

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

JULY 1840.

No. III.

Art. I.—Three Sermons upon Human Nature, being the first, second, and third of fifteen Sermons preached at the Rolls Chapel. By Joseph Butler, LL.D., late Lord Bishop of Bristol; as published in two volumes at Glasgow, in 1769.

DURING a long period after the commencement of philosophical inquiries concerning morals, it seems to have been taken for granted, that all motives to action in men, as in mere animals, originate in regard for self, and the natural tendency of all sensitive beings to self-preservation. The appetites, the desires, and even in most instances the social affections were resolved into modifications of self-love. The instinctive pursuit of self-gratification was the principle to which all action must be reduced; and somewhere in that sort of transmuted essence the elements of morals were presumed to reside. No sentiment was entertained, by some of the most popular philosophers, of the reality of moral distinctions. Law and morality were considered as mere suggestions of interest, changing with circumstances. And by those who, with Grotius, recoiled from this revolting degradation of man's moral nature, the highest point of approximation towards a satisfactory theory of morals was the

That, in the progress of society, the social principle will yet more effectually aid the due ascendancy of conscience as the guide of human action, admits of no reasonable doubt. We look in the future for a better understanding, and a better use of the connexion between conscience and the civil law. The day indeed will never come in the life time of true freedom, when the state will undertake to rule the individual sense of moral duty. But we expect the existence of such knowledge, and of such sincerity, that men, conscious as well of moral as of physical infirmity, will deem it a legitimate end of society, to secure moral as well as physical strength; and that civil law, the vital organ of social strength, will join its influence with that of other institutions of society, in vindicating and confirming the practical supremacy of conscience in the human soul. This will be a welcome harbinger of the moral renovation of the world. With the light which now shines on the path of moral duty, conscience points man towards the true perfection. It is the candle of God in the soul, lighted at the blaze of the Sun of Righteousness; and from the pure radiance of that heavenly orb, its bright flame is perpetually fed. Unlike the tapers of the evening fireside, and the twinklings of the evening sky, which grow dim as the king of day approaches; it brightens as the sun ascends, and is preparing its fulness of light to be dispensed in the noontide of the millennial day.

Charles Hodge.

ART. II.—*A History of the Rise, Progress, Genius, and Character of American Presbyterianism. Together with a Review of the "Constitutional History of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, By Charles Hodge, Professor in the Theological Seminary at Princeton, N. J."* By William Hill, D. D., of Winchester, Virginia. Washington City. 1839. pp. 224.

DR. HILL informs his readers that about eight years ago he was appointed by the presbytery of Winchester to write the history of that judicatory. He was thus led to make investigations into the early history of Presbyterianism in Virginia; which were so successful as to induce him to determine to write the history of our church in that state. The

synod encouraged this enterprise, and appointed a member of each presbytery to afford him every assistance he might require. In order to do justice to his subject, he found it would be necessary to investigate the introduction of Presbyterianism into America, and for this purpose, on two several occasions, obtained from Dr. Green access to the early records of our church. In 1837, Dr. Hill had already prepared for the press an ordinary sized octavo volume, containing the fruits of his labours. Before publishing it, however, he determined to print a few sketches, in order to elicit what might be said in opposition to his views. This measure, he says, had the desired effect; and he pays Prof. Hodge's volume the compliment of saying: "It no doubt contains the substance of all that can be said in opposition to the positions I have taken;" nay more, that it is "to be looked upon as the joint production of the strength of a party, aided by men venerable for age, experience and talents, and having access to the best sources of information and means of defence." This only shows how low "the party" has fallen in Dr. Hill's esteem; for he every where speaks of the book in question as unworthy of the least confidence; and seems to regard its ostensible author as ready at any time to sacrifice truth "to serve a purpose," and as destitute of candour or even common honesty as a historian.

The publication of Professor Hodge's work has had one effect, which the readers of Dr. Hill have reason to regret. The first draught of his work was not controversial. "I did not then," he tells us, "expect serious opposition from any quarter. That which had cost me so much labour is now laid aside as not suited to the occasion. I had to begin my work anew, and prepare to defend every inch of ground I ventured upon. This must be my apology for the very imperfect dress in which this introductory number must appear to every intelligent reader. It is a hurried and hasty production; a want of method is very apparent throughout; the importunity of friends would not allow me to transcribe it; and I could procure assistance from no one; while the calls of duty and various avocations were constantly causing interruptions and making breaks in the work." We hope Dr. Hill will prosecute his original design, and after easing his mind of all controversial matters, publish a history of our church, especially as it has appeared in Virginia, which is not controversial.

Whenever there is a controversy, it is desirable to know

the state of the question; to have the point at issue distinctly presented. Professor Hodge took the ground that our church, from its first organization in this country, adopted that form of government which had been previously adopted in Scotland, Ireland, Holland, and by the Protestants of France. He described the system intended as requiring the government of particular congregations to be vested in the pastor and eldership, and not in the brotherhood, and the association of several churches under one presbytery, composed of ministers and elders; and as providing for provincial and national synods, in which were vested the authority of review and control, and the right to set down rules for the government of the church.* There are here three points presented, with tolerable distinctness. First, the leading principles of Presbyterianism; second, the prevalence of this system of government in the places mentioned; and, third, its adoption by our own church. There is no question here about the rigour with which the system was enforced, about the authority attributed to it, whether it was of divine right, or apostolic example, or of mere expediency; whether it was essential to the being of a church, or merely the best form of its government. Not one of these questions was raised. It was merely stated what Presbyterianism is, and asserted that certain specified churches were Presbyterian. One would think that the only course for an opponent to take, was to attack one or the other of these positions; to show that Presbyterianism does not include the above mentioned principles; or that it was not, in that form, adopted by the churches in question. This, we admit, would have been a rather adventurous enterprise; still, it was the only thing to be done.

Dr. Hill has seen fit to take a very different course. He first asserts, that Professor Hodge contends that our church adopted the strict Scotch system, and then gives the following description of that system: "It is now contended that it is essential to that system that the church should be governed by church sessions, consisting of the pastor and ruling elders; that these elders must now be elected for life, and ordained in a certain form, or else the want of it will vitiate all that comes in contact with it. Though the Scotch church sometimes chose elders from year to year, that is not the system now pleaded for. Again, there must be a presbytery composed of pastors and delegates from the elderships of

* *Constitutional History*, Part I. p. 12.

many distinct congregations; there must be synods, composed of three or more presbyteries; and, to finish the system, there must be a General Assembly, composed of the delegates of the different presbyteries, and a certain portion from the different towns and boroughs; also from universities; the whole presided over by the king's commissioner. This General Assembly, to possess full powers to do whatever they may think conducive to the welfare of the church, and to deal out such powers as the Assembly may please to the inferior courts, retaining the same to themselves at the same time, when they think proper to exercise them. That this General Assembly has not only the power to suppress popery, prelacy, heresy, schism, profaneness, &c., but are bound to do so; and, if the civil power will not aid them in the work, they have *jure divino* authority to do it notwithstanding. That no liberty or indulgence is to be given to those who may differ from it in opinion concerning doctrine, government, or practice. No intercourse or communion is to be held with other sectaries; nor will they, to this day, admit even one of their old school advocates, from this or any other country, into their pulpits, or to sit in their judicatories. The system will not, and never did, admit compromise with any other. It will have the whole or nothing. They are consistent, if their divine-right claim can be made out. It is not to be wondered at, then, that even the aliens and retainers of this system should exhibit something of the same uncompromising and domineering spirit; for it is *an essential element or principle of the system itself*. Witness the solemn league and covenant, and its history and effects in Europe and elsewhere. The Scottish system is essentially and necessarily illiberal and intolerant; it cannot be otherwise to be consistent, and it is made still worse by its connexion with the state, as established by law. History does not afford an instance of a compromise, or an act of tolerance, further than they were compelled by a power superior to their ecclesiastical courts. Such is the *PATERNITY** which Professor Hodge is anxious to establish for himself and party." p. 6-7.

It is the Scotch system, thus described, which as Dr. Hill frequently asserts, Professor Hodge contends was adopted by the Presbyterian church in this country. It is very obvious that all discussion with such an opponent must be useless.

* In this, as in the subsequent extracts, we give Dr. Hill the advantage of his capitals and italics.

Should any American Episcopalian say that his church was the daughter of the church of England, and had adopted the essential principles of her form of government, he certainly would treat with silence the assertion that he thereby claimed the lordly titles, the varied powers, or exclusive principles of the English hierarchy.

As to the real point in debate, Dr. Hill has as yet done nothing. He has still to prove that Presbyterianism is not what Professor Hodge stated it to be; or that it did not prevail in the Protestant churches of Scotland, Ireland, Holland, and France; or that our church did not adopt that form of government. Until he does one or the other of these things, we may safely leave the main point in dispute just where it is. If he wishes to prove that our church was not bigoted, illiberal, and persecuting, whom will he find to oppose him? If he wishes to prove that she was catholic, tolerant and Christian in all her principles, whom will he find to deny it? She may be all that, and yet Presbyterian.

Though it is not our object to appear as the eulogists or apologists of the church of Scotland, we think it right to make a remark on the manner in which Dr. Hill allows himself to speak on that subject. A specimen, though a very inadequate one, has just been given of the style in which he writes of the Scottish church. He constantly speaks of it as rigid, illiberal, intolerant, persecuting—as the enemy of all religious liberty. He says, it always has been and must be so, since this uncompromising, domineering spirit is an essential element of the system which that church has adopted. How different was the manner in which our fathers were accustomed to speak on this subject! In a letter written in 1710, by the original presbytery, to the synod of Glasgow, it is said, We address ourselves to you, “knowing none so proper to apply unto, and repose our confidence upon as yourselves, our reverend brethren of the church of Scotland, whom we sincerely honour and affectionately esteem as fathers.” Both the synods of Philadelphia and New-York professed to look upon that church as their parent. The latter body called themselves “the young daughter of the church of Scotland.” This was the language of the Tennents, the Blairs, of Davies and of Finley. They declared that they had adopted “her standards of doctrine, worship, and discipline;” that they were “united with that church in the same faith, order, and discipline. Its approbation and countenance,” they say, “we have abundant testimonies of.

They, as brethren, receive us; and their members we, as opportunity offers, receive as ours." "If I am prejudiced," said President Davies, "in favour of any church, it is of that established in Scotland; of which I am a member, in the same sense that the established church in Virginia is the church of England." The congregation in New-York, with Dr. Rodgers and Joseph Treat at its head, frequently called themselves "a dispersion of the church of Scotland." In an official document they called themselves: "The ministers of the Presbyterian church in the city of New-York, according to the Westminster Confession, Catechisms and Directory, agreeable to the established church of Scotland." The united synod of New-York and Philadelphia say: "Our judicatories, like those in the church of Scotland, from which we derive our origin, are church sessions, presbyteries, and synods." Now, whatever else may be doubtful, one thing is plain, viz: that Dr. Hill is a man of a very different spirit, and of very different views from those fathers of our church. It would be an insult to him to say that he belonged to the same class with them. They spoke of the church of Scotland as their mother. He reviles her. Christian men are not accustomed to revile their mothers; whatever may be their parents' faults. He must look elsewhere, therefore, for sympathy in his abuse of the Scottish church; and we know not where he will find it unless he looks beyond the pale of Christianity, or at least of the protestant communion. We really do not believe that his account of the reformation in Scotland can be matched by any similar passage in any Protestant writer. Professor Hodge had made the obvious remark, that the declaration contained in the first Scottish confession of faith, of the right and duty of the people to resist the tyranny of their rulers, "was the result of the reformation being carried on by the people." We little thought that this remark could give offence or excite contradiction. There is no more familiar historical fact than that the reformation in England was conducted in the name and by the authority of the government, and in Scotland in despite of the government. To this fact much of the difference between the churches in the two countries, and much of the difference of the history of the two nations is to be attributed. Dr. Hill, after quoting the above remark, says: "We learn from Buchanan, Knox and others, what kind of people they were, how excited and how they went to work. Would not any one infer from reading Professor Hodge's laudatory notice

of this matter, that the people, the common people, were all now leavened with the principles of the reformation? The people, *the rascal multitude*, as Knox calls them, at that time neither knew nor cared any thing about the reformation. It had not reached them; they had not yet emerged from gross papal darkness; but were led on by the nobles and the heads of their clans, and instigated by the inflammatory zeal of Knox and a few others, just as they would be led to any marauding or military enterprise. It was plunder that enkindled their zeal, and prompted them to their exterminating and indiscriminately destructive course. As the principles inculcated by the Reformers, and even the confession drawn up by Knox himself, taught the people that they had a right to resist their rulers, and abolish their right to govern, whenever they should judge they had exceeded the prescribed limits of their authority [it is well for Dr. Hill and all other heirs of British liberty that the people were thus taught], the Reformers, with all they could prevail upon to follow them, abrogated the powers of government lodged in the hands of the regent; took the reigns of government into their own hands, demolished popery and prelacy, seized upon the property and wealth of the church, and plunged the country into a bloody civil war of unusual violence, [the Reformers did all this]. The weakness and inefficiency of the Queen Regent's government; the death of the king of France who had married their young queen; the distraction in which their youthful widowed Mary, Queen of Scots, found the country when she came over from France and assumed the reigns of government; her flight, imprisonment and death in England; the long minority of James VI., then a young child, all conspired to give the Reformers the opportunity of intrenching and fortifying themselves with their new system of rigid, exclusive, divine-right Presbyterianism, throughout the whole realm. This was the introduction of the Scotch Reformation."* p. 83. In precisely the same style the Papists are accustom-

* On the opposite page, he says, The church of Scotland, "when it had obtained the victory over popery, assumed the place occupied by it, as the established religion of the country, retained all the property and advantages possessed by its predecessor, in churches, glebes, seminaries of learning, &c. It retained the same connexion with the civil authority, and contended for its rights and for the mastery, by weapons both carnal and spiritual." The Romish church, before the reformation was, in proportion to the wealth of the country, one of the richest churches in Europe. M'Crie, in his *Life of Knox*, says, that its clergy had full one half of the wealth of the nation in their hands. The present church of Scotland is probably the poorest established church in the world.

ed to attribute the reformation of England to the lust and cupidity of Henry VIII.; and that of Germany to the envy and ambition of Luther; and thus too, there are Tories, who still devoutly believe that the American revolution was nothing but a Boston riot.

It is not our purpose to notice a tithe of the extraordinary things contained in the volume before us; but to confine ourselves to a few points more or less intimately connected with the history of our church. The first of these is the character of French Presbyterianism. Dr. Hill had stated in his sketches that the ecclesiastical system of the Huguenots was much more mild than those of Scotland and Holland. As Calvin was the father of the French churches; and as the mild Calvin is not exactly that combination of sounds with which the public ear is most familiar, we are not surprised that Professor Hodge was disposed to doubt whether French Presbyterianism was so characteristically gentle. To ascertain this point, he took the course which we presume will be allowed to be the correct one; he appealed to the standards of doctrine and discipline adopted by the French churches; and to the official acts of their national synods. It then appeared from the character of their confession of faith; from the rigour and frequency with which it was sworn to, and imposed on all ministers and teachers; from the provisions of their form of government; from the powers claimed and exercised by their national synods, and other judicatories, that the epithet *mild* was the very last which any reader would be disposed to apply to their system. Dr. Hill does not attempt to gainsay any of these points. But to show that the French were not so strict as the Scotch, he appeals, in the first place, to a speech of James VI., in which he boasts of belonging to the purest church on earth, to one which did not, as the church of Geneva did, keep Pasche and Yule, (Easter and Christmas.) "Why," asks Dr. Hill, "did that stupid hypocrite, James, use such language in the General Assembly of the kirk of Scotland? He spoke as he had been taught, and as he knew would please that Assembly. The Scotch kirk held other reformed churches in contempt, because they still observed pasche and yule, as Geneva and France did, with other remnants of popery. The church of French protestants, was but a young dove to the kirk of Scotland," p. 12. We must let this proof of the character of French Presbyterianism pass for what it is worth.

Dr. Hill admits that "the protestants of France exhibited

a very different character at different times. While they were favoured at court, patronised by the nobility, and their religion established by the Queen of Navarre, they were like Christians always have been in temporal prosperity, and at the right hand of power. They could then persecute the poor Independents, who had fled to their maritime coasts from oppression in England. But when their palladium, the famous edict of Nantes was revoked in 1685, and they were made to feel the effects of unrelenting persecution, their characters were entirely different." p. 9. The kind of history contained in this passage shall be noticed directly. It is enough now to remark that after the revocation of the edict of Nantes, the French protestants were almost exterminated or driven from their country, and could hardly be said to have had an ecclesiastical existence. That this representation is not too strong, will be admitted, for in quoting from Mosheim the expression, "While the Reformed churches in France yet subsisted," Dr. Hill subjoins the explanation, "i. e. before the revocation of the edict of Nantes." Now as the question at issue was the character of French Presbyterianism, one should think that this ought to be determined by the character of the church while it existed, and not after its destruction.

Dr. Hill moreover quotes largely from Mosheim to show that some of the French doctors, even before 1685, had departed in several points from the common rule of faith, and that notwithstanding the condemnation pronounced by their synod, and the opposition of their learned men, liberal sentiments gained ground, and were carried by the French refugees into other countries. We are ready to admit that if the subject in debate was the doctrinal opinions of the French emigrants to this country, these extracts would deserve attention. We admit further, that so far as they are an offset to a remark made by Prof. Hodge, viz. "As there was at an early period a strong infusion of French Presbyterianism in the churches of this country, it is well to know something of its character," they should have whatever weight properly belongs to them. How much that is, we will consider in a moment. But what have they to do with the question started by Dr. Hill in his Sketches, viz. the character of Presbyterianism as it prevailed in France? It may be admitted that false doctrine had made its appearance among the French protestants, before their great overthrow, and that their descendants departed still further from the faith, and yet every

word that Prof. Hodge said about their ecclesiastical system be correct, every word that Dr. Hill said about it be wrong. In other words, the extracts from Mosheim (the historical verity of whose statements we are far from admitting) have nothing to do with the real point at issue.

As to the question which Dr. Hill seems desirous to substitute for the original one, viz. the character of the French refugees, and their influence upon our church, we are willing to meet him on perfectly fair terms. If he will stand to his admissions as to the character of French Presbyterianism before the revocation of the edict of Nantes, we will allow the influence of the doctrinal defection of some of the French theologians on the French emigrants to this country to have been as great, as he will allow the much greater defection in the Church of Scotland to have been on the Scotch emigrants. But we cannot consent that the Scotch should not have the benefit even of heresy. If a little false doctrine made the French so different from what they once were, we cannot see how more of the same ingredient should leave the Scotch so entirely unchanged.

Before leaving this subject, we will give our readers a specimen of the manner in which Dr. Hill spins history out of his imagination, and sets down his vague impressions as positive facts. We just quoted one passage in which he gave an account of the state of the French Church, when the declaration against the Independents was made. He returns to the subject, and says: "At the time the French synod, in the year 1644, passed the acts which Prof. Hodge cites with such apparent pleasure, the Protestants of France were in great favour with the reigning king, Francis I., who, out of opposition to Charles V., did many very absurd and inconsistent things respecting the reformation. He would patronise or persecute them, just as he could make it subserve his purposes of state. He permitted his sister, the Queen of Navarre, to establish the reformation in the kingdom of Navarre, and it was during these days of prosperity, and when gross darkness rested upon Christians of every nation respecting liberty of conscience and religious freedom, that those good French Protestants did those wicked things that Prof. Hodge refers to, and which I did expect he would notice at least with some apology or mark of disapprobation; but no! the poor Independents were to be proscribed and banished forthwith for fear *they would diffuse the contagion of their poison, and introduce a world of disorders into the provinces,*" p. 13. Francis I. was

born in 1494, and ascended the throne 1515; if still living in 1644, he was in his one hundred and twenty-ninth year of his reign, and the hundred and fiftieth of his life. According to all other accounts he died in 1547, ninety-seven years before the date of his 'great favour' to the Protestants. It need hardly be said that all the minor statements of this paragraph are of the same kind with the preceding. There was, in 1644, no Queen of Navarre, and no such kingdom, in the sense in which Dr. Hill uses the terms. The Protestants so far from being established, or in high favour, or at the right hand of power, were reduced to a state of complete dependence. By the arts of Richlieu, under the reign of Louis XIII., they had by fraud or force been despoiled of all their strong towns; Rochelle, their last defence, fell in 1629. From that time they were at the mercy of their enemies. Louis XIV. came to the throne in 1643, his mother, Ann of Austria, acting as regent, and Cardinal Mazarin administering the government as prime minister. All, therefore, that Dr. Hill has said about the historical circumstances under which the declaration against the Independents was made, is pure fiction. He, of course, had no intention to deceive any body; for whom could he hope to deceive? But it is evident that he has not the slightest idea of the responsibility of a historian; that he allows himself to write down just what comes into his head; and that he is the last man in the world who is entitled to speak of other writers as unworthy of confidence.

Another subject on which a few words must be said, is the Presbyterianism of the Puritans. The "want of method" with which Dr. Hill says his book is written, renders it very difficult to ascertain his views on this as well as on many other points. The same subject being introduced first here and then there, often coming on the reader unexpectedly, and what is said in one place being, at least apparently, contradicted in another, the most careful seeker after his meaning gets bewildered. Prof. Hodge had stated that the majority of the Puritans in England were Presbyterians. From the contemptuous manner in which Dr. Hill speaks of this assertion, from his quoting the declarations of others in contradiction to it, and from the drift of a large part of his book, we took it for certain that he meant to deny the statement. But when we reached p. 142, we found him saying: "Prof. Hodge was right in saying the majority of the English nation, as well as of the parliament, were Presbyterian at that time;

but he did not tell us what kind of Presbyterians they were, nor how they became so, nor how long it lasted, but laboured hard to make the impression that there was no material difference between them and the Scotch, who pleaded divine authority for their entire form, with their solemn league and covenant, and that no other system or form of worship was to be tolerated." It answered every purpose which Prof. Hodge had in view, to show that they adopted all the essential principles of Presbyterianism. Any deficiency, however, in the exhibition of their precise character may be readily supplied from Dr. Hill. They were the Presbyterians who framed, adopted, and enforced the Westminster Directory, and those who adopted that formula, he says, 'Swallowed the Scotch system whole.' Nay more, though on p. 142 he blames Mr. H. for trying to make the impression that there was, at the time when the English Presbyterians formed the majority of the nation, no material difference between them and the Scotch, yet on p. 144 he himself tells us, "The English Presbyterians," after the restoration of Charles II., "began to lower their tone," and after having tried in vain one scheme of compromise after another, "they were taught what they might expect as the legitimate fruits of their beloved system of *jure divino* uniformity, by the famous St. Bartholomew's act of 1662, when two thousand ministerial brethren were silenced and reduced to beggary, or forced to fly from their country. Thus terminated Scotch Presbyterianism in England. High scenes were transacted in Scotland between these two schemes of divine right and uniformity in religion. [It is strange that Dr. Hill can speak thus lightly of one of the most horrible persecutions Christians ever suffered.] But Presbyterianism in England henceforward assumed a new character, and they learned modesty and meekness in the school of adversity."

With regard to the Puritans of New England, Dr. Hill represents Prof. Hodge as claiming the majority of them "as good Presbyterians, and as agreeing with the strict Scotch system;" and contending strenuously "in the greater part of his introductory chapter, that the majority of the Puritans, by whom New England was settled, were decidedly and to all important purposes good Presbyterians," p. 41; as maintaining that "the Independents bore but a small proportion to the Puritans" in New England, p. 49. This assertion is repeated in different forms, we presume, at least ten or twelve

times. What Prof. Hodge really said was merely this, "that no inconsiderable proportion of those [Puritans] who came to America, preferred the Presbyterian form of government."* The only occasion, so far as we know, on which he ventures to state the proportion, he fixes it at ONE FOURTH.†

Dr. Hill makes Prof. Hodge say that the Cambridge platform "contains all the essential features of Presbyterianism," p. 38; that it "had all the elements [of that system] predominant," p. 45. This assertion too, we think must be repeated at least a dozen of times; and yet it is just as incorrect as the preceding. Mr. Hodge said: "The Saybrook platform comes much nearer the Presbyterian model than that of Cambridge," and even the former he said came short of Presbyterianism.‡

Dr. Hill says more than once that Prof. Hodge admits that Mr. Andrews "was a Congregationalist," p. 111. What Mr. Hodge really says on that point is "Mr. Andrews, so far from being a Congregationalist, was an old side Presbyte-

* Constitutional History, Part 1, p. 31.

† "The number of Puritans who settled New England," says Prof. Hodge, "was about twenty-one thousand. If it be admitted that three-fourths of these were Congregationalists (which is a large admission) it gives between fifteen and sixteen thousand." History, Part 1, p. 69.

‡ History, Part 1, p. 38 and 39. The Cambridge platform was framed in 1648, 49, and expressly denies to synods the right to perform any act of "church authority or jurisdiction." By an assembly, held about 1660, it was declared that synods duly composed, "and proceeding with a due regard to the will of God in his word, are to be revered as determining the mind of the Spirit concerning things necessary to be received and practised;" and that "their judgments be acknowledged as decisive." In reference to these declarations, Prof. Hodge remarked: "Here it is evident that the presbyterial element in those churches predominated." This remark had no reference to the Cambridge platform, which taught a very different doctrine. Prof. Hodge merely meant to say, that the Presbyterians in the Massachusetts' churches, predominated in the assembly of 1660 so far as to procure a declaration of their doctrine as to the authority of synods, in opposition to the congregational doctrine that they were merely advisory councils.

It is a fact worthy of Dr. Hill's consideration that when the assembly which framed the Cambridge platform adopted the Westminster Confession of Faith, they made no exception of those clauses which relate to the power of civil magistrates in matters of religion, while they did except those parts "which have respect unto church government and discipline." Whereas our synod, in adopting the same formula, made no objection to what related to church government; while they objected to what referred to the power of civil magistrates.

Dr. Hill says that the Cambridge platform, "after being adopted by the general court, and undergoing various amendments and explanations from time to time, has been the standard authority and form of government ever since," p. 21. According to the best of our information, it has been a dead letter for more than a hundred years.

rian.”* His very object in referring to the fact that the majority of the English Puritans were Presbyterians, and that many of those who came to this country belonged to the same class, was to show the impropriety of gratuitously assuming that all New England ministers who entered our church were Congregationalists. Dr. Hill seems to think it was useless to guard against such an assumption (see p. 47); yet he, throughout his book, we believe without exception, makes this very assumption. Mr. Andrews he says was a Congregationalist; Mr. Abraham Pierson, who he supposes was ordained in Boston, he says was a thorough going Congregationalist; he argues, that others were Congregationalists because their congregations were in his opinion composed of New England people; and in one of those fancy sketches, with which his work abounds, he says, “Makemie induced his Presbyterian neighbouring ministers, who were brought to this country through his influence, to unite in forming a presbytery upon these liberal principles. Andrews had as much influence over his congregational brethren from New England, and caused them to drop the name of Congregationalists, to agree to be called Presbyterians, and thus to approximate each other, and settle down upon some common principles, as fast as they could see eye to eye,” p. 114. There is not, to the best of our knowledge and belief, the slightest historical evidence for all this. There is no evidence that there was in the presbytery, at the time of its organization, one minister from New England, except Mr. Andrews himself, much less one Congregationalist. That Mr. Andrews was no Congregationalist is rendered certain by his denying every distinctive principle of Congregationalism, and affirming every principle distinctive of Presbyterianism.† Dr. Hill, however, says, he never had any elders in his congregation. As this statement is directly contradicted by the minutes of the presbytery, where his elder is named almost at every meeting, it must be sustained by the strongest evidence, before it can be admitted. The mere mention of a committee on the records of his church is no such evidence; since such committees to manage the secular affairs of the church were often

* History, Part 1, p. 97.

† How could a Congregationalist adopt the Westminster Confession of Faith, declaring that he objected to nothing but to certain clauses relating to the power of civil magistrates? See also the four articles on church government unanimously adopted by the synod in 1722, Constitutional History, P. I. p. 142.

appointed, when there was a regular session. "The incorporated committee" of the first church in Philadelphia, were its trustees. If however it should be proved that there were no elders in Mr. Andrew's church during his life, it would no more show that he was a Congregationalist, than the fact that Dr. How and Dr. Snodgrass were pastors of an independent congregation, shows that they are Independents.

The next subject which Dr. Hill takes up is the settlement of the Puritans out of New England. The first case on which he dwells is that of Newark. And "to show what kind of foundation Prof. Hodge is willing sometimes to rest his statements upon," he quotes the following passage from his history. "The Rev. Abraham Pierson was, it is believed [here is the evidence, *it is believed*, by whom besides himself we are not told, but it is believed] *episcopally* ordained in England, from whence he emigrated to this country with a number of followers. After several previous attempts at settlement, they fixed themselves at Brandford in Connecticut. Being dissatisfied, however, with the union between the colonies of New Haven and Connecticut, they removed to Newark. After continuing the pastor of the church there for about twenty years, Mr. Pierson was succeeded by his son, who was subsequently appointed the first president of Yale College. These two ministers *tradition relates* [here is his proof] were moderate Presbyterians, but the son more especially [more especially what? Why more especially a moderate Presbyterian. What distinction can be drawn between a moderate and a more moderate Presbyterian? This must be a nice distinction indeed.] He [that is the son] had imbibed moderate Presbyterianism from his father, and when at Cambridge College, he had received strong prejudices against Plymouthian independency, and after his father's death, he was for introducing more rigid Presbyterianism into Newark, &c." Dr. Hill quotes the whole of this passage as the language of Prof. Hodge, though the part on which he particularly comments is marked as a quotation from the venerable Dr. M^rWhorter; with whose style he makes himself merry. We quote now from Dr. Hill, "To prove that Newark was settled and governed by Presbyterians, Prof. Hodge refers to a manuscript history, and asserts that its writer [Dr. M^rWhorter, why did not Dr. Hill mention his name?], says, "that an aged elder, then eighty-six years old, stated that there had been a church session at Newark from the earliest

time he could remember, and that he always *understood* there was one from the beginning? Does our professor expect to establish historical facts by such vague hearsay evidence as this? Then he may establish any thing. . . . After these few samples of our professor's ingenuity, to say nothing of his candour, the reader will be left to form his own opinion respecting the degree of credit that ought to be given to his statements," p. 61.* All that need be said in reply to this is, that every thing stated in reference to the settlement of Newark, the history and character of the two Piersons, and the character of the church in that town, is given on the authority of Dr. M'Whorter. That venerable man entered our synod as long ago as 1760; and however contemptible his authority may appear in the eyes of Dr. Hill, when adduced in behalf of Presbyterianism, we doubt not he would gladly go without his dinner many days in succession, to find any thing half so good to prove that there was one solitary Congregationalist in the original presbytery of our church. We shall soon see him pleasing himself with the reminiscences of a lady still living in Alexandria, as to the state of the congregation at Marlborough more than a hundred years ago.

Dr. Hill is not satisfied with one attack upon the account given respecting Mr. Pierson, he returns to it, on page 64. After quoting from Mather's *Magnalia*, the history of the formation of the church of which Mr. Pierson became the pastor, at Linn, Massachusetts, and his removal to Southampton, he adds: "If our learned professor of Princeton had noticed this chapter of Mather's *Magnalia*, he would not have gone to guessing that Mr. Pierson had been episcopally ordained in England; he would have found that his ecclesiastical standing was assumed at Boston; and that he was as thorough going a Congregationalist as any of that day. But he can manufacture Presbyterians when and how he pleases, and un-

* The reason given by Dr. Hill for discrediting the testimony of Dr. M'Whorter with regard to the younger Pierson is instructive in more ways than one. If he was so strict a Presbyterian, is it supposable, he asks, he "would have been chosen by the trustees of Yale College, chiefly composed of Connecticut clergymen, as president of their college? The Puritans did not often betray such folly." For Presbyterians to refuse Congregationalists, is bigotry; for Congregationalists to receive Presbyterians is folly. To us, however, nothing is more supposable than that though the Presbyterianism of Mr. Pierson might give offence to some of his congregation, it would raise him in the respect and confidence of the educated clergy of Connecticut. Congregationalism is like universal suffrage, easy to get down to, but hard to get up from.

make them as fast." The Doctor forgets that it was Dr. M'Whorter, and not Mr. Hodge, who made the Piersons Presbyterians. Notwithstanding all this positiveness, it is none the less certain that the elder Pierson was episcopally ordained in England. The settlement at Southampton took place in 1640; and as Mr. Pierson was first employed in Massachusetts, he must have arrived in the country some time before that date. And if a preacher before his arrival, the probability, to say the least, is that he was episcopally ordained. Dr. Hill himself says: "The overwhelming majority of the Puritans who settled New England, had belonged to the Episcopal church," (p. 38), and there were few if any preachers among them before 1640 who had not received their ordination from the English bishops. That Mr. Pierson was a preacher in England is distinctly stated by his biographers.* There is no ordination, properly speaking, known to have occurred in New England before 1644; but what Dr. Hill calls Mr. Pierson's ordination, must have occurred before 1640.† Such ordination, "was in the nature and design of it only an instalment over a particular church."‡ Mr. Hobart says, the number of ministers who arrived in New England before 1640 is estimated at ninety. "Dr. Mather," he adds, "has given us the names of seventy-seven, and the places where they all settled in this country. And the same list may be seen in Mr. Neal's History of New England. These had every one of them been ordained by the bishops in England."—p. 90. The fifty-third name on this list is that of the Rev. Abraham Pierson, of Southampton.§

We have read and re-read what Dr. Hill says of the settlements of the Puritans on the Delaware, and cannot see that he has been more successful than Mr. Hodge in his search for historical evidence on this subject. He considers it a matter of importance, since so many of the churches connected with the first presbytery were in that region of country.

* See Allen's Biographical Dictionary, and the authorities therein cited.

† Hobart's Second Address to the Episcopal Separatists in N. E. p. 93, published 1751. The ordination referred to in the text was that of Mr. John Woodbridge, at Andover.

‡ Hobart, p. 90. When Mr. Wilson was re-ordained at Charlestown, Mass. in 1630, "It was with a protestation by all, that it should be only as a sign of his election to the charge of his new flock, without any intention that he should thereby renounce the ministry he had received in England."—Magnalia, B. I. p. 22. Such was the only ordination Mr. Pierson ever received in this country.

§ Mather's Magnalia, B. III. p. 2.

If the kind of people of which those churches were composed can be ascertained, it would afford a ground of presumption as to the character of their ministers. Hence his anxiety to prove that the people were from New England. Though, on page 61, he quotes Professor Hodge, as saying, "In 1640, the colony of New Haven made a large purchase of land on both sides of the Delaware, and sent out about fifty families to make a settlement;" yet on p. 64, having cited the same account from Trumbull & Holmes, he adds, "This occurrence entirely escaped Prof. Hodge, who fixes the first attempt to settle on the Delaware in the year 1669, and makes even that a failure." As to the failure, Professor H. does nothing more than refer to the account of Trumbull, who states that the Dutch governor, Kieft, dispatched an armed force, burned the English trading houses, seized their goods, and made a number of the planters prisoners.* The Dutch and Swedes had settlements and claims on both sides of the river; this settlement from New Haven, we infer from its being noticed by Gordon, in his History of New Jersey, (who says the number of persons sent was greatly overrated), was on the eastern side.

Dr. Hill quotes another passage from Holmes, under date 1642, which speaks of a settlement of about twenty families, on land to which neither the Dutch nor Swedes had any just claim. This colony suffered so much, he says, from sickness, during the first summer, as to threaten its very existence, "and to mend the matter, Kieft, the Dutch governor of New Netherlands, without any protest or legal warning, sent an armed force to Delaware, burned their trading house, and seized their goods." Whether this was the same expedition as that mentioned by Trumbull, we do not know. Trumbull says, the purchase of land was made in 1640, but does not say when the people were sent; Holmes does not say when the land was bought, but fixes the settlement in 1641, and the attack of Kieft in 1642. Neither writer states, on which side of the river the settlement was made, but say it was on land on which neither Dutch nor Swedes had any just claim. But Dr. Hill tells us the Swedes "bought of the the natives the land from Cape Henlopen to the falls of the the Delaware, and obtained peaceable possession" in 1627 and 1629. There were, no doubt, some New England

* Trumbull's History of Con. Vol. I. p. 120.

traders on the west side of the Delaware, attracted, as Bancroft says, by the climate and facility of commercial intercourse, but we know nothing of any settlements sufficiently numerous to exert any marked influence on the character of the population. If they were so numerous so early as 1640 and onwards, how comes it, with their Puritan habits, and the great superabundance of ministers in New England,* they never had a minister before 1700 or 1705? On no better foundation than that above referred to, so far as we can discover, Dr. Hill says: "The New England part of the population was no doubt the most numerous on the Delaware."—p. 71. This remark is made in special reference to the west side of the river, for it is made in order to determine the character of the congregations "between Philadelphia and Cape Henlopen."

The last subject on which we propose to say any thing at present, is the origin of the original members of the presbytery of Philadelphia. On page 137, Dr. Hill quotes from Professor Hodge the following passage: "Of the original members of the presbytery, Mr. Hazard says: 'It is probable that all except Mr. Andrews were foreigners by birth, and that they were ordained to the gospel ministry in Scotland or Ireland.' The correctness of this statement can be proved by documentary evidence in regard to most of these gentlemen, and by the strongest circumstantial evidence with regard to others." On this quotation, he thus comments: "Now let us scrutinize this statement of our learned professor. The conclusion he is driving at is, *that all these original members, but Mr. Andrews, were foreigners, and had been ordained to the ministry in Scotland and Ireland.* Now for the proof. Mr. Hazard, about *thirty* years ago, thought it *probable* that this was the case; therefore the case is settled. A professor should be a little more logical in his reasoning than this amounts to." The proof lies in the documentary and circumstantial evidence referred to. Mr. Hazard's opinion was mentioned to show the effect of that evidence on an impartial man. That it has not produced the same effect upon Dr. Hill must, we think, be attributed to his state of mind.

* According to Dr. Hill's estimate from Mather, of the number of emigrants to New England, before 1640, there was one minister for about every forty-five persons; according to Bancroft's estimate of the population, which we believe to be correct, there was still one minister for every 230 or 240 of the inhabitants. Surely, if they had so many brethren on the Delaware, they ought not to have left them fifty or sixty years without a pastor.

With regard to Messrs. Makemie, M'Nish, and Hampton, it is admitted, that they were foreigners and presbyterially ordained, before they came to this country. Mr. Andrews, it is admitted, was from Boston. The whole doubt is about Messrs. Wilson, Davis, and Taylor. Mr. Wilson was settled at New Castle; Mr. Davis, first at Lewestown, though not as a pastor, and afterwards at Snowhill. "The strong presumptive evidence that they were educated as Congregationalists," according to Dr. Hill, "arises from the places where they settled, the kind of population of which their congregations were formed: the liberal and tolerant government which they practised; and last, though not least, the peace and harmony which prevailed among them."—p. 163. Now, as the form of government which they practised, was the same as that practised by their co-presbyters, Messrs. Makemie, M'Nish, and Hampton, who were foreigners and Presbyterians, we cannot see how it proves that the others were New England Congregationalists. And as harmony was preserved between the gentlemen just named and their brethren, it might have existed though Messrs. Wilson and Davis were Presbyterians. The case turns, then, on "the kind of population of which their congregations were formed." We are willing to let it rest there. If Dr. Hill will make it appear that New Castle, Lewestown, and Snowhill were New England settlements, we will admit that he has gained one ground for presuming that Messrs. Wilson and Davis were from New England.*

The only remaining case is that of the Rev. Mr. Taylor.

* On page 71, Dr. Hill says: "The New England part of the population, which was no doubt most numerous upon the Delaware river, would of course look to be supplied from New England." The minutes of presbytery inform us, that the people of Lewes were at an early period looking somewhere else. In 1707, it was "ordered by the presbytery that Mr. ——— and Mr. Makemie write to Scotland to Mr. Alexander Coldin, minister of Oxman, in the presbytery of ——— to give an account of the state and circumstances of the dissenting Presbyterian interest among the people in and about Lewestown, and to signify the earnest desires of that people for the said Mr. Coldin coming over to be their minister. And that Mr. Makemie make report of his diligence herein to the next presbytery. The presbytery appoints Mr. John Wilson to write to the presbytery of ——— to the effect foresaid, and to make report of his diligence herein to the next presbytery." The first name in this minute is obliterated, except the last letter *n*. The latter part of the record shows that it was the name of Mr. Wilson, who, with Mr. Makemie, was to write a joint letter to Mr. Coldin, and a separate letter to the presbytery, the name of which is not given. This is one of the circumstances which connects Mr. Wilson with Scotland. We do not know how Dr. Hill will account for New England people writing to Scotland for a minister.

Professor Hodge had stated, on the authority of the late Dr. Balch, that Col. Ninian Beall, a native of Scotland, having been driven by persecution from his own country, came to Maryland about 1690; that he wrote home for his friends and neighbours to join him, and that in consequence of his exertions about two hundred of them came, bringing the Rev. Mr. Taylor as their pastor, and formed the church and congregation of Upper Marlborough. This account Dr. Hill very unceremoniously rejects. He calls it a story, a tale; says Dr. Balch was misinformed, conjectures that the account was received from him when he was "far gone in second childhood," &c. He insists upon it "That the first account we hear of a church at Marlborough was a petition sent to presbytery about the year 1715 or 1716, from a few Scotch merchants and others for supplies of preaching. Two members, Messrs. Conn and Orme were sent to those regions to look after the people at Marlborough, and others. Both of these ministers settled west of the Chesapeake, in Maryland, and Mr. Conn was ordained and settled at Marlborough in the year 1716 as their first minister, as the records of the mother presbytery will show." "Such a Scotch congregation and minister [as those mentioned by Dr. Balch] never existed. It is all a mistake. Dr. Balch must have been misinformed. Before 1716 the people and congregation of Marlborough were never mentioned or alluded to, in the minutes of the presbytery, as being under their care." p. 85. All these assertions are repeated on p. 152-4, where he mentions that he was well acquainted with the son and granddaughter of the Rev. Mr. Orme above mentioned, from whom he received his information concerning that part of Maryland, and who agreed that there never was a congregation organized in that region of country before the visit of Messrs. Conn and Orme.

The main position of Dr. Hill, and that on which his whole cause depends, is that the congregation of Marlborough is not mentioned in the minutes before 1715. We must premise here that Marlborough lies on the Patuxent river, hence Dr. Hill sometimes calls the congregation in question Marlborough, and sometimes Patuxent. The minutes do the same thing. In 1715 it was ordered that "a letter be written to the people of Patuxent," and we find it addressed "To our Christian friends at Marlborough." These, then, according to Dr. Hill and the minutes, were different names for the same congregation. As early as 1711, we find the following

repeated mention of this congregation. "Mr. M'Nish's affair in reference to Patuxent deferred to another time." p. 12. And on the same page, "Mr. M'Nish's case came under consideration, and it was determined to leave his affair respecting Jamaica and Patuxent to himself; with the advice, not to delay fixing himself somewhere." The simple explanation of these minutes is this. The Rev. Mr. Taylor who, Dr. Balch says, was the first pastor of the Patuxent people, died about 1710. He was present at the presbytery in 1709, but never appeared again. His congregation being thus left vacant, they called Mr. M'Nish, and he having at the same time received a call from Jamaica, Long Island, was left to decide between them. He decided in favour of Jamaica, where it is known he settled in 1712; and accordingly, supplies became necessary for Patuxent; hence it was "ordered that Mr. Wilson do supply the people of Patuxent four sabbaths; Mr. Henry four sabbaths, and Mr. Hampton is left to himself to supply sometimes if he can." All this was in 1711; so much for the assertion that there is no allusion to this congregation before 1716. It should be stated that no church is mentioned on the minutes, unless there was some particular occasion for it. We are not aware that the first church in Philadelphia is mentioned for the first twenty or thirty years, and simply because there was no occasion to mention it. So in the case of Marlborough, as long as Mr. Taylor lived, his church had no reason for appearing before the presbytery; but as soon as he was dead, we find them soliciting for another minister, or for supplies.

Dr. Hill's next assertion, viz. that Mr. Conn organized the church at Patuxent, and became their first pastor in 1715 or 1716, is of course refuted by the preceding records, which prove at least the existence of the congregation in 1711. This assertion, however, is repeated in various forms, and with much detail. "About the year 1714," says Dr. Hill, "two young men, licentiates or students in theology, arrived from England, Hugh Conn and John Orme. The next year, 1715, Mr. Conn was ordained and sent to preach to the people about Patuxent and Bladensburg. He organized congregations at each of those places and became their first pastor, and lived and died such." It will appear from what follows that Mr. Conn, so far from being the first pastor of Patuxent, was never the pastor of that congregation at all. He was received by the presbytery as a licentiate in 1715, as appears from the following record. "Mr. James Gordon having pre-

sented a call from the people of Baltimore county, in Maryland, unto Mr. Hugh Conn, the presbytery called for, considered and approved the said Mr. Conn's credentials as a preacher of the gospel, and likewise considered and approved the call, which being presented by the moderator unto Mr. Conn, he accepted of it, whereupon it was appointed that Messrs. Magill, Anderson, Gillespie, Wortherspoon and Evans, after being satisfied with his ministerial abilities, should solemnly, by prayer, fasting, and the imposition of hands, ordain him unto the work of the ministry among the above said people, the third Thursday of October next." He was ordained, therefore, over the people in Baltimore county, and not over the Patuxent people. What makes this matter still more certain is, that the Patuxent people had at this very time a pastor settled over them. In September, 1715, a month, therefore, before the ordination of Mr. Conn, it was "ordered that Messrs. Andrews, M'Nish and Gillespie write a letter to the people of Patuxent in relation to the present posture of their affairs." In that letter the presbytery say, "We had much comfort in hearing from our brother and your Reverend pastor, that when (as is our practice) he was interrogated concerning the manner of his people's deportment towards him in his pastoral office, he made his answers wholly to their advantage." The letter is principally an exhortation to peace, and a caution against Satan's attempts to produce divisions among them. And in conclusion they say, "We recommend to you earnestly a Christian regard to our worthy brother, your pastor, and that you encourage, honour and obey him in the Lord, that his labours, as they are for his people, so they may turn to his and their account in the day of the Lord."

Dr. Balch states that after the death of Mr. Taylor, this congregation was vacant for about three years, but at last obtained a pastor, the Rev. Mr. Magill, from some presbytery in Scotland. We have already seen that the name of Mr. Taylor ceases to appear on the minutes after the year 1709, that in 1711 the congregation called Mr. M'Nish, but that he declined, and in 1713 Mr. Magill was received as an ordained minister, as will be seen from the following extract. "Mr. Robert Lawson, Mr. Daniel Magill, and Mr. George Gillespie, having applied to this presbytery for admittance as members thereof, the presbytery finding, by their ample testimonials, that they have been legally and orderly ordained

as ministers of the gospel, and that they have since behaved themselves as such, did cheerfully and cordially receive them, and they took their places." The coincidence does not stop here, Dr. Balch says Mr. Magill was an austere or morose man, got into difficulty with his people, and left them. Accordingly we find that in 1715, two years after his settlement, there was trouble in the congregation, and that the presbytery found it necessary to write to them and to exhort them to exercise proper feelings towards their pastor; and in 1719 Mr. Magill was without any pastoral charge; for it is recorded in the minutes for that year that an overture was presented "that Mr. Magill and Mr. Orr have synodical testimonials, they havig at present no particular pastoral charges." p. 48.

Again, Dr. Balch says that after the departure of Mr. Magill the congregation obtained, through the intervention of certain London merchants, the Rev. John Orme as their pastor. This statement also fully accords with the minutes; for in 1720 the minutes state that "Mr. John Orme presented to the synod his testimonials relating to his ordination and his qualifications for the gospel ministry, which the synod was satisfied with, and upon his desire he was received as a member of this synod."* p. 51.

Here then are a series of coincidences which admit of no other explanation than the truth of Dr. Balch's history. According to him, Mr. Taylor came to this country with his people towards the beginning of the last century; he died early, and after an interval of a few years was succeeded by Mr. Magill, who differed with his people, and left them, and was succeeded in 1719 by Mr. Orme. We learn from the minutes that Mr. Taylor was a member of the presbytery in 1705, that he was dead in 1710, that as soon as he died the Patuxent congregation were without a minister; as soon as Mr. Magill appears on the minutes they are found to have a pastor; and when he is reported as without a charge, Mr. Orme appears, and not before. As these accounts are entirely independent of each other, their agreement renders their correctness, even on the principles of the mathematical doctrine of chances, certain.

* Dr. Balch says Mr. Orme remained the pastor of Marborough until he died in 1758, in the seventy-eighth year of his age. The death of Mr. Conn was reported to the synod in 1753. He could never therefore have been the pastor of that church. He was the pastor of Bladensburgh; and Dr. Hill, by making him pastor of Marlborough, has left Mr. Orme, who he says correctly was a neighbour of Mr. Conn, without any known charge in that region of country.

Considering that Dr. Balch derived his information from oral tradition, its accuracy is a matter of wonder, though his opportunities of learning the facts which he records were unusually good. "My wife," he writes to Dr. Green, "is a great grand daughter of Col. Ninian Beall, who laid the foundation of the Presbyterian church in Marlborough, and was one of the most active members in building it up. Moreover, my father-in-law, Col. George Beall, who died lately in the seventy-third year of his age, and who, in the male line, was grand son of Col. Ninian Beall, was well acquainted with some of the circumstances which I relate, and which you and Mr. Hazard wish to know."

Dr. Balch furnished two accounts of this interesting congregation; the one dated April 2d, 1793, and the other December 18th, 1810, neither, therefore, written during his second childhood, as Dr. Hill conjectures. The former, which is much shorter and more general than the other, does not present a single case of discrepancy with the official records of the presbytery.* In his second communication,

* We here insert all that part of this account which relates to the early history of this congregation. "In the reign of Charles II. king of Great Britain, a persecution was set on foot by the Episcopalians against the Presbyterians. This storm fell with great weight upon—[we cannot make out the word here]; many of them were burnt, drowned, hung, or otherwise tortured to death; others were compelled to leave their pleasant houses, their wives and children, and to take refuge in foreign climes. Of this latter class, was Col. Ninian Beall, a native of North Britain, who, for the sake of conscience, fled from his own land and nation, and fought for that liberty in Maryland which was denied him on the other side of the Atlantic. Some years after his arrival in Maryland, he made a purchase of several large tracts of land from the tribe of Piscataway Indians. On one of these tracts he laid out the town of Upper Marlborough, and there fixed his own residence. Remembering that he had a large number of relations at home, subjected to the same sufferings from which he had escaped, and now enjoying the sweets of religious and civil liberty, he wrote to his friends to come over to Maryland, and partake of his happiness, urging it upon them, at the same time, to bring with them a faithful minister of the gospel. They arrived some months afterwards, accompanied by the Rev. Mr. Taylor, their pastor. Col. Beall marked off a lot in Upper Marlborough for a meeting house and burying ground, containing about an acre and a half of land. A house for public worship was built, and the small but growing congregation were happy and thankful under the labours of their minister, when, lo! Mr. Taylor, to the great grief and consternation of his flock, was suddenly called into the invisible world. They lamented, for a time, this dark process of divine Providence; at last, however, they took courage, and made application to some of the presbyteries or synods in Scotland for another minister. Mr. Magill was sent over, and being by nature of a morose, sulky temper, he and the congregation soon differed and parted. The Rev. John Orme, a native of Derbyshire, was fixed on for their next pastor. He arrived at Upper Marlborough in 1719, and continued labouring among them with success until the year 1758, when he was removed from his charge by death."

Dr. Balch goes more into detail. After narrating particularly the manner of Col. Beall's escape from Scotland, he fixes his arrival in this country at about 1690, and that of his friends, to the number of at least two hundred, about 1700.* He calls Mr. Taylor, Mr. *James* Taylor, instead of *Nathaniel*, and Mr. Magill, Mr. *Robert* Magill. He also places the death of Mr. Taylor in 1703, whereas he was living in September, 1709. Such inaccuracies are precisely what might be expected from an attempt to be so particular in giving, from tradition, such minute circumstances.† Instead of weakening, however, the credibility of his account, they rather confirm it, by showing that it is entirely independent of the official records, by which, as to all the essential points, it is so wonderfully confirmed. All the main facts, in Dr. Balch's statement, viz: that Mr. Taylor was the pastor of Marlborough before 1705, that he died early, that he was succeeded by Mr. Magill, and he by Mr. Orme, are sustained by the coincident statements of the minutes, in such a manner as to leave no doubt of their correctness.

With regard to Mr. John Boyd, who was ordained by the presbytery at the first meeting of which the records are extant, viz: that of 1706, Dr. Hill says, "Who he was and whence he came, we know not. Professor Hodge claims him as a Scotchman; but what credit is due to such claims from our professor, or to such unpublished manuscripts of which he has had the exclusive privilege of culling from, we have already seen."—p. 164. On the 6th page of the minutes, it is recorded: "A letter, presented by the people of Freehold, about the settlement of Mr. Boyd, is referred to the next meeting." And again, on the same page, "ordered that Mr. Boyd shall supply, every third sabbath, at Wood-

* Professor Hodge was inaccurate in stating 1690 instead of 1700 as the date of Mr. Taylor's arrival in this country. This mistake arose from his confusing the two accounts given by Dr. Balch. In the one he states that Col. Beall arrived 1690, and in the other, that his friends came some years after, without mentioning the year. Hence Mr. Hodge stated the time as about 1690. This mistake is of little consequence, as the only point of interest was to show that Mr. Taylor, was in this country before the organization of the presbytery in 1705.

† The mistakes and confusion as to names in the records and other manuscripts connected with the history of our church are exceeding numerous. The same name is often written several different ways. The Mr. *John* Boyd of the minutes is called first *Samuel* and then *Robert* Boyd by Dr. Woodhull. The man who appears on the minutes fifty times, as Mr. John Guild, suddenly appears for one occasion, as Mr. Jonathan Guile. We see too that the person whom Dr. Balch calls Col. Ninian Beall, Dr. Hill calls Col. Ninian Bell.

bridge, if they desire it, and the presbytery are to write to the people of Freehold, desiring there consent thereto." In the letter to certain ministers in Connecticut, by the presbytery, quoted at length by Dr. Hill, p. 89, it is said: We advised, "that Mr. Boyd, minister at Freehold, should, if desired by the dissenting party, come and preach at Woodbridge, one Lord's day every three weeks." Dr. Hill, therefore, had the means of knowing at least that Mr. Boyd was minister of the Scotch congregation at Freehold; and if we are not misinformed, the following passage from the manuscript volume of Mr. Hazard has passed under his eye, though now forgotten: "The death of the Rev. John Boyd was announced to the presbytery in their present session (1709). He came to America from Scotland, and was the first pastor of the church at Freehold in New Jersey." Mr. Hazard's authority for this statement is, indeed, the same manuscript history of that church to which Mr. Hodge appealed. Though Dr. Hill does seem disposed to admit its testimony, its correspondence with the statement of the records of presbytery, as well as the source whence it was derived, place its authority on a perfectly satisfactory basis.*

The greater portion of the volume before us consists of a review of about ninety pages of the first part of Professor Hodge's History. Dr. Hill intimates his purpose to continue this review in the future numbers of his work. After the exhibition which has just been made, we are satisfied the public will feel that they have no right to assume that the correctness of his representations is admitted, should they be allowed to pass uncontradicted. Any mistakes in Professor Hodge's work which he may detect and expose, we doubt not that gentleman will feel bound to acknowledge and correct. As yet there is but one such error, to the best of our knowledge or belief, which calls for such acknowledgment. It relates to the following passage in Mather's *Magnalia*. "Before the woful wars which broke forth in the three kingdoms, there were divers gentlemen in Scotland, who, being uneasy under the ecclesiastical burdens of the times, wrote over to New England their inquiries: Whether they might be there suffered freely to exercise their Presbyterian church government? And it was freely answered, that they might. Hereupon, they sent over an agent, who pitched

* It was written in 1790 by the late Dr. John Woodhull, for many years the pastor of the church at Freehold.

upon a tract of land near the mouth of Merrimack river, whither they intended to transplant themselves. But, although they had so far proceeded in their voyage as to be half seas through, the manifold crosses they met withal made them give over their intentions; and the providence of God so ordered it, that some of those very gentlemen were afterwards the revivers of that well known Solemn League and Covenant which had so great an influence on the following circumstances of the nation. However, the number of those who did actually arrive in New England before 1640, has been computed at about 4,000; since which time, far more have gone out of the country than have come into it; and the God of heaven so smiled upon the plantations, while under an easy and equal government, that the designs of Christianity, in well formed churches, have been carried on so as no history can parallel it." We think the most obvious and natural interpretation of this passage is: that although the attempt of the Scotch Presbyterians to make a settlement at the mouth of the Merrimack river, was frustrated, yet the number of those Presbyterians who did actually arrive in New England before 1640, was about 4,000. We still think, that any reader would suppose the writer spoke of the Presbyterians, whom he had just mentioned. Dr. Hill, however, says that, upon a close inspection of the passage, it will be seen that Mather meant to say, that the number of settlers of all classes who arrived before 1640, was about four thousand. We believe that he is right in his explanation, though we doubt whether any inspection of the passage would ever have led us to that conclusion. We find, however, the same statement in other writers who refer to Mather as their authority, and we therefore infer that Professor Hodge is wrong, and Dr. Hill is right as to this point. The reason why this latter explanation of the passage never occurred to Mr. Hodge, no doubt, is that the statement that only about four thousand emigrants arrived in New England before 1640, appeared incredible. And we think the estimate incorrect, for the following reasons: First, other writers of high authority estimate the number at more than twenty-one thousand;* and, secondly, if it is true that from 1640 to near the close of the century, more people

* Dr. Hill, in the very note in which he corrects Professor Hodge's mistake, tells us, from Holmes, that in the two years, 1637 and 1638 alone, six thousand emigrants arrived.

left the country than came into it, how is it possible to account for the number of inhabitants known to be in New England about 1700? This number is estimated, even by those who had no disposition to swell the amount, at 120,000 in the three provinces of Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Rhode Island. The natural increase of four thousand, under the most favourable circumstances, in a little more than sixty years, would not amount to one fourth of that number. But the circumstances of New England were not the most favourable to a rapid natural increase of the population. The sickness and hardships attendant on new settlements always retard more or less their progress; and several bloody wars with the Indians occurred during this period, which must have had no small influence in checking the advance of the population. How is it possible, then, that 4,000 emigrants could, within the time specified, have furnished 120,000 people to New England, besides the numbers who settled upon Long Island and in New Jersey? And where is Dr. Hill to get the people whom he makes so numerous on both banks of the Delaware? The Puritans were a wonderful people, but they could not achieve impossibilities. We believe, therefore, that Dr. Mather is wrong in his calculations. The whole of Bancroft's twenty-one thousand is necessary to account for the subsequent population of the country. We have only to remark, in conclusion, that Professor Hodge's representation of the influence of Presbyterian sentiments in New England, rested only in a small degree upon his mistaken interpretation of Mather. That representation was founded on the explicit statements of the union of Presbyterians and Congregationalists in the New England churches, elsewhere given by Mather and Trumbull, and upon the nature of the ecclesiastical systems there adopted.

Samuel Taylor.

ART. III.—*The Works of Lord Bacon.* Edited by Basil Montague, Esq. London: William Pickering. 1838.

THE object of this article, is to exhibit the nature of the Logic taught by Aristotle, in his *Organon*, and the nature of the Method of Investigation taught by Bacon, in his *Novum Organon*. We have treated these two great subjects in con-