THE

PRINCETON REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1846.

No. IV.

ART. I.—1. *The Directory for the Worship of God in the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, as amended and ratified by the General Assembly in May,* 1821.

2. *The Book of Common Prayer, and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, according to the use of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America.*

IF any feel amazement at the variety of forms in which the religious sentiment of Christians seeks expression in mental and bodily exercises, while, in all the cases, the God who is worshiped, the end of the worship, and the spirit which guides the worshipper are the same, they have but to consider this obvious and significant fact: That the spirit of God in the mind of man expresses itself in the various languages, and the various forms of thought and of actions familiar to the persons who are the subjects of his operation. The different forms of Christian worship are different languages employed to express one and the same sentiment of religion.

The people of different nations, under their various forms of social organization, differing from each other in their climates, their education, and their occupations, and having little assimilating intercourse with one another, have their various forms of expressing respect and disrespect, love and hatred; while the

air of truth which induces us to believe it. It is due, however, to the gentleman who wrote the former articles of the News Letter—and who is at present absent from the city—to say that nothing but a firm belief in the truth of the statements made by him could have prompted him to make them public. We know him to be a gentleman of high and honorable principles, utterly incapable of asserting anything touching the actions or the characters of others without the strongest convictions of its truth. We are confident that no one will more heartily approve of this act of justice to Dr. Breckinridge, than he, and we can safely say for ourselves and him, that whilst we regret the appearance of the misstatement in the columns of the News Letter, we rejoice that Dr. B. has been enabled to satisfy us of its incorrectness, and afforded us the opportunity of correcting it." See Catholic Advocate, Louisville, September 5, 1846.

Thus ends this discreditable affair. The memory of a man dear to the whole Presbyterian church, has been vindicated in such a manner as to force an acknowledgment from the unwilling lips of those who have evinced a disposition to say and to believe anything, howevever preposterous, which they thought could gain credit with the most ignorant and prejudiced of his enemies.—Since even they have recanted, it is hoped no one can hereafter be found of sufficient hardihood to renew the charge.

ART. VII.—*Lectures on Mental Philosophy, and Theology.* By James Richards, D. D., late Professor of Christian Theology in the Theological Seminary at Auburn, New York. With a sketch of his Life, by Samuel H. Gridley, Pastor of the Presbyterian congregation, Waterloo, New York. New York: William M. Dodd. 1846. 8vo. pp. 501.

JAMES RICHARDS was born in New Canaan, Connecticut, October 29, 1767. His father was a farmer, a man of good sense, and esteemed for his social and Christian virtues. His mother, Ruth Hanforth, was a woman of vigorous intellect, of consistent piety, and of uncompromising faithfulness in all matters of social duty,

of whom her son was accustomed to say, "She governed her family with her eye and forefinger."

Though of a delicate constitution, the subject of this memoir made such early progress in his studies, that at the age of thirteen, he taught a common district school with such success as to secure a renewal of his appointment as a teacher. His desire to secure a public education, was met with the difficulty that his father was not prepared to furnish him with the requisite means. He therefore turned his attention to some mechanical appointment, and became an apprentice to a cabinet maker. When, however, in his nineteenth year, he was brought personally to embrace the gospel, and to turn his heart to God, he determined to devote himself to the work of the ministry, and to seek the necessary literary preparation. His master kindly released him from his obligations, and he commenced his preparation for college under the Rev. Justus Mitchel, pastor of his native village. He entered Yale College in 1789, but, failing to avail himself of a foundation to meet his necessary expenses, he was obliged to leave the institution at the close of the freshman year. He subsequently pursued his studies privately, principally under the direction of the Rev. Dr. Burnet, of Norwalk, and of Dr. Dwight, then of Greenfield. In 1793 he was licensed to preach the gospel by the Association of the Western District of Fairfield Co., and the following year he received a call from the Presbyterian congregation, Morristown, N. J., and in 1797 was ordained as its pastor by the presbytery of New York. His success in his ministerial work was very great, and he rapidly gained the confidence and respect, not only of the congregation with which he was connected, but of the whole church. At the age of thirty-seven, he was elected the moderator of the General Assembly.

In 1809, Dr. Richards removed to Newark as successor of the Rev. Dr. Griffin in the pastoral charge of the first Presbyterian church in that city. He was early elected a trustee of the college of New Jersey, and in 1812 when the Theological Seminary was established at Princeton, he was chosen one of its directors. His name is connected with the origin and early history of several of the great benevolent institutions of the country. In Newark, as in Morristown, his ministry was eminently successful. After fifteen years of laborious service of the church of which he was the pastor, he removed to Auburn, in 1823, as professor of theology,

in the fifty-sixth year of his age. The Seminary in that place was established by the Synod of Geneva in 1819, with the sanction of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church. It was incorporated by a law of the state of New York in 1820, and by the act of incorporation was placed under the care of a Board of Trustees and a Board of Commissioners; the latter to be chosen annually, by the presbyteries named in the act and by other presbyteries which might afterwards associate with them. In 1821 the Seminary went into operation with three professors and twelve students. Not a professorship, however, was endowed, no sufficient library had been collected, and at the end of two years the number of students had diminished rather than increased. About this time Arthur Tappan, Esq., of New York, gave fifteen thousand dollars for the endowment of a professorship of Christian Theology. This donation and the election of Dr. Richards gave the institution a new impulse, and from that time it may be considered as firmly established. Owing to the inadequate provision, however, for its support, much of Dr. Richards's time and attention was devoted to financial matters, and it is to his influence and efforts that its successful establishment is in a great measure to be referred.

The years 1826 and 1827 were years of new and peculiar trial to Dr. Richards. The new divinity, the new measures, the new spirit, and new style of preaching connected with the name of Rev. Charles G. Finney, were then producing their appropriate fruits of fanatical excitement and spurious conversions. While the storm lasted every one who did not bend to it, it strove to break. Dr. Richards firmly and perseveringly bore his testimony against the false doctrines and evil spirit with which the churches in that region were infatuated. He was regarded as standing in the way of the Lord. He was preached against, prayed against, and every effort was made "to break him down," that is, to destroy the reputation and influence of a man who could not conscientiously join in these new measures. The result was such as might have been anticipated. The truth prevailed. The course taken by Dr. Richards was at last seen to be wise even by those who were not able to see so soon and so far as he did; and his reputation for discretion and piety only rose the higher for the efforts made to detract from it.

"The years 1837 and 1838 are never," says Mr. Gridley, "to be forgotten in the Presbyterian church. The act of the General Assembly, in its summary excision of four synods, was matter of extreme pain and mortification to thousands of the best men of the church, and to none more than to Dr. Richards. He lived in the heart of one, and in the immediate neighbourhood of two more of the synods thus cut off. His position furnished him means of knowing their character both as to doctrine and practice. He was engaged in teaching theology, in a seminary specially fostered by these synods: and if views of doctrine and church order had prevailed upon this field essentially different from those taught in its own seminary, he must have known it. Yet he was able to see no adequate cause for the amputation which took place. Though he had taken occasion to resist some new measures, which at different times and in different places had found some favour, and also some innovations in doctrine, which, originating in other fields, had been brought into western New York; yet he firmly believed that the church and ministry connected with these synods, as a whole, deserved a place among the first in the order and faith of the Presbyterian name. And though he regretted to be separated from the ecclesiastical recognition of brethren, to whom his soul had been knit through all his Christian ministerial history, yet (to use the language of Dr. Cox, one of his colleagues) be preferred to be of the exscinded rather than of the exscinding."

The regret here attributed to Dr. Richards was warmly reciprocated by his brethren. In the peculiar circumstances in which he was placed it was scarcely to be expected that he would take any other view of duty than that taken by the synod of which he was a member. We have no intention to discuss the question how far error in doctrine or fanaticism prevailed in western New York; nor do we feel disposed to detract from the high character which Mr. Gridley assigns to the churches and ministry of those synods. These questions have really nothing to do with the propriety or impropriety of the course adopted by the General Assembly. Its act was not passed on the ground of the corruption of those churches. The act bears upon the face of it, its own interpretation. The Assembly declared its willingness to remain in ecclesiastical connexion with those synods, on condition, not that they should become orthodox, not that the

ministers or members should become better men, but on the simple condition that they should become presbyterian. The act of union adopted in 1801, allowed in feeble and frontier settlements the admission of congregationalists as such to presbyterian churches and judicatories. Under this plan, and unknown to the church generally, there had grown up a vast heterogeneous body of presbyteries, synods and churches, which were neither one thing nor the other; which were all represented in the higher judicatories of the church, and had equal authority in the decision of all questions of presbyterian doctrine and discipline. In this way men who were never ordained, who had never adopted our standards, who were not subject to our tribunals, came to determine what presbyterianism was and what presbyterians should do. It was their votes which helped to decide whether certain doctrines were consistent with our standards, whether we should be allowed to have Boards of Domestic and Foreign Missions, and other matters no less vital to our interests. This was just as anomalous, and just as unfair as it would be for France to send members to the English parliament and appoint men to sit in English courts to administer English laws for Englishmen. The General Assembly determined that this unjust and anomalous system should cease. They therefore abolished the plan of union, which had been thus abused; and then required that all churches, presbyteries, and synods forming a part of the presbyterian church, and represented in the General Assembly, should conform to the presbyterian constitution. This was all they did. Is there anything so horrible in this? In applying this obviously just principle the Assembly had to deal with two classes of cases. The one, to which the synods of New Jersey and Albany belonged, was composed of those judicatories in which the congregational element was small. These judicatories the Assembly ordered to give the congregational churches within their bounds, the option of conforming to the constitution or of quietly withdrawing from our connexion. The other class, to which the synods of the Western Reserve, and those of Western New York belonged, consisted of judicatories in which the congregational element was either very strong or actually predominant. Those belonging to this class the Assembly dissolved, and directed them to reorganize, including no churches or ministers who were not willing to adopt our standards and conform to the

constitution. It is possible that the Assembly may have erred in judgment as to some of these synods. That to which Dr. Richards belonged might perhaps have been more properly included in the former of these two classes with those of New Jersey and Albany, than placed in the same category with that of the Western Reserve, some of whose presbyteries did not contain a single presbyterian church. But this was a mere error in judgment; a discourtesy and an inconvenience to that synod, but no real injury. The act excluded no presbytery, minister, or member from the presbyterian church. All they were required to do, was either to separate from the congregationalists, or to report that they had no congregational churches or ministers. Instead of doing this, all the synods concerned met in convention at Auburn, and resolved that they would not separate from the congregationalists; that they would not conform to the constitution of the church, while they insisted on being regarded as one of its constituent and governing portions. This we think was a mistake. We think the time cannot be far distant when it will be universally regarded as preposterous that any body not presbyterially organized should claim to be part of a presbyterian church, and as such exercise authority over presbyterians. We think too that those who took this step are beginning to see their error. As they refused to separate from congregationalists, congregationalists are beginning to separate from them. A western convention has already pronounced the Plan of Union an injustice and an absurdity, and a system of agitation in behalf of congregationalism is now in operation, which threatens to convince those who were slow of faith, that the decision of the Assembly of 1837, that presbyterians ought to be presbyterians, was neither unjust nor unwise.

The separation of the church was not effected by the decision of the Auburn convention to disregard the abrogation of the Plan of Union. That separation was accomplished by a still more extraordinary act. When the Assembly met in 1838, the delegates from all these presbyteries, some of them not including a single presbyterian church, presented themselves to be enrolled as members. They handed their commissions to the standing committee on commissions, which met before the meeting of the Assembly, and were rejected, the committee feeling that whether the action of the preceding Assembly was right or wrong, they

had no authority to reverse it. The course prescribed in the constitution when the commission of a delegate is rejected as irregular or invalid, is to refer the question to the house for decision. These delegates, however, took a different course. Instead of waiting until the house was organized, instead of waiting until the question could be entertained whether they were entitled to sit, while the officer appointed by the constitution was in the chair, one of their number rose and said, I move Dr. so and so take the chair, his associates said, aye. The new moderator then put the motion to adjourn, and walked out of the house followed by his followers, leaving the constitutional moderator and the great body of the Assembly behind them. Thus the separation was consummated. When the question, whether this seceding body was a secession or the true Presbyterian Church in the United States, entitled to all the corporate funds, institutions and powers of the church, was submitted to the decision of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, that body pronounced them a secession, one judge dissenting. Time and the Providence of God have already, we think, pretty distinctly ratified this decision. As our New School brethren still continue to denounce the injustice of what they call "the exscinding acts" of 1837, it is necessary to repeat the statement of the case as it appears from our point of view, for the benefit of those to whom the history of those days is not familiar.

The lectures contained in this volume are not designed to form a system either of philosophy or theology. They are confined to a few points, such as the will, creation, second causes, the fall and depravity, extent of the atonement, election, effectual calling, justification, the prayer of faith, apostacy, ability and inability. They will sustain and extend the reputation of Dr. Richards as a man of vigourous sense and scriptural knowledge. His theology has much of a biblical form, and approaches far nearer to what is called old-schoolism, than what generally passes for new school divinity. There are few points, we presume, in which a little explanation as to the meaning of terms, would not have satisfied Dr. Richards that he and his Old School brethren were substantially agreed. This volume contains on the one hand little evidence of extensive reading of any kind; that is, there is very little reference either to the history of opinions, or to the writings of others; and on the other, it contains decisive

evidence that the author's reading had not been expended on the theological works of the Reformers and their successors of the seventeenth century. He frequently gives a sense to forms of expression, or statements of doctrine, which no one acquainted with those writers could suppose them to bear, and makes objections which presuppose a view of doctrines which they constantly disclaim.

The lecture on the extent of the atonement contains a great deal of truth, well presented, and differs we apprehend more in modes of expressions, than in reality, from the common doctrine of Calvinistic churches on that subject. The question is very loosely stated in the first instance. He asks, "Whether Christ died for all men, or for a part only?" which is a question which he himself would have to answer differently, according to the meaning put upon it. He understands those who said, "Christ's death was sufficient for all, and efficient for the elect," as meaning, "that while Christ's death opened the door for the salvation of all, so far as an expiatory sacrifice was concerned, it was designed, and by the sovereign grace of God, made effectual to the elect. Their belief was that Christ died intentionally to save those who were given to him in the covenant of redemption; but it does not appear that they supposed his death, considered as an expiatory offering, had any virtue in it, in relation to the elect, which it had not to the rest of mankind." p. 303. To all this he agrees; and to all this, though we should not prefer this language, we agree. We understand it to mean, that Christ died in execution of the covenant of redemption and with the specific, or as Dr. Richards repeatedly calls it, the ultimate, design of saving his own people; and that in accomplishing that object he did precisely what was necessary for the salvation of all men; so that his righteousness is just as well suited to one man as another, just as sufficient for the whole as for a part. This view of the matter which we understand to be that taken by Dr. Richards, is radically different from the common theory of a general atonement. According to that theory, God first willed the salvation of all men, then made salvation possible for all, and seeing none would accept it, elected some to eternal life. If this is so, then Christ did not come in execution of the covenant of redemption to save his own people, but in execution of a purpose to make salvation possible to all. Agreeably to the view given in our

standards God having elected some to everlasting life, sent his Son to redeem them. The purpose to send Christ is thus made subordinate to the purpose of election. According to the opposite view, the purpose of election does not precede, but follows the purpose of redemption. God purposes to redeem all men, and then to apply that redemption to some. The question is not which of these views is the more scriptural, we only remark that these are the two modes of apprehending the subject which distinguish the advocates of the opposite theories as to the design and extent of the atonement. And of these views Dr. Richards, under the influence of his scriptural knowledge, decides for that which distinguishes the advocates of the doctrine that Christ's death had a special reference to his own people, and that he did not die in any proper sense of the words, equally for all men. Dr. Richards very evidently does not understand this doctrine, in the sense in which it is really held by its advocates, and therefore he argues against it, while he really admits the great principle for which they contend. This of course leads to a misapprehension of the details of the system, and of the arguments by which it is sustained; and gives this lecture an aspect of being decidedly hostile to the common doctrine of the Reformed churches, when it is really directed against a doctrine those churches never held. We do not mean to say that mutual misapprehension is at the ground of the whole difference between Dr. Richards and Old School men on this subject; but we are well satisfied of two things, first, that far the greater part of the difference is to be referred to that source; and second, that the doctrine of Dr. Richards is immeasurably higher, better, more scriptural, saving and sanctifying than that taught by the younger President Edwards, and after him by such writers as Dr. Beman and Mr. Jenkyns.

Much the same remarks may be made of the Lecture on Justification. According to Dr. Beman's doctrine, Christ did not fulfil for us the demands of the law, he did not satisfy the justice of God, he simply opened the way for the pardon of sin. There is no such thing as justification; the possibility of pardon is all Christ has procured for us. Dr. Richards goes much beyond this. In answer to the question, What is justification? he quotes the reply to that question in the Shorter Catechism and the eleventh chapter of the Confession of

Faith, as containing "a clear and concise view of the subject." He represents the only proper ground of a sinner's confidence towards God to be "the meritorious obedience and sacrifice of our Lord Jesus Christ."

In reply to the question, "What is that righteousness on account of which God justifies us?" he argues to show first that it is not our personal righteousness according to the law; secondly, that it is not faith and its fruits, and thirdly, that it is the righteousness of Christ, and that this righteousness includes two things; "satisfaction to the penalty and obedience to the precept of the divine law." The two points in the lectures on this doctrine, in which Dr. Richards fails, it appears to us, to come up to the views given in our standards, are, his answer to the questions, "What is implied in our being justified before God?" and, "What is intended by the imputation of righteousness? As to the former, while he rejects the idea that justification is mere pardon, and while he makes it consist in pardon and a title to eternal life; and teaches that it is founded on a righteousness, and therefore called a justification, p. 389; he says, "It is not pronouncing the sinner just in view of the law;" "the law is not made the rule of judgment, nor is the sentence pronounced according to this rule;" "God, in justifying men, therefore, in this way, does not proceed according to law, but as a sovereign judge, acts above law, in the same manner as the supreme magistrate acts above law, when he pardons a man condemned by the laws of his country." We of course, understand and admit the importance of the object intended to be answered by these cautions. Dr. Richards wishes to make it clear that there is nothing in the doctrine of justification which is inconsistent with the personal unworthiness and guilt of those who receive that blessing; to make it apparent that when God is said to justify men, he does pronounce sentence in their favour "on the ground of their personal innocence." This of course we admit. Justification is of grace; those justified are ungodly, and worthy of condemnation. Still we cannot admit that the modes of expression above quoted are strictly accurate or agreeable to scripture. A justification that is not according to law, in which the law is not made the rule of judgment, is a contradiction in terms. We can understand an act of pardon being above law, but an act of justification, as the word imports, must be

according to law. It is a declaration that the demands of the law are satisfied, as it relates to those in whose behalf the sentence is past. The ground of that sentence may be their personal innocence, or it may be, as we learn from scripture, the righteousness of another. Still it is no justification if it be not according to law, if it does not declare the law to be satisfied.—This, as we understand it, is the precise nature of the justification of believers, for Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth. God justifies no man who has not the righteousness which his law demands; if not his own, he must receive as a gift the righteousness of Christ, and on the ground of that righteousness is not merely pardoned but justified.

The diversity of statement between Dr. Richards and ourselves on this subject, is no doubt due mainly to different modes of training. Still we regard the right or scriptural method of stating a doctrine so fundamental as justification to be a matter of no slight importance.

On the second question, What is intended by the imputation of Christ's righteousness? Dr. Richards says, "Every one who admits that the righteousness of Christ is the meritorious ground of our acceptance with God, must, to be consistent, admit that it is in some way imputed to us or reckoned to our account. But the question is, how is it imputed, and what is the nature of this imputation?" In answer to this question he says, 1. It is not so imputed as to become our personal righteousness. "The righteousness of one can never be so transferred as to become really and truly the righteousness of another. Sin and holiness, virtue and vice, are, in the very nature of things personal." 2. "The righteousness of Christ is imputed to the believer, much in the same manner as the worthiness of Joseph was imputed to his brethren, when they were kindly received by Pharaoh, and had the land of Goshen, the best part of Egypt, assigned to them." p. 401. "Herein is his righteousness reckoned or imputed to them, since by means of it they are treated in various important respects as they would have been, had they themselves been righteous. This is imputation, and the whole of it, so far as the question before us is concerned." p. 402.

With the negative part of this account of imputation we fully agree, but not with the positive part. We contend for no such imputation as implies a transfer of moral character, making a

man inherently sinful or holy. On the other hand, however, we do not admit, that the righteousness of Christ is in no other sense imputed to us, than the worthiness of Joseph was imputed to his brethren. This would imply that there is no more connection between believers and Christ, than between Joseph and his brothers. The union between Christ and his people is a legal, federal, vital union, established by God himself. No such union existed in the other case. Joseph did not perform his duty to Pharaoh in the name and for the sake of his brethren, and upon condition that they should have the land of Goshen. That gift was no part of the stipulated reward of Joseph; and his worthiness laid no foundation in justice, that Goshen should be assigned to his family. But Christ's righteousness was wrought out in the name and for the sake of his people, and upon the condition that on the ground of that righteousness, they should be justified. His righteousness therefore does lay a foundation in justice, for the salvation of believers, a claim arising out of no merit of theirs, and therefore not vesting in them, but arising out of the covenant of God and vesting in Christ. We understand, therefore, by the imputation of righteousness, such an ascription of the merits of Christ to believers, on the ground of the union between him and them, as to lay a foundation in justice for their complete justification in the sight of God. In himself, indeed, the believer is most unworthy, but inasmuch as God has covenanted to pardon and accept all those for whom Christ wrought out that righteousness, and forasmuch as that righteousness is a full and fair satisfaction to the demands of the law, those to whom it is imputed become entitled to eternal life. A title which presupposing their personal unworthiness, is founded in the transcending worthiness of their Lord and Saviour. This is a doctrine, therefore, in which grace and justice strangely meet, and therein is its blessedness and glory.

We cannot pursue this subject farther. While we are sensible that Dr. Richards's theology is not in all respects accordant with that which we have been taught to believe and made to love, we rejoice in the evidence furnished by this volume of his high moral and intellectual worth, and of the agreement between him and his old-school brethren in the great substantial points of evangelical doctrine.