

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1858.

No. IV.

ARTICLE I.—*A Discourse commemorative of the History of the Church of Christ in Yale College, during the first Century of its Existence.* Preached in the College Chapel, November 22, 1857. With Notes and an Appendix. By GEORGE P. FISHER, Livingston Professor of Divinity. New Haven: Thomas H. Pease. 1858.

ANY historical review of the course of any department in Yale College for the past century, cannot fail to bring to light facts of great interest and importance. This is peculiarly true of the history of the Christian church and religion in such an institution during a period so extended, so critical, and so formative for all public institutions in our country. Foremost among these is the church, in close relation to which are Christian colleges, which, deriving their sap from the church, seem beyond any other public institutions to partake of its life, vigour, and perpetuity. The history of the church in these seats of learning and culture, serves to illustrate the mutual relation and reciprocal influence of high education and vital Christianity. On these general grounds, therefore, the friends of religion and education will acknowledge their obligations to Professor Fisher for his careful and dispassionate survey of the formation, growth, and vicissitudes of the church of Christ in Yale College, and for the many curious and instructive facts which he has rescued from oblivion in executing the task.

The topics which naturally come into bold relief in such a discourse, are religion in colleges, the best means for its promotion, together with their present, as compared with their former, moral and religious state. These subjects are of commanding interest and importance. They receive ample illustration in Professor Fisher's discourse. Inviting as these topics are, we must pass them by at this time.

There is another topic which is more or less discussed in this pamphlet, owing to the peculiar relation which Yale College sustains to it. Says Professor Fisher: "In recounting its religious history, it is proper to notice what the College has done for theological science. The fathers of the New England theology—Edwards, Bellamy, Hopkins, West, Smalley, Emmons, and Dwight—went forth from Yale. The younger Jonathan Edwards is the only one of the leading expounders of the New Divinity who was educated elsewhere. He was a graduate of Nassau Hall. The first and most eminent of these, after taking his degree, remained here for several years as resident graduate, and afterwards as tutor. Here, in his own judgment, his religious life began; here his principles were formed, and he received the discipline which prepared him to take the highest rank in the field of intellectual science. Bellamy, who was converted soon after leaving college, and Hopkins, were pupils of Edwards. From Hopkins, West derived his theology; Smalley studied with Bellamy, and Emmons with Smalley. These men, and especially the foremost one among them, who gave impulse to all the rest, have strongly influenced the thinking of the age. Whatever is distinctive of American theology as contrasted with the general theology of the church, may be traced to them. . . . The leaders of the various parties in theology among us, who have contended in recent times, were most of them instructed by Dr. Dwight, and profess to deduce their views from his teaching.* Yale College has borne a theological stamp from the outset." Pp. 36, 37.

* Foremost among these, as most of our readers are aware, were Drs. Tyler and Taylor, both deceased since the publication of Professor Fisher's discourse, and both graduates of Yale College. To these may be added, Dr. Griffin, and Professor Stuart, among the dead; Drs. Hewit, and Harvey, and

“Now add to these parties a third, which arose later under the lead of President Edwards, who was graduated here about twenty years before President Clap was placed at the head of the College. Its members were the most able and thorough adversaries of Arminianism; but in the process of defending the established faith, they were led to recast it in new forms and to change its aspect. Their system thus originated, was termed the New Divinity, and in later times has received the name of New England Theology. The younger President Edwards has enumerated ten ‘improvements’ on the theology of his day, made by his father and his father’s followers. *In truth, however, their distinction, especially at the outset, was not so much in the circumstance that they broached new opinions, as in the fact that their views were the result of independent reflection, and were maintained on philosophical grounds.*” Page 7.

The election of Dr. Dwight to the Presidency of Yale College, marked the triumph in New England of the Edwardean theology. According to Dr. Hopkins, there were in 1756 “not more than four or five who espoused the sentiments which have since been called the *Edwardean* or *New Divinity*; and since, after some improvement had been made upon them, *Hopkintonian* or *Hopkinsian* sentiments. In 1773 they had increased to forty or fifty. In 1777, under date of November 7th, we find the following passage in Dr. Stiles’s diary:*

“Rev. Mr. Edwards, of New Haven,† tells me there are three parties in Connecticut all pleased with my election, viz. Arminians, who, he said, were a small party; the New Divinity gentlemen, (of whom, he said, he was called one,) who were larger, he said, *but still small*; and the main body of the ministers which, he said, were Calvinistic.” In a letter written in 1796, Hopkins informs us, that “among the advocates of the New Divinity were included more than one

Drs. Lyman and Edward Beecher, Dr. Bacon, and Dr. Bushnell, among the living, as graduates of Yale College who have been conspicuous in the theological discussions of New England.

* Dr. Stiles was the immediate predecessor of Dr. Dwight in the Presidency of Yale College.

† The younger Jonathan Edwards.

hundred in the ministry." Whether the ministry of Connecticut, or New England, or North America, he does not say.

Professor Fisher further quotes President Stiles, as saying in 1787: "It has been the *ton* to direct students in Divinity, these thirty years past, to read the Bible, President Edwards, Dr. Bellamy, and Mr. Hopkins's writings; and this was a pretty good sufficiency of reading. But now the younger class, but yet in full vigour, suppose they see further than these oracles, and are disposed to become oracles themselves, and wish to write theology, and have their own books come into vogue. The very New Divinity gentlemen say, they perceive a disposition among several of their brethren to struggle for preëminence; particularly Dr. Edwards, (the younger,) Mr. Trumbull, Mr. Smalley, Mr. Judson, Mr. Spring, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Strong of Hartford, Mr. Dwight, Mr. Emmons, and others. They all want to be Luthers."

Our author winds up this theological retrospect in the following terms. "By a variety of agencies, the party professing the ancient Calvinism and eschewing 'the improvements' of the New Divinity, has been quite obliterated in New England. Eighty years ago, the followers of President Edwards* among the Calvinistic clergy, were said by his son, the younger President, to be few in number. At present there are some who are scarcely aware that there ever was a time, since his death, when the Calvinists of New England did not regard President Edwards as the most authoritative expounder of their principles. *His theology, however, it cannot be denied, had from the beginning the respect of many who refused to adopt the additions proposed by his disciples. It is still a mooted point among the interpreters of his writings, whether he deviated from Calvin in any thing except modes of statement.*" Pp. 80-82.

We have quoted at this length from this pamphlet in order that our readers may see for themselves, first, that intelligent and candid men, such as Professor Fisher shows himself in this discourse, and as we personally know him to be, do not hesi-

* Not Edwards's followers exactly, but New Divinity men.

tate to class the various speculative systems that have, or have had, currency in New England, under the title of New Divinity, or the still more conveniently respectable but indefinite designation of New England theology, as Edwardean, or as products of the school of which President Edwards was leader; and secondly, for the purpose of exhibiting the channels of mental association through which dispassionate and honest minds, with a one-sided view of the subject, can be led to connect the name of Edwards with a set of opinions which he gained his chief celebrity in demolishing. The animus of the foregoing extracts, certainly the impression they convey to the reader, whether designed or undesigned, is that Edwards was the father and leader of that theological party which includes Hopkins, Emmons, and Taylor, and that the various peculiarities of these and other men, which have had currency in the country under the assumed title of New England theology, are developments of Edwards's system, and may lawfully protect themselves with the shield of his mighty name. It is quite time that this claim should be investigated and settled. The propounders and abettors of all the ephemeral schemes of divinity that have successively risen to notoriety in the Congregational and Presbyterian bodies of our country, have successively and confidently made it, as if it were as certain as that Edwards wrote theology at all.

I. We propose to prove that Edwards held and devoted his labours to prove the doctrines commonly known as Old Calvinism, with the single exception theologically, that he taught Stapfer's scheme of the mediate imputation of Adam's sin; and with the further qualification, that he held an eccentric philosophical theory of the nature of virtue, as consisting wholly in love to being in general. This was invented as a corrective of the theory which founds moral excellence in self-love. Neither of these peculiarities, however, was allowed to act upon or modify other parts of his theology. Their connection with the subsequent forms of New Divinity, we shall indicate before we close. We think it easy to show, however, that the distinctive features of this New Divinity, in all its successive forms, are utterly abhorrent to his entire system. They have no more place in Edwards than in Turretin, or the Westminster stand-

ards. On all these and other points, with the single exception of mediate imputation above noted, it was his great labour, not to subvert but to vindicate the doctrines of those standards, not merely in some vague substance thereof, but in their most exact and literal import. And even in regard to original sin, his theory enabled him to say in the most literal sense, "we sinned in him and fell with him in the first transgression." He held, as a few now hold, that the posterity of Adam as branches did what he their root did, literally, not representatively according to catholic Calvinism, and in our belief, the Bible. In this, however, as elsewhere, he did not think of himself as discovering any new Edwardean theology. He avowedly takes the idea from Stapfer. In his concluding summation of the points which are vindicated and corroborated by his great treatise on the Will, he specifies among others the following.*

"The things which have been said, obviate some of the chief objections of *Arminians* against the *Calvinistic* doctrine of the *total depravity and corruption of human nature*, whereby his heart is wholly under the power of sin, and he is *utterly unable*, without the interposition of sovereign grace, savingly to love God, believe in Christ, or do any thing that is truly good and acceptable in God's sight."

He, indeed, says, that the objections to such inability have been obviated by proving it a moral inability, and so inexcusable. But the same thing is said by Owen, Turretin, Pictet, and the older theologians. By moral inability he meant not such an inability as is consistent with the declaration that the unregenerate, as New Divinity men have uniformly taught, are, in any real sense, truly able to obey the gospel without sovereign grace. He meant, as we have already seen, that they are "utterly unable" to do this. This is the unvarying, unqualified language and spirit of his theology and his sermons—just as clearly so as of those of John Owen. His great treatises on the Will and Original Sin were written to establish, not to dilute this doctrine.

* Edwards's Works, New York edition. Vol. II. p. 282, et. seq. Our references will all be to the New York edition of his Works.

He proceeds to say, that his treatise obviates the objections of the Arminians to efficacious grace; which mainly amounted to this, "that it is repugnant to the nature of virtue, that it should be wrought in the heart by the determining power and efficacy of another, instead of its being owing to a self-moving power; because not the person in whom it is wrought is the determining author of it, but God that wrought it in him." Now this notion that the sinner's change in regeneration must be caused by his own will, not another's, else his repentance and faith would not be his own, but God's, who wrought it in him, was one of the most familiar, constant, and distinctive, in the New-school preaching a quarter of a century ago.

In like manner he claims to have demolished the various vulgar objections to the doctrines of God's universal and absolute decree, and of absolute, eternal, personal election; such as that they are inconsistent with the use of the means of grace, or the reasonableness of rewards and punishments; that they make God the author of sin, and imply a contradiction between his secret and revealed will.

But what shows conclusively that Edwards understood himself to have been confirming, not modifying or improving old Calvinism, in his Treatise on the Will, is the following consequence which he deduces from it. "From these things it will inevitably follow, that however Christ in some sense may be said to die for all, and to redeem all visible Christians, yea, the whole world, by his death; yet there must be something *particular* in the design of his death, with respect to such as he intended should be actually saved thereby. . . . God pursues a proper design of the salvation of the elect in giving Christ to die, and prosecutes such a design with respect to no other most strictly speaking; for it is impossible that God should prosecute any other design than only such as he has; he does not, in the highest propriety and strictness of speech, pursue a design that he has not. And indeed such a particularity and limitation of redemption will as infallibly follow from the doctrine of God's foreknowledge as from that of the decree."

There is no subject in regard to which the improvements of New England theology have been more vaunted, than the penal nature of Christ's sufferings, the imputation of his righteousness

to believers, of their sin or guilt to him—in short, all that belongs to the old idea of Christ's standing in our law-place. It boasts of having cleared theology of these perplexities and incumbrances. But it is quite certain that Edwards strenuously maintained and defended them.

“The first thing necessary to be done, is, that the Son of God should become our representative and surety; and so be substituted in the sinner's room. . . . Who would have thought of a person of infinite glory representing sinful worms, that had made themselves by sin infinitely provoking and abominable! For if the Son of God be substituted in the sinner's room, then *his sin must be charged upon him; he will thereby take the guilt of the sinner upon himself*; he must be subject to the same law that man was, both as to the commands and threatenings. . . . Again, if the Son of God be substituted in the sinner's stead, then he comes under the sinner's obligation to suffer the punishment which man's sin had deserved.” Vol. vii. p. 71.

After asserting that the imputation of Christ's righteousness is a gospel doctrine, he says, “by that righteousness being *imputed* to us, is meant no other than this, that the righteousness of Christ is accepted for us, and admitted instead of that perfect inherent righteousness which ought to be in ourselves. Christ's perfect righteousness shall be reckoned to our account, so that we shall have the benefit of it, as though we had performed it ourselves. And so we suppose that a title to eternal life is given us as the reward of this righteousness. The Scripture uses the word *impute* in this sense, viz. for reckoning any thing belonging to any person to another person's account.” In proof he compares Philemon, 18, with Rom. v. 13, in which the original *ἐλλογεω* is translated, in the one case, impute, in the other, put to the account of.

“The opposers of this doctrine suppose that there is an absurdity in supposing that God imputes Christ's obedience to us; it is to suppose that God is mistaken, and thinks we performed that obedience which Christ performed. But why cannot that righteousness be reckoned to our account, and be accepted for us without any such absurdity? . . . Why may not his obeying the law of God be as rationally reckoned to our

account, as his suffering the penalty of the law." Vol. v. pp. 394-5.

"Justification is manifestly a *forensic* term, as the word is used in Scripture, and a judicial thing, or the act of a judge, so that if a person should be justified without a righteousness, the judgment would not be according to truth. . . . So that our judge cannot justify us, unless he sees a perfect righteousness some way belonging to us, either performed by ourselves, or by another, and justly and duly reckoned to our account." Pp. 397-9.

"Believers are represented in Scripture as being so in Christ that they are legally one." P. 399.

One of the distinctive features of New England theology, (especially the later forms of it,) "as contrasted with the general theology of the church," lies in its persistent refusal to recognize in the word *guilt* any meaning but personal moral ill-desert, and in reasoning against the old theology, as if it employed the term in the same sense, which is now its more common popular acceptation. Of course, it is easy to reason down the old theology, by attaching to its language a meaning which it never bore. The old meaning of the word *guilt*, as found in creeds and books of theology, was obnoxiousness to punishment, which indeed is the result of moral ill-desert, either in a principal, or substitute and representative. Such is its scriptural use, when it is said, "all the world may become guilty *ὀποδίκως* before God." Rom. iii. 19. "He is guilty *ἐνοχός* of death." Matt. xxvi. 66. In this sense Edwards used it in reference to these subjects. His words are, "Christ, by suffering the penalty, and so making atonement for us, only removes the guilt of our sins." "When he had undertaken to stand in our stead, he was looked upon and treated as though he were guilty with our guilt; and by bearing the penalty, he did, as it were, free himself from this guilt." P. 396.

A very important question of practical divinity which separates New England theology from the "general theology of the church," is whether faith in Christ is before and conditional to repentance, or repentance is before and conditional to faith; not indeed in the order of time, but the order of nature. As to the order of time, and as concerns actual existence, each sup-

poses the other. Faith must exert itself in repentance—repentance must have faith for its root. The sun and its radiance suppose each other; but the sun is before and in order to its rays. Now the New England theology, “as contrasted with the general theology of the church,” has largely maintained that love and repentance are the antecedents of faith in the soul.* The church theology held that there was no genuine repentance, which does not proceed from a believing “apprehension of the mercy of God in Christ.” So Edwards condemns the ignorance of those who suppose “that the repentance by which remission of sins is obtained, can be completed without any respect to Christ, or application of the mind to the Mediator, who alone has made atonement for sin. Evangelical repentance is an humiliation for sin before God. But the sinner never comes and humbles himself before God in any other repentance, but that which includes hoping in his mercy for remission. If sorrow be not accompanied with that, there will be no coming to God in it, but a flying further from him.” Pp. 432-3.

Another distinctive feature of the New Theology, closely related to the foregoing, as “contrasted with the general theology of the church,” is found in the doctrine, that evangelical feelings, affections, and purposes precede and give rise to that spiritual illumination, or perception of the beauty and glory of divine things, which the Bible everywhere ascribes to the saint. Whereas the standard doctrine has been, that while spiritual illumination and spiritual feeling are contemporaneous in fact, yet, in the order of nature, spiritual light is before and conditional to spiritual feeling. In effectual calling, the “enlightening of the mind” is requisite to “the renewing of the will.” The former is the condition of the latter, not the latter of the former. This arises from the very structure of the soul, whereby the understanding is the faculty of guidance, and it can only love and choose what it apprehends as in some sense lovely and desirable. Whoever desires to understand Edwards’s view on this subject may consult the fourth book of

* Smalley, one of the most moderate and judicious of these divines, says: “An apprehension of pardoning mercy is not necessary, however, to the first feelings of true repentance.”—*Sermon from Acts*, iii. 19.

the Treatise on Religious Affections. The very title of it is, "gracious affections arise from the mind being enlightened rightly and spiritually to apprehend divine things." The first sentence reads thus, "holy affections are not heat without light; but evermore arise from some information of the understanding, some spiritual instruction that the mind receives, some light or actual knowledge." It is not inconsistent with this that he sometimes speaks of this spiritual discernment, as a "sense of the heart." For the heart, the whole emotional, affective and voluntary power, in Edwards's view, and in truth, acts in view of the light furnished by the understanding. It is an æsthetic apprehension, the nature of which is that the perception of beauty is followed by pleasurable emotions. So he says, spiritual understanding *primarily* consists in this *sense or taste of the moral beauty of divine things*. It is because taste is, whether literary, moral, or spiritual, like conscience, both intellectual and emotional in its workings, that it and its operations are sometimes spoken of in one aspect, sometimes in the other. But this does not alter the fact, that the perception of the understanding is the antecedent ground of the emotion.

That men are not born sinless, that dispositions to sin or holiness, are themselves sinful or holy, is constantly maintained in the treatise on Original Sin, the former throughout, the latter especially in Part II., Chapter 1.

By that class of divines who maintain the native sinlessness of man, it is often mentioned as a peculiarity of Edwards's theology which lends countenance to their own, that he held depravity to be not any positive creation of God, but to originate in a privative cause, viz. the withholding of divine influences. But Edwards did not deem this view at all a discovery of his own. He regarded it as pertaining to the common theology of the church. He says: "It is agreeable to the sentiments of our *best divines*, that all sin comes originally from a DEFECTIVE or PRIVATIVE cause." But the absence of that principle of love to God, arising from the withdrawal of God's presence, leaves the lower principles in that *ἀραξία* and *ἀνομία*, that want of conformity to the law of God, which the Bible and the creeds, with Edwards, pronounce sin. While this deprives the later New Theology of all sanction from

Edwards, it for ever separates him from another sort represented by Emmons, who ascribe all sin to the immediate efficiency of God.

In view of all this, we submit to all candid minds, whether it is not proved beyond fair dispute, that Edwards differed in no respect from the "general theology of the church," except with Stapfer, and a small body of Reformed divines, in asserting the mediate, as distinguished from the immediate, imputation of Adam's sin: and whether the various speculative systems that have successively risen and decayed under the title of New England Theology, can, with even a show of justice, be ranked as of the school of this great divine, or claim the shield of his authority.

II. The younger Edwards enumerates ten improvements which he contends his father, and those whom he calls his followers, made in theology.* Some of these have reference to his philosophical views of the nature of virtue; and besides being somewhat overstated, are philosophical rather than directly theological. We shall return to this in due time. Some other points represented as improvements, had long been among the common places of theology. Thus the second and fourth on Liberty, Necessity, and the Origin of Evil, entirely depend upon that view of will which reduces all necessity in the moral acts of men, to the simple *certainty* that they will be what they are and not otherwise. Turretin, for example, in dealing with the question, whether the decree of God brings with it a necessity of the events decreed, in regard to acts of will, expressly puts out of the discussion, 1. Absolute and physical necessity, which pertains to causes in their own nature determined to one event and that only, as, for example, the necessity by which fire burns, or the sun shines. 2. The necessity of compulsion by a cause external to the will which forcibly counteracts it: and says, that the question only respects a hypothetical necessity, consisting in the connection of antecedent and consequent, with respect to the *certainty of the event*, and its futurition by virtue of the decree, which he

* See Dwight's Biography of Edwards, the elder. Edwards's Works, Vol. i. p. 613, *et seq.*

asserts.* It is not easy to state the doctrine of Edwards on this point more exactly. The novelty of his treatise lies not in the position it takes and defends, but in the multitude of proofs, the fecundity and cogency of the arguments by which he maintained it; making it, in the main, impregnable to all subsequent assaults.

Edwards the younger, in treating of this alleged improvement, represents that even the Westminster Assembly were groping in darkness on this subject, because they say our first parents fell in consequence of "being left to the liberty of their own will;" and that by God's foreordination, "the contingency of second causes is not taken away but rather established"! These divines, says he, "unquestionably meant that our first parents, at least, in the instance of their fall, acted from self-determination, and by mere *contingence or chance*." He might as well have said, that he or his father meant that men sin by chance, because they sin freely; and their acts though certain in themselves, are no less certainly contingent on the way in which they choose; while again it is quite certain that this is contingent on their pleasure.

The fifth improvement claimed regards the atonement. But this, like several which succeed it, is claimed not directly for Edwards himself, but for his "followers." The only error here is that which we are endeavouring to expose, in reference to this whole subject. Herein they were not his followers, but the antagonists of that general theology of the church, which he so ably vindicated.

The next point respects the Imputation of Adam's sin, and of Christ's righteousness. The improvements in regard to these he also claims for the followers of Edwards. The most noteworthy thing here is his statement of the difficulty which these followers found in the old doctrine. It was this. They assumed that to reckon anything to the account of another, is just the same as to reckon or think it his inherent or personal property; and hence, to use their own term, that to impute Christ's righteousness to the believer, is literally and personally to

* Sed quæritur de necessitate hypothetica et consequentiae, respectu certitudinis eventus et futuritionis ex decreto; quam asserimus. *Turretin; Loc. Quart. Quæst. IV.*

“transfer” it to him. “How,” (asks he,) “can the righteousness or good conduct of one person be the righteousness or good conduct of another? How can God, who is omniscient, and cannot mistake, reckon, judge, or think, it to be the conduct of that other?” It is a short way of demolishing a doctrine, first to misconceive and then misrepresent it. But how so clear a head as this writer possessed, could have studied his father’s writings, as already quoted, and entertained this misconception, we do not understand; much less why, in connection with this class of subjects, those who cherish such misconceptions should rank themselves as “followers” of the great divine.

The next improvement claimed is not attributed to Edwards but to Hopkins, and refers to his peculiar views in regard to the unregenerate, and the instructions to be given them. All that is peculiar in these is far enough from Edwardean, and has for the most part died out of the New Theology itself.

The eighth improvement claimed is ascribed to Edwards himself. It regards the nature of experimental religion, as elucidated in his great work on the Affections. No one questions the consummate ability of this treatise, or that it unfolded the distinctive and constituent elements of evangelical religion with extraordinary perspicuity and force; or that it set some sides of the subject in a clearer light than had been done before. The same thing is true, to some extent, of every work of permanent value on this or any other subject. It was true of Shepard’s Parable of the Ten Virgins, and Flavel’s Touchstone, from which Edwards so largely quotes. It was true of Edwards’s discourses on Justification by Faith. To set known principles in a stronger light, with new defences against new forms of antagonistic error, or with a more adequate and effective application, is one thing. To bring to light radically new truths, previously unknown or unregarded, is quite another. The younger Edwards says: “The accounts of Christian affection and experience which had before been given, both by American and European writers, were general, indiscriminate, and confused. They seldom, if ever, distinguished the exercises of *self-love, natural conscience, and other*

natural principles of the human mind, under conviction of divine truth, from those of the new nature, given in regeneration." (The italics are his.) Marvellous as this statement is, it is only more marvellous that it could have been made by one who had read the Treatise on the Affections, and the quotations from Shepard, Flavel, Preston, Owen, Calvin, &c., in the foot-notes. He might as well say that Dickinson had improved upon the theology of the Assembly's Catechism, because he had ably explained and defended the Five Points.

The ninth point respects disinterested affection. Especial reference is had doubtless to Edwards's theory of the nature of virtue, and the development and application of that theory by Hopkins. Here the simplest summation of the truth is, that the "new things are not true, and the true things are not new." So far as the scheme makes virtue a mere means of happiness, whether to ourselves or others, or to "being in general;" so far as it resolves all virtue into benevolence; so far as it makes a due regard to our own happiness inconsistent with or not requisite to holiness, it is contradicted by Scripture and the universal conscience of our race. So far, it has long been abjured by the New Theology itself, and in its place the opposite extreme of reducing all moral goodness to some form of self-love, or means of happiness to the agent, has been widely adopted. This latter scheme was earnestly and ably defended by the most distinguished modern improver of theology in New England, the late Dr. Taylor. It is, however, already on the wane even among his disciples.* So far, however, as Edwards

* Dr. Dutton, of New Haven, after avowing his opinion that Dr. Taylor is the greatest of the New England divines, not excepting the elder Edwards, adds: "Having said this, I must also say, in the spirit of fair criticism, that there is one part of his theological system which, in my view, will not bear the test of time and of light. That is the self-love theory, or desire of happiness theory, as it has been called; viz. that all motives that come to the mind find their ultimate ground of appeal in the desire of personal happiness, and that the idea of right, in its last analysis, is resolved into a tendency to the highest happiness. This theory, though advocated by him, was not peculiar to him, and never should be attributed to him as a peculiarity. It was plainly taught before him by Dwight and the elder Edwards; though, with his accustomed frankness and boldness, he gave it greater prominence than they." *Sermon on the death of Dr. Taylor, by S. W. S. Dutton, D. D.*

These last clauses are hardly consistent with the claim of Edwards the

and Hopkins meant to teach that pure religious affections, without excluding, have an origin higher than self-love; that their direct and immediate object is the excellency of moral goodness as such, of God and of divine things, and not merely our own selfish advantage or enjoyment, they taught what is true and important indeed, but not what was new; simply an old and precious truth which we have often been obliged to defend against the later champions of New Divinity.

The last improvement which he attributes to his father, "and those who adopt his views," pertains to regeneration. "It is their opinion, (says he,) that *the intellect* and *the sensitive faculties* are not the immediate subject of any change in regeneration. They believe, however, that in consequence of the change which the renewed heart experiences, and of its reconciliation to God, light breaks in upon the understanding. The subject of regeneration sees, therefore, the glory of God's character, and the glory of all divine truth." We think it has been abundantly shown, that whoever may hold this opinion, Edwards, "and those who adopt his views," are not among the number. It has characterized New England theology through all its improvements, since it took a distinctive name and bias from the decisive innovations of the younger Edwards. The Scriptures teach with the "general theology of the church," that we are "transformed by the renewing of the mind" as such, not exclusively in any one part, but in all its parts, intellectual, sensitive, and voluntary. Certainly, if any portion of the mind is signalized as preëminently the immediate subject of renovation in regeneration, it is the intellect. The eyes of

younger, that his father established the scheme of disinterested benevolence, among other alleged improvements in theology. The fact seems to be, that Edwards and Dwight made the highest happiness of the universe the only proper ultimate end of action, and placed the essence of virtue in its pursuit. Dr. Taylor, as Dr. Dutton avows, placed it in seeking our personal happiness. It is a question, however, whether if happiness be the ultimate and highest good of all being, it must not also be the ultimate and highest good of each individual; and therefore whether it is not his highest mission to get as much of it for himself as he can. Any theory which analyzes moral goodness into a means of something better than itself, or into elements simpler than itself, prepares the way for almost any conclusions, which an ingenious mind may take the trouble to deduce from it.

the understanding are enlightened. The soul is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created it. The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, for they are spiritually discerned. But if the intellect is the immediate subject of regenerating influence, it is not so exclusively of the affections and will. The love of God is shed abroad in the heart by the Holy Ghost, and he works in us to will and to do, of his own good pleasure. But then as there is an order in which these respective faculties operate; as the affections and will act in view of the perceptions of the intellect; so, as we have already observed, and have seen that Edwards proved, spiritual illumination is the antecedent logical condition of spiritual feelings and choices. Christ must be seen to be chief among ten thousand and altogether lovely, in order to his being loved and chosen as such. It is when our eyes see God that we abhor ourselves, and repent in dust and ashes. The idea of the will being immediately wrought upon, without any attendant or antecedent operation on the "intellect and sensitive faculties," is absurd. It supposes that the will is an irrational power, acting irrespective of the views of the understanding, and that regeneration is a work not only above nature, but in contravention of its laws: not only supernatural, but a miracle. It supposes such a divorce and mutual isolation of the powers and operations of the one indivisible, intelligent, sensitive, voluntary soul, as has no existence.* Couple with

* "Nor can there be a clear distinction made between the two faculties of understanding and will, as acting distinctly and separately in this matter. When the mind is sensible of the sweet beauty and amiableness of a thing, that implies a sensibleness of sweetness and delight in the presence of the idea of it; and this sensibleness of the amiableness or delightfulness of beauty, carries in the very nature of it the sense of the heart." This passage from Edwards on the Affections is quoted with approbation by Hopkins in his chapter on *Divine Illumination*.

It is to be observed, that of those who have had name as expounders and promoters of the New England theology, there have been two sorts, sometimes in vehement conflict with each other: the abettors respectively of the Exercise-scheme, and of the Taste-scheme. The former scheme, which confined all moral quality to mere acts of volition, was developed in an extreme form by Emmons, and afterwards, with less extravagance, by Dr. Taylor. The abettors of the Taste-scheme, including Hopkins, Dwight, and probably Smal-

this the power of contrary choice, in opposition to the prevailing inclinations of the soul, which both the Edwardses, and all the New England schools claiming to be the successors of both or either of them, strenuously denied, previous to the time of Taylor and Beecher, and we have that scheme of plenary ability which has been the salient point of New Divinity for a quarter of a century, and has, more than all else, given rise to the embittered theological contests and disruptions of that period, yea, to a New and Old-school of New England theology itself.

Thus it appears beyond dispute that the novelties which gave form and being to the New Theology, when it came to be recognized as such, as contrasted with the general theology of the church, were, with scarcely an exception, unknown to Edwards. Nor did Hopkins go the length of the younger Edwards in innovation. Indeed, Professor Fisher himself says as much. "In truth, however, their distinction, especially at the outset, was not so much in the circumstance that they broached new opinions, as in the fact that their views were the result of independent reflection, and were maintained on philosophical grounds." To this we would add, especially with regard to Edwards, that their faith in divine truth was founded on the Scriptures, and their metaphysics were designed to show the

ley, were far nearer the truth. Many of their representations were in full accordance with it. Their chief error and source of error on this subject, arose from overlooking the circumstance, that taste is a cognitive as well as an emotional faculty. What they appear to have opposed, was the idea that regeneration imparts a perception of truths not set forth in Scripture, or increases our speculative faculties or knowledge. They were contending against false views of spiritual illumination, which virtually confounded it with revelation or inspiration. But here again they did not differ from the general theology of the church. They were not discoverers. The truth in their doctrine was not new. The only novelty was the error which some of them worked into their statement and defence of this truth, viz. that in regeneration the immediate change wrought is exclusively on the will or affections, and not at all upon the intellect, and in the separation which they at length, and emphatically of late, have recognized between the actings of intellectual and active powers, forgetting that mutual implication of each with each in all moral exercises which experience proves, and such scriptural phrases as the "carnal mind," "ignorance of heart," &c., constantly intimate. In nothing is the word of God more explicit than in the condemnation of spiritual blindness and perverse moral judgments.

accordance of Scripture doctrine with genuine philosophy. We agree with Professor Fisher, when he adds, "The boldness with which they declared in the pulpit the terror of the gospel, and the force of their appeals to the conscience, in contrast with what had been usual, made their sermons exciting and effective." This was more especially true of the elder Edwards and Bellamy, who gave emphasis to the terrors of the Lord, at a time when a prevalent reticence in regard to them, into which preaching in quiet times is always apt to subside, rendered such emphasis startling and potent. But this is no peculiarity of any new system of theology, in contrast with the old; it simply pertains to ministerial prudence and fidelity. It was no more characteristic of Edwards and Bellamy, than of Whitefield and the Tennents, who certainly had no vein of Neo-Calvinism. The whole class were called New Lights, rather with reference to the unusually startling and awakening character of their preaching, and the extravagances which marred the revival of which they were leading promoters, than to any theological tenets at variance with old Calvinism. It was not till Hopkins and the younger Edwards brought in their radical innovations, that a *New Theology* began to be much recognized, either by friends or foes. It was by them preëminently, and their successors culminating in Emmons, that a system was elaborated which infused into preaching not only the terrors of the Lord, but other terrors not of the Lord. Most of the preachers who adopted this system were indeed earnest supporters of some of the high doctrines of grace, and set them forth in preaching with remarkable distinctness and force. So far they were efficient and successful preachers. But this was due to the old truths, not to the new discoveries they proclaimed; which, as far as they went, according to our best knowledge, were an incumbrance and a clog to their usefulness. It is certain that Hopkins and the younger Edwards enjoyed but very meagre success as pastors and preachers. The view which President Stiles, who, before his accession to the Presidency of Yale College, was pastor of one church in Newport, Rhode Island, while Dr. Hopkins was pastor of the other, gives of this matter, is not very wide of the truth. Commenting on a letter from Dr. Hopkins to himself, after his removal

to New Haven, in which the former complains that the people in Newport "were going from bad to worse, and he saw no way for his continuing there longer than till spring," Dr. Stiles says, as quoted by Professor Fisher: "Remark 1. Very lamentable is the state of religion in Newport, and particularly that they will not attend public worship. But, 2. One occasion of this negligence is brother Hopkins's New Divinity. He has preached his own congregation almost away, or into an indifference. 3. Where the New Divinity ministers are liked, their preaching is acceptable, *not for the new tenets*, but for its containing the good old doctrines of grace, on which the new gentlemen are very *sound, clear and full*. In other parts, where the neighbouring ministers generally preach the Calvinistic doctrines, the people begin to be tired of the incessant inculcation of the unintelligible and shocking new points; especially that an unconverted man had better be killing his father and mother than praying for converting grace; that true repentance implies a willingness and desire to be damned for the glory of God; that we are to give God thanks that he caused Adam to sin, and involve all his posterity in total depravity," &c. When this system finally crystallized into the dismal dogmas of Emmons, hard, cold, and clear as polar ice—which, under the title of sermons, he would argue to Sabbath congregations by the hour—that God is the efficient cause of sin, in the same sense as of holiness; that the wicked are as much indebted to him for their iniquities as the saints for their purity;* that the soul is a chain of exercises; that it has no virtuous or sinful principles, but only acts, created by God;†

* "Since the Scripture ascribes all the actions of men to God as well as to themselves, we may justly conclude, that the divine agency is as much concerned in their bad as their good actions. Many are disposed to make a distinction here, and to ascribe only the good actions of men to the divine agency, while they ascribe their bad ones to the divine permission. But there appears no ground for this distinction, either in Scripture or reason. . . . If he produced their bad as well as their good volitions, then his agency was concerned *in precisely the same manner*, (the italics are the author's) in their wrong as their right actions."—*Emmons's Sermons*, Boston edition of 1812, pp. 39, 40.

† "Since, in regeneration, God does not create any new nature, disposition, or principle of action, but only works in men holy and benevolent exercises, in which they are completely free and active, there is a plain absurdity in calling

that there is no virtue but disinterested benevolence;* that men must exercise holy love and genuine repentance before they can be warranted to believe on Christ;† the capacity of the public mind for the monstrous and dreadful was overstrained. Recalcitration was inevitable. We would, in the language of a distinguished statesman, recently deceased, as soon “toss icebergs into a Christian congregation, or before inquiring souls, as such theories.”

III. The reaction came, and in a two-fold way. First,

the renovation of the heart a miraculous and supernatural change.”—*Id.* pp. 180.

“But if a new heart consists in new holy exercises, then sinners may be as active in regeneration as conversion. Though it be true, that the divine agency is concerned in the renovation of the heart, yet this does by no means destroy the activity of sinners. Their activity in all cases is owing to a divine operation on their minds. . . He always works in them to will and to do in all their free and voluntary exercises.”—*Id.* pp. 178-9.

* In a discourse from Gal. v. 22, the doctrine is that the Holy Spirit produces only love in regeneration, which he says is “the love of benevolence, not the love of complacency,” p. 157; he infers from this premise, 1. That there is no distinction between “regeneration, conversion, and sanctification.” 2. That men are equally active in them all. 3. That regeneration is “no more a supernatural work than any other divine operation upon the minds of men.”

† In a sermon on Gal. v. 6, one of his concluding inferences is thus stated, “If there can be no true experimental religion, but what originates from that supreme love to God which is before faith in Christ; then there is ground to fear, that there is a great deal of false religion among all denominations of Christians. For many of their most devout teachers inculcate the doctrine that faith in Christ is before love to God.” P. 288.

The doctrine of a sermon from Prov. viii. 17, is that God does not love sinners until they first love him; and the third inference is thus stated: “If God does not love sinners before they love him, then they must love him, while they know that he *hates* them, and is disposed to punish them for ever.” P. 110.

The love of the Scriptures implies trust and confidence. Who can stand in this relation to a being that he knows is bent on his perpetual and irremediable ruin, “disposed to punish him for ever,” however righteous he may know such a purpose to be? The very idea involves a contradiction. This necessity of perceiving the mercy of God in Christ, as a prerequisite to the cordial love of him, is not inconsistent with our loving him for his intrinsic excellency, as well as for his love to us. But it is an indispensable prerequisite to our loving him truly and confidingly, on any ground whatever. To love God because he first loved us, is not in itself sordid; it is doing what we ought, but not all we ought. But to admire and delight in his glory, as it shines in Christ, does not cease to be a duty, or an element of piety, because his glory demands the believing sinner’s salvation.

and in a direction almost entirely salutary, in the person of Dr. Dwight, whose system of theology, although unsatisfactory at some points, betraying a too imperfect acquaintance with the general theology of the church, and with theologians outside of New England, is nevertheless marked by a rebound from the extravagances we have noted, towards standard divinity. This is eminently so with the practical, which is far the most significant side of his theology. Professor Fisher, as we have seen, regards his accession to the Presidency of Yale College, as "marking the triumph of the Edwardean theology." The degree of truth in this statement, depends on what is meant by "Edwardean theology." Was it the theology of Edwards the father, or Edwards the son and his confederates and successors? Professor Fisher says, "he (Dwight,) gained strength by discarding the eccentric theory of Hopkins and Emmons concerning Resignation, which he had espoused in early life, and especially by vigorously opposing their odious propositions relative to the divine efficiency in the production of sin." P. 82. This is very true. And it is true also that he "gained strength, i. e. mitigated the opposition of old Calvinists, by rejecting some other eccentricities, and "odious propositions," that excited great repugnance in New England, among men like President Stiles, and among those Presbyterians who had rejoiced to welcome the elder Edwards to their bosoms, and whose successors now feel honoured with the custody of his precious dust. It is further true, that it was not Edwardean theology, but Hopkinsianism, Emmonsism, and Taylorism, that awakened the repugnance felt in the Presbyterian Church to that variable and uncertain thing called New England theology. The doctrine that moral character attaches not merely to acts, but to the antecedent dispositions or principles, whence those acts flow, is radical in old Calvinism, and the general theology of the Church. In regeneration, says Dr. Dwight, "God gives him (the sinner) a new and VIRTUOUS disposition; styled in the Scriptures a new heart; a right spirit; an honest and good heart; the treasure of a good heart; and by several other names of a like import. . . What I intend by this disposition is *the cause, which, in the mind of man, produces all virtuous affections and volitions; the state in which the*

mind is universally possessed of a character, or the tendency, itself, of the mind towards all that which in the character is morally excellent."* As Dr. Dwight is the author of these italics, this statement may be taken as deliberate and emphatic. Indeed, he seizes every opportunity to make his readers feel his abhorrence and contempt for the dogmas of Emmons. Even in regard to that idea which is so common among New England theologians, that love and repentance precede faith, he says it is impossible and unimportant for us to know in what particular order they occur;† while, at the same time, in describing them, he specifies faith first.‡ Unfolding the subject in more practical relations, he says, that of true "obedience, the Scripture informs us, evangelical faith is the genuine spring, and the only spring in the present world;"|| and finally, that "the obedience which precedes the existence of faith, is destitute of any virtuous character."

In regard to the use of the means of grace in seeking salvation, and the prayers of the unregenerate for grace, he most earnestly repudiated the views of the New Divinity men, who shocked the pious, and perplexed inquiring souls, by raising the question in their minds whether it was not wicked to pray before they were conscious of being new creatures. His round common sense, profound practical sagacity, and earnest piety, led him to recoil from ultrasisms in the midst of which he was reared. They enabled him to curb the extravagance and narrow the influence of the Emmons party. They conciliated the confidence, and quieted the opposition of the Old-school divines. But this was a triumph of "Edwardean theology," so far as this term is used to designate opinions contrasted with the general theology of the church," by renouncing rather than procuring acceptance for the most obnoxious of those opinions. It is true that in regard to imputation, atonement, and some affiliated points, Dr. Dwight kept on in the track in which he had been educated. Yet he was not wont to be obtrusive upon points in which he differed from standard church theology. He rather softened and rounded the hard, angular

* Dwight's Theology, New Haven edition; Vol. 2. p. 450.

† *Id.* p. 451.

‡ *Id.* p. 355.

|| *Id.* p. 363.

points. Although he took up the doctrine substantially handed down from Edwards, that virtue consists wholly in benevolence and is founded in utility, he rejected its Hopkinsian application. One of his sermons is devoted to proving that seeking our own salvation is not inconsistent with benevolence. His argument against the imputation of Adam's sin, goes strongly to indicate that he had been trained in that school, which, in the language of President Stiles, regarded a few New England divines a "pretty good sufficiency" of theological reading. It is this. "The verb *λογίζομαι* which is the original word *impute*, denotes originally and always, *to reckon, to count, to reckon to the account of a man, to charge to his account*; but never to transfer moral action, guilt, or desert from one being to another." Vol. i. p. 498. Now, is it necessary to say for the thousandth time, that those who hold to imputation, hold to no transfer of personal qualities, but simply a reckoning them to the account of another as a ground of dealing with him? Is not this a remarkable case of misapprehending a doctrine, and then urging against this misconception the very doctrine itself? Even so, it is above the average arguments against imputation, for it betrays a knowledge of the meaning of the word—a rare circumstance with its impugnors.

While Dr. Dwight, by redeeming the New England theology from some of its objectionable features, as well as by the influence of his eminent piety, sound judgment, and commanding eloquence, quieted opposition to it, still his system differed in several points from the theology of the church, and was destitute of that systematic coherence which, along with its scriptural supports, gives this system its enduring vitality. It was destined to disintegration, and either to be lost in Old Calvinism; or in a development of those portions of it which were antagonistic to the ancient theology, into a more determined and positive antagonism to this theology. Many of the disciples of Dr. Dwight were, in the conflicts of the last quarter of a century, found in the former position. Many more were nearly so, of whom Dr. Griffin may be taken as an example. But another class, of whom the late Dr. Taylor was the most conspicuous leader and representative, developed out of the novel elements previously introduced into New England theology,

with the help of some inventions of their own, what has been known as the New Divinity of the last thirty years.

IV. This scheme advanced beyond any form of the New Divinity that preceded it in four radical points: 1. In asserting the native sinlessness of our race; 2. In asserting the plenary ability of the sinner to renovate his own soul; 3. In asserting self-love, or the desire of happiness, to be the primary cause, and the happiness of the agent the end, of all voluntary action; 4. The inability of God to prevent sin, without destroying moral agency. The proofs of this have so often been laid before our readers, that we need not here consume space in reproducing them. It is to be observed, however, that not all the adherents of the New Divinity who accepted the first two principles, could tolerate the third and fourth. The third, especially, was chiefly confined to Dr. Taylor and his immediate pupils, some of whom, as we have seen, are renouncing it, and even in their eulogies upon him, predicting its universal discredit. And it is still further to be observed, that, as to the other points, many embraced them with various degrees of qualification and allowance. Still, these are the radical principles of the late New Divinity, which has stimulated the conflicts of the last quarter of a century.

It is obvious that the self-love scheme was the product of an extreme reaction from the previous theory, which resolves all virtue into disinterested benevolence, and its affiliated "eccentric theories of resignation," &c. But here, as in many other cases, the opposite of error is not necessarily the truth. The radical error in each case was the taking a part for the whole of virtue, and viewing virtue and vice, not as intrinsically good or evil in their own nature, but only as they are resolved into a means of some higher good beyond themselves, viz. the happiness either of the agent himself, or the universe. These theories, however, are dying out, if not *in articulo mortis*. We wish as much could be said for some of the speculative ethical and theological dogmas to which they have been ancillary.

In regard to native sinfulness, it is susceptible of the clearest proof, that it was asserted by all divines of standing in New England, of whatever school, prior to the era of Taylorism—

particularly by both the Edwardses, Bellamy, Hopkins, Smalley, Emmons and Dwight.* While this was earnestly maintained, the mere denial of imputation caused less alarm and opposition among old Calvinists, although many of them feared, what afterwards came to pass, that the denial of Original Sin altogether would result from this loosening of its foundations. For if the arguments adduced against imputation are admitted as valid, they are still more conclusive against any other ground of the derivation of sin and guilt from Adam. But it was not till the actual appearance of a large party in the church who assailed the doctrine of native sinfulness with perseverance and adroitness, that energetic, extensive, and inexorable opposition was aroused.

The same things substantially may be said of the doctrine of ability, and its attitude before and after the recent New Theology. The New England divines of all classes have asserted, with the general theology of the church, that the sinner's inability is moral, i. e. pertains to the moral nature. They, however, have also asserted, since the time of Edwards, that this *moral inability* was coupled with a *natural ability* to obey the will of God. But, the exercise school excepted, they had uniformly explained themselves to mean by natural ability, that the sinner possesses all the essential *faculties* of humanity, of moral agency, and accountability; that his only inability lies in a corrupt disposition of heart or soul, which is culpable, and being dominant, is invincible by the man himself, or by any power short of sovereign grace. The chief difference between this view and the theology of the church, lay in using the word *ability* to denote the natural relation of man to the requirements of the gospel. It was justly objected to as adapted to perplex plain people, to introduce confusion into questions carefully defined by a scriptural terminology, and to furnish a shelter to the advocates of the Pelagian theory of

* *Instar omnium*, Dwight, who, it will not be claimed, was of a higher tone than the others, on this subject, says: "With these facts in view, we are compelled to one of these conclusions; either that infants are contaminated in their moral nature, and born in the likeness of apostate Adam; a fact irresistibly proved, . . . or that God inflicts these sufferings on moral beings who are perfectly innocent. I leave the alternative to those who object against the doctrine." Vol. i. p. 486.

plenary ability. Still it was borne with until this last result was actually developed, and the most unqualified ability of sinners to change their own hearts was asserted by the school which impugned native sin and guilt, while they sheltered themselves in this convenient distinction of natural and moral ability. Smalley was the most authoritative expounder of this distinction among the distinctive New England divines, before the appearance of the recent New Divinity. He expresses himself thus:

“*Besides all the powers and senses required to constitute man a rational, voluntary, and conscious agent, something further is necessary to his actually performing good works; namely, a good disposition. This we suppose to be radically wanting in mankind, as born of the flesh; and to be the thing created radically anew when any are born of the Spirit. A man will not and cannot act right, as long as he is not so disposed, however capable he may be of willing and acting agreeably to his own mind. . . ‘A corrupt tree cannot bring forth good fruit.’*” *Smalley’s Sermons*, Hartford edition, p. 282.

Dr. Dwight’s view is sufficiently evident from what we have already seen to be his doctrine, that a new disposition or relish is communicated in regeneration. “In this (says he) lies the real difficulty of regenerating ourselves, and not in the want of sufficient natural powers; and, so long as this continues, an extraneous agency must be absolutely necessary for our regeneration.” Vol. ii. p. 403. It is very clear from this, and from the whole current of his writings, that however he may have used the term *natural ability*, he meant by it simply the faculties or powers of moral agency, not any actual sufficiency to make ourselves new hearts. And even Emmons, holding that all our volitions are the immediate product of divine efficiency, was compelled to explicate natural ability into harmony with this theory: so that without the agency of God, men are not sufficient for their own regeneration.

Dr. Taylor’s system has been tersely, but as justly as can be done in a brief phrase, styled, “Emmonsism with the divine efficiency part cut off.” That moral quality pertains to exercises only, not to dispositions lying back of and causing them; that

these exercises are from the self-originating power of the will, excluding every other efficient cause within or without the man; that the will is a power of choosing either way, not only as the man is pleased to choose, but the contrary; that hence the sinner is in the most absolute sense able, truly competent to obey God *propriis viribus*; that there is no sinful taint in the human soul prior to the first exercises of intelligent moral agency, (which exercises Emmons regarded as occurring in some rudimental way from birth;) that the will has "power to act despite all opposing power," and defeat the effort of the Almighty to prevent sin in the moral system—these, with the self-love theory, which was an obvious and powerful adjuvant of the sinner's plenary ability, were the salient points of this system. They chiefly, except the last, radiate from and converge in the unqualified power of contrary choice.

With equal means of knowledge, a like desire to do justice, and a not less warm admiration of the genial personal traits, the intellectual acumen, and self-reliance of Dr. Taylor; while we differ from Dr. Dutton in our estimate of the merits of his theology, we recognize as mainly just his statement of this cardinal feature of it, as well as of another already adverted to. He says, in his eulogistic sermon, "The doctrine of human freedom, which he justly [?] defined, not merely and only to do as we will, but also as liberty to will, *power to will either way*, he illustrated, fortified and defended, and carried through all parts of his system of morals and theology." In a foot note he adds, with reference to the statement, "They can if they will," he (Dr. Taylor) used to say, in his terse and strong way, "they can if they wont." Again, Dr. Dutton speaks of the plea of inability which was in vogue when Dr. Taylor entered on the stage, as "with some a natural inability or want of natural power, with others a misnamed [?] moral inability, which differed from the other only in name—in either case a real and total *incompetency* to accept the offers of the gospel." He tells us Dr. Taylor showed that "what God commands man to do, man *can* do." It would be difficult to find language which more completely expresses the doctrine of plenary ability, or more unmistakably affirms that Dr. Taylor took a position on this subject before unknown, even in what

was called New England theology; that, in short, he rejected what this theology meant by moral inability. Is it not strange that the adherents of this class of opinions should claim to be of the Edwardean school, as against those from whom Edwards differed theologically only on the simple point of mediate imputation?

There is one circumstance which may have helped to connect the name of Edwards with speculations alien to his own system. His own son bearing his name, and Hopkins who studied with him, but preëminently the former, gave development and shape to those modifications of theology which he ascribes to Edwards and his followers, and which constituted what was first known as New Divinity in New England. It might very naturally be called Edwardean without any definite reference to the views of the elder Edwards. But the mere fact that some theologians are pupils of others, affords no evidence of unity of doctrine, or even of a catena of continuous derivation. Many who have been trained in the different Theological Seminaries of this country, have proved defenders of principles quite contradictory to those which were taught them. Professor Fisher mentions that Emmons studied with Smalley, as if there were some continuation or derivation of doctrine from one to the other. The most casual reader of the two must be struck with the frequency and point of Emmons's attacks and inuendoes upon his teacher's theology.

There is another circumstance mentioned by Professor Fisher, however, which goes to prove conclusively that the theology of the elder Edwards was distinguished in the public mind from that New Divinity of which his son and Hopkins were representatives. When Dr. Stiles became President of Yale College, the younger Edwards informed him that the great body of the ministers were old Calvinists, and that the New Divinity party to which he belonged was small. In 1756, Dr. Hopkins had said, it numbered only four or five persons. Now it is utterly impossible that at these dates the theology of Edwards should have been that of a small number, or that his writings should not have ranked as of standard excellence among a large portion of those styled by his son, old Calvinists, in distinction from himself. Indeed our author furnishes a key to the whole

relation of Edwards to the successive forms of the New Theology, when he says with great candour and justice, "His theology, however, it cannot be denied, had from the beginning the respect of many who refused to adopt the additions proposed by his disciples." This disposes of one important ground of his alleged complicity with them.

If Edwards's name cannot, without flagrant injustice, be used to sanction the various fleeting systems already considered, which have had currency under the title of New England theology, much less can it be, without inexcusable dishonesty, implicated with still later and looser speculations which sweep away every vestige of the doctrine of native corruption, vicarious atonement, impugn the Trinity, or set the truths recognized by the devout heart in conflict with the judgments and convictions of a sound understanding.

V. Having thus shown the broad and irreconcilable difference between the theology of Edwards, and of the successive parties claiming under him, it remains, in order to complete a just view of the subject, that we show the precise extent of their indebtedness to him. We have seen that he differed from old Calvinism, in holding to the mediate imputation of Adam's sin, and further, that he promulgated a peculiar philosophical theory of the nature of virtue, as consisting in *love to being in general*, or benevolence, or devotion to the greatest happiness of the universe. This he designed as a barrier to theories which found religion in mere self-love, and it was applied by him for this purpose, and no further. These two peculiarities might have attracted no special attention, and led to no important results, as has often been the case with occasional eccentric views of great men, aside of the general track of their thinking. In this case, however, it was otherwise. These points were by subsequent divines worked out to their most extreme results, logical and illogical, in reference to the whole circle of doctrine, until they were themselves indeed generally repudiated, but not till they had been made instrumental in undermining many of the most precious truths, which Edwards put forth his chief strength in defending.

In regard to the imputation of Adam's sin, the great problem is to account for what all parties concede to be the corrupt

and degraded condition of our race. All parties having any title to be considered Christian, admit this to be, in some way, due to the sin of Adam. That the Scriptures teach this, does not admit of a show of question. But what is the connection of this estate with Adam's sin? Apparently the Scriptures teach that Adam so acted as the representative of the race that his sin was reckoned to their account and judicially dealt with as such; that they were condemned for it, and hence come into being with that want of rectitude and the divine favour, that consequent inward pollution and subjection to wrath and misery, which are found to be universal. "By the offence of one, judgment come upon all men to condemnation." "By one man's disobedience many were made sinners." "The judgment was by one to condemnation, *χρῖμα εἰς κατάκριμα.*" Rom. v. Now if this apparent meaning of the apostle be explained away, it must be because it seems unjust that the sin of one should be so reckoned to the account of others as to subject them to its penal consequences. The first and germinant penal consequence, whence all else flows, is that withdrawal of the divine favour and influence which are the source of all holy principles in the soul, and, in the absence of which, its mere natural principles which are of the essence of human nature, instantly relapse into *ἀταξία* and *ἀνομία*, disorder and lawlessness, the prolific source of all other penal evils. So Edwards represents inherent depravity in its germinating root, in a passage already quoted, and more at large. Vol. ii. pp. 535—7. Now the question is, how shall this privation of divine favour and support, which is in itself so great an evil, and the spring of all other evils which degrade, corrupt, and afflict our race, be accounted for? We say, because we think the Scriptures say, it was a penal visitation for the sin of Adam acting as their federal head. But Edwards, following Stapfer, says, we were in Adam as the branches of a tree in its root, so that his act was literally and physically the act of each of his posterity. In order to sustain this view, he tasks his wonderful metaphysical dexterity in unsettling and confounding our first notions of personal identity. It is of course impossible that a supposition so contradictory to the first truths of reason should stand. Its adherents have always been few. Like Dr. Edward Beech-

er's solution of the present condition of our race, it lacks believers. It has scarcely been heard of since Edwards's day, until its late reproduction by some good brethren, who are trying to restore deeper doctrines than have been current in New-school circles, in a German mould. But while this scheme disappeared, its effects in undermining the Reformed doctrine of imputation remained. The principle that lived after the root-scheme died, is, that our first evil disposition is "not properly a consequence of the imputation of Adam's first sin; nay, it is rather antecedent to it, as it was in Adam himself." *Edwards's Works*, vol. ii. p. 544. The main drift of the arguments and representations of his treatise on Original Sin presupposes, indeed, and often directly expresses the current view of reformed theology. But the principle just quoted outlived and overbore them all, until it leavened the whole lump of New England theology. And its logical and actual consequences were far reaching.

1. If the scriptural representation, that our present state is a penal visitation arising from condemnation for the sin of Adam acting as our divinely appointed representative, be rejected, then, whatever difficulties it involves, they are ten-fold greater on any other hypothesis. If this solution of our deplorable state be rejected, as implying injustice in God, what shall be said of any other hypothesis which makes it a mere sovereign infliction, without any probation on our part either personal or by a fit representative, and without respect to any sin of which it is a punishment? If it is unjust that so dire an evil should be visited in a penal way, must it not, *a fortiori*, be conceded that it is unjust that it should be visited at all? If the doctrine of human corruption will not stand on this basis, much less can it stand on any other. The effect was inevitable; gradually and surely the doctrine of human corruption was attenuated, till the residuum became what it is. First, the exercise scheme of Emmons reduced native sinfulness to so much of it as could be found in the exercises of moral agency at birth. Then it was entirely denied as to the period of life which precedes intelligent moral agency, and the voluntary violation of known law, and as to all dispositions of soul lying back of acts. Then we find Dr. Edward Becher contending that the present condi-

tion of our race on any theory, old or new, implies monstrous injustice in God, unless we admit what next to none believe, a probation of each individual in a pre-existent state. And finally, Miss Catharine Beecher condemns the whole doctrine of natural corruption, in any form of it, as absurd and monstrous! Such is the terrible crevasse which the denial of the scriptural view of immediate imputation opens upon the whole doctrine of Original Sin and Human Corruption.

2. By denying the imputation of Adam's sin, the nexus between the visitation of evil and sin in moral beings, under the government of God, is broken. This is a great and perilous stride. It reduces the divine administration to the sway of expediency. It accords with the theory that God is governed by a sole regard to happiness or utility, or by mere will, instead of the immutable laws of holiness and justice. It saps the foundation of vicarious atonement, which lies in the necessary bond between sin and penal suffering. It weakens our confidence in the immutable truth and faithfulness of God, if expediency or mere sovereignty of will may be ascendant over them.

3. It is so plain as almost to have precluded question, that the Apostle draws a parallel in Rom. v. between the manner of our ruin by the sin of the first Adam, and of our salvation by the righteousness of the second Adam. It is condemnation by the sin of the former: justification by the obedience of the latter. If the sin of the former condemns us mediately, and only by inducing that inherent sin which is the only real and immediate ground of condemnation, then it follows that the righteousness of the latter justifies us by inducing that inherent righteousness which is the real ground of our justification. If, on the other hand, the sin of Adam procures our condemnation by being immediately reckoned to our account or imputed to us, the righteousness of Christ justifies us in the same way. Thus the whole doctrine of atonement and justification is implicated with that of imputation. The various attenuating processes put upon these doctrines by the younger Edwards and some of his successors down to Dr. Bushnell, show the gradual and ultimate effect of loosening such a stone in the arch of Christian truth as the immediate imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity.

The consequences of Edwards's theory of the Nature of Virtue, have been in some respects coincident with the foregoing, and probably still more extended and pervasive. When virtue was once reduced to the rank of a mere means to the general happiness as something better than itself, and the fall of our race was no longer accounted for by the imputation of Adam's sin, this catastrophe was very naturally accounted for by the theory that sin is the necessary means of the greatest good or happiness. As virtue consists in love to being in general, and God, who is infinitely good, ordained the existence of sin, why did he ordain it unless because it was a necessary means to the good of being in general? This accordingly was the dominant theory of the improvers of theology up to the time of Dr. Taylor. But already the difference between sin and holiness is obliterated, as it must be, sooner or later, on every theory which does not make that difference intrinsic and immutable as the unchangeable holiness of God, which is the first source, standard, and norm of all excellence. What more can holiness be, on this scheme, than "the necessary means of the greatest good?" Is it not far wiser and safer to say in reference to this whole subject of the permission and ordination of sin, "O, the depth of the riches, both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his judgments and his ways past finding out! For who hath known the mind of the Lord? or who hath been his counsellor?" This theory could not stand. Dr. Taylor supplanted it by another still less tolerable, which resulted from the power of contrary choice as held by him; viz. that the existence of sin may be accounted for by God's inability to prevent it in a moral system. Still less will this command any permanent or lasting assent. Is anything too hard for the Lord? Is he dependent on the will of his creatures for the accomplishment of his pleasure? We know not why sin exists. But we do know that it is not lack of goodness or of power to prevent it in God. Even so Father, for so it seemeth good in thy sight!

It scarcely needs to be pointed out that this conception of sin as the necessary means of the greatest good, was auxiliary to Emmons's theory, that God is just as much the efficient cause

of sinful as of holy exercises in man. It in fact subverts the radical distinction between them.

The natural rebound from the disinterested-benevolence, or love-to-being-in-general theory, to the self-love theory of the later New Divinity has already been set forth. The bearing of this latter, especially when coupled with the power of contrary choice, upon regeneration, conversion, and experimental religion is too patent to need explanation.

The connection of this theory, that all goodness consists exclusively in benevolence or a regard for the greatest happiness of the universe, with the scheme of the younger Edwards and his successors on the Atonement, is vital and indissoluble. The substance of this scheme is, that distributive justice, or the disposition of God to render to sin its proper desert of evil, is not satisfied by the Atonement. Christ's sufferings and death were not penal, they were not endured by him as the sinner's substitute, standing in his law-place. They were simply an expedient to satisfy general justice, which he defines as a regard to the highest good of the universe, i. e. to satisfy benevolence. In the later forms of stating this theory, Christ's death serves the same purpose in impressing the moral universe with a sense of God's regard for his law, which the eternal punishment of the sinner would have done. It is simply a governmental expedient, not a true proper satisfaction of divine justice. Into the merits of this scheme we cannot now enter. It has already had ample discussion in our pages.

If we have succeeded in executing what we undertook in beginning this article, we have shown that Edwards's theology was, with scarcely a variation, one with Old Calvinism, and at war with all those successive forms of New Divinity which have been so industriously and adroitly linked with his name; and that the early forms of the New England Theology "as contrasted with the general theology of the church," developed by his son, and others, differ from his system on cardinal points, while they themselves differ widely from the later forms of New Divinity.

On the other hand, we have tried to show in what sense and degree one or two eccentricities of his theology and philosophy,

afterwards lifted to extreme prominence, exerted an influence in promoting developments of doctrine at war with the system he spent his life in promulgating and defending. These are not the offspring of his system, but have been aided by one or two eccentric theories outside of his system. We hope we have succeeded in shedding some light on a subject which has come, from various causes, to be enveloped in great and increasing obscurity. We feel indebted to Professor Fisher for the aid which his facts and his candid statement of them have afforded us, although we do not always put his construction upon them. And we leave the subject with a new strength of conviction, that the system of theology known as Old Calvinism, and developed in the Reformed and especially the Westminster symbols, has a depth of truth, a logical consistency, and a scriptural support, which will enable it to outlive the future, as it has the past assaults and alleged improvements attempted upon any of its marked and characteristic features.*

* Since this article was written, we have received the sermon of Dr. Cleveland of New Haven, preached on the twenty-fifth anniversary of his settlement there. He says, in reference to what is known as New Haven Divinity, or Dr. Taylor's scheme, "The enthusiasm felt here a quarter of a century ago for the then recent scheme of theology has greatly abated. New parties have arisen, contending for new issues. The current of theologic opinion and speculation is seeking other channels, and assuming other phases. In this process of disintegration and reconstruction, some have fallen back on positions more in sympathy with the older theology, and into a style of preaching less rationalistic and more scriptural; while others are pushing their investigations in the opposite direction," &c.