that the power which God exerts, is *through the truth*, as a means, and not directly on the naked soul;" and that this view is distinguishable from the absurd theory of *physical*, coercive, and literally creative regeneration.² In the passage cited by Mr. C., the Dr. simply inquires, whether God cannot convert sinners by the use of His own truth, whether "of his own will," He can not beget "*us with the Word of truth*," whether we must adopt the theory of a "*creative* force, acting directly, immediately on the naked soul of man, without the intervention of truth, or any medium or means of influence whatever,"³ in order to account for the fact of regene-

¹ p. 137.

² Duffield on Regeneration, pp. 482. 483.

³ Two Discourses on Regeneration, by George Duffield, p. 4.

ration. This is the Dr.'s whole crime, so far as set forth by the author;—the crime of asking the question, whether God cannot convert a sinner without *literally* creating him over again! A very great heresy! a painful evidence, that the "New School," and not a few of the "Old," have departed from the faith! a luminous proof, that "they, in effect, make truth an agent!" As a correction of his *crude* notions on this whole subject, we recommend to his special notice, "Charnock on Regeneration;" also, a Review in the Biblical Repertory, for April, 1830, of Dr. Cox's sermon on "Regeneration and the Manner of its Occurrence." He gives abundant evidence that he is not familiar with the writings of the "leading and influential divines," to be cited in proof of the "denominational theology" of "Old School" Presbyterians.

We present a third quotation by the author: "Not much less deluding are the systems and tactics of those who, fearing to invade the province of the Spirit, are careful to remind the sinner that he is utterly unable by his own unassisted powers, either to believe or repent, to the saving of his soul. It might as truly be said that he cannot rise and walk by his own unassisted powers." This is cited as proof that "New School" Presbyterians reject the agency of the Holy Spirit in revivals. The extract is taken from Chap. 29, entitled "The means of Grace." The author has mutilated the first sentence. In the original it reads: "Not much less deluding are the systems and tactics of those who, fearing to invade the province of the Spirit, are careful to remind the sinner, AT EVERY TURN, that he is utterly unable by his own unassisted powers, either to believe, or to repent to the saving of his soul." The phrase, "*at every turn*," is a part of the sentence which gives complexion to the meaning of the whole. And we inquire, what was the author's *instinct*, that led him to cut a passage out of the middle of the Dr.'s sentence? He must have seen the passage, as proved by the fact that he saw the words on both sides of it. Why did he not quote it, when professing literally to give the language of Dr. Duffield? The simple truth is, it changes the complexion of the Dr.'s words. His object was to administer a rebuke to those who, in urging the sinner to believe and repent, are careful "at every turn," to tell him that he has no power to believe and repent, lest they invade the province of the Spirit. If there be no such persons, then the rebuke is harmless; but if there be, then we commend to every reader of the Bible the question, whether they preach repentance and faith to sinners after the example of the apostles. But, does the Dr. repudiate and dishonor the agency of the Spirit in the matter of the sinner's conversion, as Mr. C. would fain make his reader believe? Ah! there are passages in this very chapter, and one in the paragraph but one sentence removed from the sentence quoted, which must have met

¹ p. 172

² Duffield on Regeneration, p. 542.

his eye, and fully taught him, that Dr. Duffield, as really as himself, believed in the doctrine of the Holy Ghost, and conversion by His power. That the reader may see Mr. C.'s *manner* of representing to the public the sentiments of others, we give one or two of these passages. "The sinner that truly repents, will learn more effectually from his *own* EXPERIENCE than from all human teaching, to whom the efficacious grace, which made him willing to turn to God, is to be ascribed." A sentence of just *seven* words separates this from the one quoted by the author, as proof of Dr. Duffield's heresy. "It is only as the use of the means of grace secures the *divine agency*, that they become *effective* means of salvation." "In the conversion of a sinner, the agency of God is the result of special DESIGN, and not according to any fixed law, to which, as in the operations of nature, successful appeals may be infallibly made." We might cite such passages indefinitely, showing the *faith* of Dr. Duffield. And yet, Mr. C. not making the distinction between *natural and moral inability*, as does the Dr., would leave the impression upon the reader's mind, that he discards the agency of God in the conversion of sinners, and holds "another gospel." The Dr., as the whole connection shows, was simply replying to those, who, when they urge sinners to repent and believe, "at every turn," deny that they have the repenting *faculty*, lest they "invade the province of the Spirit." If Mr. C.'s use of the passage is orthodox, we ask whether it is *candid*?

It will be remembered that this same Dr. Duffield was once tried by the "Old School" Presbytery of Carlisle upon charges based on the sentiments of this book. There were ten charges of error; on eight of which the Presbytery, by a divided vote, rendered a verdict of *guilty*; on two of which, *not* guilty. In reference to the censure, the Presbytery, after receiving notice from the accused of his intention to appeal and complain to the next General Assembly, adopted the following preamble and resolution: "As to the counts in which Mr. Duffield has been found guilty, Presbytery judge that Mr. Duffield's book and sermons on Regeneration do contain the specified errors; yet, as Mr. Duffield alleges that Presbytery have misinterpreted some of his expressions, and says he does in fact hold all the doctrines of our Standards, and that he wishes to live in amity with his brethren, and labor without interference for the glory of God, and the salvation of souls; Therefore, Resolved, That Presbytery at present do not censure him any further than to warn him to guard against such speculations as may impugn the doctrines of our Church, and that he study to maintain the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." "Messrs. James and M^r.K. Williamson (the active agents of the prosecution,) gave notice of their intention to protest and complain of this decision to

¹ pp. 537, 538.

the next General Assembly." The Presbytery then appointed their commissioners "a committee to defend the Presbytery against all appeals and complaints, which may come before the Assembly against the doings of Presbytery." The protestants did not prosecute their complaint before the Assembly; and in view of the final action of the Presbytery, Mr. Duffield had no occasion to prosecute his; and thus the matter ended.

It will be seen, "that the final sentence" of the Presbytery was a "virtual acquittal." It did not touch the ministerial standing of Mr. D., but simply warned him "to guard against such speculations as may impugn the doctrines of our church;" it did not decide that his "speculations" had done this, or that "the specified errors," set forth in the charges, were incompatible with a faithful adherence to the Standards. This "Old School" Presbytery, therefore, did not see in Mr. Duffield "another gospel;" and thus they differed very materially from Mr. C. in their judgment.

Mr. Finney is the author's next witness. He quotes quite freely and on sundry points, the testimony of this writer. We have no occasion to follow the track of these quotations; but would remark that Mr. Finney is not, and has not been for many years a Presbyterian, "Old School" or "New." We suppose that Mr. C. is acquainted with this fact; and we cannot withhold the expression of our surprise, that he should refer to this writer, as an authority for the "denominational theology" of "New School" Presbyterians, without even intimating the well-known truth in regard to Mr. Finney's position. It is disingenuous. It is a very easy thing to say that "New School" men are all *Finneyites*, as it is easy for a man to say more things in five minutes, than he can prove in forty years. Without traveling out of our way to present the points and grounds of our dissent from Mr. Finney's views, we emphatically object to the testimony.

The name of Dr. Dewey also figures on the author's pages. He has contrived to insert a number of passages, in some of which Dr. Dewey, so far as the *words* are concerned, has written in a manner *orthodox enough* for any Presbyterian, "Old School" or "New." From this he infers a doctrinal affinity between Unitarians and "New School" Presbyterians. We make no reply, for we have no words to waste upon such reasoning.

The reader has now an insight of Mr. Cheeseman's manner of going back of the Confession to what he calls "an ultimate criterion" of "denominational theology." His "Old School" authorities, all told, are just four in number, two of whom are not competent witnesses. The *all-sufficiency* of the atonement, and that "*they could not tell*;" these are the matters proved. This paucity of evidence is compensated for, by a very expanded amplification

* Principles of Presbyterian Discipline, &c.; Carlisle: printed by George Fleming, 1835—p. 113.

and frequent use of the word "we." We have never seen an instance, in which "we" was so large and pompous a term. Of his "New School" authorities, as revelations of their own heresy, and, by imputation, the heresy of others, after the previous remarks, we shall leave a candid world to its own judgment. The truth is, he has made no case for trial; he is logically *non-suited*. He must have calculated very largely on the credulity and stupidity of his readers. Such a method would be exceedingly questionable in a political campaign, where "*stump speeches*" are made merely for effect; in a grave theological discussion it is perfectly unbearable. It violates the very first laws of good reasoning. If the "New School" were the greatest heretics that ever lived, the author has not given one particle of evidence, that the "Old School" are not quite as bad. To his virtual proposition, that we should take him as an exponent of the latter, we can only say, *we wish to be excused*. We much prefer to see his authorities, and that too in their own words.

If from the author's *general* method, we now turn to what may be denominated his *particular* method, we shall find another very large and varied subject for critical remarks. In reading his book for the purposes of a review, we had divided this method into several branches in the following manner: Instances in which the author quotes the Scriptures to prove a point, when the passage has no relation to the point to be proved: instances of *false* interpretation of the Bible, and many more of no interpretation: instances in which he contrives to mingle his own philosophy with, as if a part of, the Word of God: instances of gross injustice in quoting "New School" authorities: instances of unauthorized inference and false statement in respect to "New School" Presbyterians: instances of passages, either containing no ideas, or ideas in some cases ridiculous and in others perfectly abhorrent. To do justice to this schedule of subjects would be to write another article. We offer one or two examples.

He accuses Mr. Barnes of "indirection" and evasion in his comment upon Rom. 8:7: "Because the carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." The evidence is in these words of Mr. Barnes: "The apostle does not express any opinion about the metaphysical ability of man, or discuss that question at all." "But the affirmation does not mean that the *heart* of the sinner might not be subject to God; or that the *soul* is so physically depraved that he cannot obey, or that *he* might not obey the law. On that the apostle here expresses no opinion. That is not the subject of the discussion." The author's comment is in the following words: "Here we are told substantially, that the very thing which the apostle did say, he did not say, or at least that he did not mean to say it; yea, that he expressed no opinion on that point, selecting the only point on

which the apostle expressed himself in the most decided terms, and contriving to contradict him without seeming to do so, and that by an adroit introduction of the words metaphysical and physical.” We have two remarks. First, the author has committed himself to the doctrine of *physical* depravity, sin in the very *substance* of the soul; for this is what Mr. Barnes says Paul did *not* say, and what Mr. C. says he did say. Secondly, as a hermeneutical question, Mr. Barnes is right, and M. C. is wrong, in the interpretation of the passage. “*Διότι τὸ φρόνημα τῆς σαρκὸς, ἔχθρα εἰς θεόν· τὸ γὰρ νόημα τοῦ θεοῦ οὐχ ὁμοιάσεται, οὐδὲ γὰρ δύναται.*” Rom. 8: 7. Of what does the apostle predicate “enmity against God,” etc.? “*τὸ φρόνημα τῆς σαρκὸς.*” What is this? Literally, and truly, as Mr. Barnes says, “the *minding of the flesh.*” This “minding of the flesh” is not the mind itself considered as a simple *essence*, nor is it a *faculty* of the mind, but an operation, a yielding to the flesh, a *state*, and not a faculty. Immaterial what is true about metaphysical ability or physical depravity, that truth is not the subject of affirmation or denial by the apostle. The *minding of the flesh* is put in contrast with the *minding of the spirit* in the 6th verse; and neither *minding* applies to the faculties of the soul, simply as such. If Mr. C., therefore, had referred to his Greek Testament, forgetting his “Old School” mania while he studied the very words of the apostle, he would not have accused Mr. Barnes of “indirection,” and cited his “singular evasiveness” as a specimen of “New School” theology. The “indirection” is solely with the author. The very thing he undertakes to condemn, that he does.

We present an instance in which the author does great injustice to Mr. Barnes’ Exposition of Rom. iv. 3: “For what saith the scripture? Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness.” What are Mr. B.’s views of justification by faith, according to the picture drawn by Mr. C.? “But Mr. Barnes, in opposition to this, (the *Larg. Cat. Ans. 73*, and *Short. Cat. Ans. 33*.) affirms, that the act itself (faith,) is imputed to us for righteousness. On Rom. iv. 3; “It was counted unto him for righteousness,” he remarks, “*It* here evidently refers to the act of believing. It does not refer to the righteousness of another, of God, or of the Messiah. Faith is always an act of the mind, it is not a created essence which it placed within the soul. It is not a substance created independently of the soul, and placed within it by Almighty power. It is not a principle. For the expression, a principle of faith, is as unmeaning as a principle of joy, or a principle of sorrow, or a principle of remorse. God promises, man believes, and this is the whole of it.” After farther quoting Mr. B., the author observes: “Hence Mr. Barnes obviously teaches that faith is an act demonstrable of love to God, and to which God is graciously pleased to promise pardon, *though it receives not, as indeed it cannot, the “righteousness of God, or of the Messiah.”*”

¹ pp. 32, 33.

Again, remarking upon Mr. B.'s coincidence with Dr. Dewey, he observes: "Faith, (says Mr. Barnes,) is an act demonstrable of love to God. It is a state of mind to which God is graciously pleased to promise pardon. *It has no reference to the righteousness of another, of God, or of the Messiah.* God promises, man believes: and this is the whole of it." What, then, is the offensive matter in Mr. Barnes' views, according to the account given by Mr. C.? We suppose, not that faith is "an act demonstrable of love to God," nor that it is "a state of mind to which God is graciously pleased to promise pardon;" this is orthodox enough for aught we can see; but that "*it has no reference to the righteousness of another, of God, or of the Messiah;*" and here surely the creed is bad enough. This is a rejection of the work of Christ in the matter of justification, faith without its object. If Mr. Barnes, or even John Calvin, holds this view, let him be condemned. But if Mr. B. does not hold this view, then let Mr. C. be set down as a *false accuser* of his Christian brother.

What then does Mr. Barnes teach? On the passage, "And it was counted unto him for righteousness," he observes, "The word 'it,' here evidently refers to the *act* of believing," namely, Abraham's act of believing. "It does not refer to the righteousness of another, of God, or of the Messiah," that is to say, by this word "it," is not meant the "righteousness of another," but the faith of Abraham, "which in *some sense* is counted to him for righteousness. In what sense this was, is explained directly after." Now, if Mr. Barnes be in fault here, then is the apostle also, both here and in the fifth verse; "But to him that worketh, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his *faith* is counted for righteousness." What is counted? His faith. To whom? To him "that believeth." For what? "For righteousness." But does the apostle or Mr. Barnes teach, that faith is so counted, though it receives not Christ, though it "*has no reference*" to the work of Christ, as Mr. C. would make us believe in respect to the latter? No such thing; and here we accuse him of a great want of truth and candor. When Mr. Barnes said, "God promises, the man believes; and this is the whole of it," he was *defining* faith as the believing act; for he immediately adds, "Beyond the mental operation there is nothing in the case; and the word is strictly limited to such an act of the mind throughout the Bible." He was not saying, as Mr. C., by changing the relation of his sentences, and putting his words into a false position, makes him say, "this is the whole of it," in reference to the *relations* of faith, or God's gracious reckoning in regard to it. This is not Mr. B. speaking for himself, but Mr. C.'s very ungracious caricature of Mr. Barnes. There is no apology for this untruthful exhibition of another's sentiments. Mr. C. had the means of knowing better, in Mr. Barnes' notes upon the verse

¹ pp. 56, 57, 58.

in question. In commenting on the phrase, "*For righteousness,*" Mr. Barnes said, "In order to justification; or to regard and treat him in connection with this (his faith) *as a righteous man.*" In expanding this generic statement, he said, "It is in no sense a matter of merit on our part, and thus stands distinguished entirely from justification by works, or by conformity to the law. From beginning to end, it is, so far as *we* are concerned, a matter of grace. The *merit* by which all this is obtained, is the work of the Lord Jesus Christ, through whom this plan is proposed, and by whose atonement alone God can consistently pardon and treat as righteous those who are in themselves ungodly." In his comments on the fifth verse, he says, "But he (God) regards them (believers) *as united by faith to the Lord Jesus; and IN THIS RELATION he judges that they SHOULD be treated as his friends, though they have been, are, and always will be personally undeserving.*" Mr. Barnes, if we understand him, holds that faith is the the *instrumental* cause of justification, and that it is reckoned to the believer for righteousness, not as a work of merit, but because it receives the merits of Christ; that God for Christ's sake freely pardons and graciously saves those who are united to Christ by faith. If the author meant to say, that Mr. B. did not believe that the moral character of the Saviour was set over to believers so as to be really and truly their character, that he did not believe in the transfer of Christ's character to His people; then he should have used very different language. As it is, he has grievously misrepresented his Christian brother.

Passing by a long list of passages we had noted for comment, we conclude by giving a specimen of the author's ideas of our common Christianity.

"The differences which separate believers into denominations are various, and though each communion may receive a sufficient amount of evangelical truth to preserve their church state, yet, when each one shall have relinquished all their differences with every other, the denomination which would be the result would have but little to distinguish it from an association of free-thinkers." "And thus we might proceed to include other denominations, and to show, that if we should agree to relinquish our respective differences for the sake of a common union with each other, we should, in that event, agree to relinquish every evangelical truth, everything held dear and sacred by any." Our present concern is not with the design of the author in making the above statements, but with the statements themselves. We think they will fall as a new and strange sound upon Protestant ears; and were they true, we should be compelled to adopt the mournful lamentation of Dr. Junkin, in reference to the alledged heresies of

¹ pp. 206, 207.

Mr. Barnes, and say, *ex animo*, that such doctrines shake the foundation of our personal hopes for eternity.

The question is not whether an organic and formal union of all "believers" is either practicable or desirable; but, what would be the consequence of such a union? The author assures us, that it would turn the whole family of Christ into little else than "*an association of free-thinkers*;" that it would be "*to relinquish every evangelical truth, everything held dear and sacred by any!*" He contradicts himself in the very act of making the statement. He concedes to "each communion" of believers "a sufficient amount of evangelical truth to preserve the integrity of their church state." If they have this amount, being separate, would they have any less when united? He fully grants the infidel scandal against the church of Christ; makes Christianity, as embodied in that church, a mere matter of *moonshine*; substantially affirms that there is no ground of "evangelical truth" common to, and held equally by all Christians—that there is no unity of faith—that Christians doctrinally cease to be Christians the moment you deduct their differences, and take only their agreements. If they would relinquish "every evangelical truth" by union, will the author tell us how many such truths they hold in a state of disunion? He will please also to show the beautiful symmetry of thought between this new doctrine and another idea of the same chapter, namely, "The church is in all ages the same, and her testimony is the same." The same! What! when her differences are so great, that if these were given up for the sake of union, all would be gone! One general wreck would ensue! No wonder, the author with such a creed in his heart and in his head, and the other kindred *custodes ecclesiarum omnium*, should want to magnify "Differences." There is nothing else to magnify; the very life of Christianity is in them; the moment you lose sight of these, there is nothing to be seen but the ruins of a supposed faith. This certainly is a very sensible and comprehensive view of our glorious Christianity. Peradventure, it may be one of those rhetorical exuberances, sudden inspirations of fancy, that led the "Presbyterian" to think "that a little pruning would not injure the style." We suggest this as a very good passage to begin with.

It is really painful to witness such an exhibition of theological *disease*, or of the most radical, High-Church sectarian monomania. Under the influence of either, the mind acquires a cast of thought, which makes it almost *insane*. Amid all the actual harmonies of the Christian world, the subject of the strange passion is incessantly sounding his favorite note of "Differences." It is his key-note; and by a vitiated moral taste he learns to relish the music. That he should write a book on this subject, if he writes anything, is no marvel. If he is a preacher, he will doubtless often edify his people with the theme. Go where he will, do what he will, his pre-

vailing passion will steal the march on him. Put him in the World's Convention, laboring to form an Evangelical Alliance upon a doctrinal basis common to Protestant Christians; and there he is in a spasm of agony on account of his favorite theme. The idea of such an Alliance—why, it is a perfect *humbug*! The moment Christians undertake to agree by a relinquishment of "differences," all their supposed unity of faith evaporates! They agree! Never, except at the expense of "every evangelical truth!"

In taking leave of Mr. C. we remark, that he has presented no cause for trial, touching the "Doctrinal Differences between Old and New School Presbyterians." So far as his book is concerned, we know not what they are, and could make no reply, were we ever so much disposed to try it. The witnesses on one side only have been heard. It is not certain that even the brother himself is an "Old School" Presbyterian. How he would appear when brought to the standard of high authorities, no mortal can guess from his work. Hence we totally decline all comparison of the "Differences," with his statement for a basis.

ARTICLE IV.

THEOPHANIES OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

By REV. E. NOYES, A. M., Pastor of the Freewill Baptist Church, Boston.

THE Scriptures, both of the Old and New Testament, are exceedingly explicit in maintaining the invisibility of the DIVINE BEING. Let the following texts be considered, viz: Ex. 33: 20, "There shall no man see me and live." Job 9: 11, "So he goeth by me, and I see him not; he passeth on also, but I perceive him not." John 1: 18, "No man hath seen God at any time." John 5: 37, "Ye have neither heard his voice at any time, nor seen his shape." Rom. 1: 20, "For the invisible things of him (are) his eternal power and Godhead." Col. 1: 15, "Image of the invisible God." Heb. 11: 27, "He (Moses) endured, as seeing him who is invisible." 1 Tim. 6: 16, "Whom no man hath seen, nor can see."

Now with these positive declarations of God's invisibility before us, what are we to do with that numerous class of texts found in the Old Testament, in which God seems to place himself within the scope of human senses, causing both his *voice* to be heard and his *shape* to be seen? We might indeed suppose that such language was made use of to express a spiritual appearance of God, did not the circumstances connected with such manifestations