

THE
BIBLICAL REPERTORY.

OCTOBER, 1835.

No. IV.

Ashbel Green

ART. I.—*Address delivered to the Theological Students of the Princeton Seminary, N. J., at the close of the semi-annual Examination in May, 1835.* By ASHBEL GREEN, D.D.

MY BELOVED YOUNG BRETHREN—*Candidates for the Gospel Ministry:*

For the fourth, and probably the last time, it has become my duty to address you—on your retiring, for a short period, from this Seminary. On a former occasion, when this service was allotted to me, I endeavoured to show, among other things, that it is erroneous and idle to expect that improvements may be made in revealed or Christian Theology, similar to those which have been, and still may be made, in the secular sciences. This opinion has since been controverted in this place; and, as I am persuaded, not only of the justness of the opinion, but of its great importance, I propose at this time to offer something in its vindication, and something to expose what I apprehend to be the dangerous tendency of its opposite.

The whole argument opposed to the sentiments I have heretofore advocated, and am still disposed to maintain, so far as I have seen or heard, is one of analogy. It may be summarily stated thus:—Since it is undeniable that, in modern times, great discoveries and improvements have been

And deny it who will, we boldly say, that from the moment when this principle was recognized upon the adverse side, the war was at an end. Acts of hostility may be repeated, and the parties may continue to dispute the field; but the war, not as a war of words or passions, but as a war of principles, is absolutely over. Presbytery triumphed when the fathers and grandsires of the church were taught to keep their proper place behind the oracles of God. Such an advantage would never have been yielded by the more wary papist. Untempered zeal has betrayed our adversaries (for they are not foes) into a decisive, nay, a ruinous concession. Presbyterians have only to maintain what they have won. Let no sophistical evasion tempt them, therefore, to forsake the fountain of living waters, to fish for truth in muddy streams, or rake for it in ditches. Let those who will, instead of walking in the plain path of scriptural precedent, climb the tottering ladder of patristical tradition, till they reach the point from which they ought to have set out; and then, like the Irish juggler, let them pull the ladder after them, and foist into the scriptures all the pitiful inventions of the middle ages. Let them prove, if they will, that when Peter 'girt his fisher's coat unto him,' (John xxi. 7) he was 'vested with his rochet' as a bishop; or that the young man who followed Jesus (Mark xiv. 51) 'having a linen cloth cast about his naked body,' was 'decently habited in a surplice.' Let them prove, that without three orders in the ministry, or ten, or twenty thousand, there can be no salvation. Let them consign us, if they please, to 'uncovenanted mercy;' and let us consign them to the 'sure mercies' of Him who openeth the eyes of the blind, and whose word maketh wise the simple.

Charles Hooper

ART. V.—*A Narrative of the Visit to the American Churches by the Deputation from the Congregational Union of England and Wales.* By ANDREW REED, D. D. and JAMES MATHESON, D. D. In two volumes. New York: published by Harper & Brothers. 1835.

“THE Englishman,” says Bulwer, “is vain of his country for an excellent reason—IT PRODUCED HIM. In his own

mind, he is the pivot of all things—the centre of the solar system. Like virtue herself, he

‘Stands as the sun,
And all that rolls around him
Drinks light, and life and glory from his aspect.’”

It is probably owing to this trait of character, that the English are generally the most prejudiced and disagreeable of travellers. Their standard of judgment is commonly false, and they seem to have a personal interest in derogating from all other excellence than their own. It is, therefore, a rare thing to see an English traveller rising above his national prejudices, and viewing in a truly philosophic spirit the manners and institutions of foreigners. Though no country has suffered more from their injustice than our own, the complaints against them are nearly universal. We have had travellers of all sorts, the fastidious patrician, the vulgar radical, the vitiated nursling of the green-room, yet all English. Each appeared among us as the personation of England, and each, in his own way, has had it for his object to show how far he and his country are superior to all other people. Most of these travellers, apart from the national feeling common to them all, have had each his own special motive for misrepresentation. To the high-churchman and tory it was the first of all objects to show that religion, refinement, order, and justice, all wither under a democracy. To the radical, the desire of making a piquant book of travels, which should replenish his purse, was a stronger motive than even his long cherished antipathy to aristocratical institutions. The result has been that the most injurious representations of America have been constantly presented to the British public. The same national egotism which produces the calumnies, secures for them a ready reception and full credence. There seems, indeed, to be no limit to the easy faith of our English friends, wherever any thing to the disparagement of America is concerned. The Quarterly Review gravely appeals to Major Downing's Letters as a finished specimen of the colloquial dialect of the United States, and betrays no misgivings lest its readers should question the conclusiveness of the evidence.

We owe Drs. Reed and Matheson some apology for connecting these remarks with a notice of their work. Contrast, however, is as strong a principle of association as

likeness. It is precisely because they are so unlike their predecessors that we were led to advert to the subject. We have at length an account of America written with something like justice. The advantages of these gentlemen for the successful execution of the task which they undertook, were in every respect considerable; and they have accomplished it in a manner to confer a lasting benefit on their readers on both sides of the Atlantic. While we think thus favourably of the general character of the work, we admit that it has many defects, though fewer perhaps than we had any right to anticipate. In the portion written by Dr. Reed, there are not a few indications of English egotism, a sense of personal superiority, and an air of condescension in administering praise. All this, however, disappears in the second volume, when he comes to the discussion of the important questions connected with religion and education. In the narrative portion of the work, there is much fine description of natural scenery, though rather laboured and ambitious, with much insignificant detail and trifling remark. He frequently betrays either a want of judgment or a want of consideration in drawing general conclusions from very narrow premises, or in stating facts as "illustrative of manners" which are perfectly isolated or accidental. An example of this kind occurs at the very commencement of the book. As he arrived in New York in the early part of the day, having missed his breakfast on board ship, he requested some refreshment at the bar of a very respectable hotel. The attendant, not being apprised of the peculiarity of his circumstances, very naturally supposed he merely wished something to stay his appetite before dinner, and acted accordingly. Our traveller still did not explain, but ate his bread and cheese in silent wonder at the manners of the Americans. "The breakfast hour," he says, "was past, and the dinner hour was not come; and an American inn, while it provides bountifully for periodical hunger, has no compassion for a disorderly appetite." This occurrence is made the foundation of a general reflection on the American character in contrast with the English. Now the truth is, as every one knows, that if he had ordered breakfast he could have had it, in his own room at his own time, and at his own table, as easily and comfortably as in London or Liverpool. But Mr. Bunker's attendant, not having the gift of divination, could not discover that he wished what he did not ask for, and Dr. Reed was

not slow in drawing the general conclusion that no breakfasts are to be had in America except at a given hour, and that *therefore* the Americans are far less independent in their *habits*, whatever they may be in their *opinions*, than the English. This is a very good specimen of the art of manufacturing both premises and conclusion, so common among travellers. There is a good deal of this disposition to make every little occurrence however casual, or however peculiar to the individual concerned, an illustration of character. This perhaps is very natural. When a man comes to a foreign country with the definite purpose of ascertaining its peculiarities, his eyes are always open, and his mind is ever on the spring for conclusions. This, however, is the very reason why he should be on his guard, and be certain in the first place as to his facts, and in the second as to the correctness of his deductions. After all, it is with Dr. Reed, as with his predecessors, only when an isolated incident goes to the support of a foregone conclusion, that it is so readily generalized. The interesting meeting of slaves which he attended in Lexington, Virginia, was not assumed as proof of the religious advantages and culture of all the slaves in the United States, with the same readiness with which his inability to get a breakfast at Mr. Bunker's, without asking for it, was made the ground of his conclusion as to the character of all American inns, and the general habits of the people. In Ohio he met with a very respectable lady in the public stage, who, having in vain requested her daughter to sing for the amusement of the passengers, herself delighted them with the song "Home, sweet home!" This also is given as a characteristic incident; yet nothing could be less so. According to the statement of Dr. Reed and of all other, even the most vituperative, travellers, the decorum of American ladies is peculiarly remarkable. In the judgment of Mrs. Trollope, for example, it is carried to a ridiculous extreme. We have travelled many thousand miles in the United States, but we never had the fortune to hear one indecorous word from female lips, or to witness one act of boldness analogous to the case mentioned by Dr. Reed. We cannot avoid the surmise that the lady in question was a foreigner. At any rate, an occurrence more completely un-American could scarcely be mentioned.

Dr. Reed has not been able to place himself in the right position in travelling through this country. Accustomed

to little England, with her twelve or fourteen millions of inhabitants, and her centuries of gradual improvement, he marvels at not finding her roads, her inns, and public conveyances, even in Ohio, where, forty years ago, there was scarcely a white inhabitant. The wonder really is that he should have found any comfortable tavern at the extremity of that state, any public roads, or regular conveyances. We think, therefore, his complaints are rather unreasonable. "For many miles out of Columbia," he tells us, "the roads are *shamefully* bad. - - - About noon we paused at a town called Jefferson. We were to wait half an hour: there would be no other chance of dinner; but there appeared no signs of dinner here. However, I had been on very short supplies for the last twenty-four hours, and considered it my duty to eat if I could. I applied to the good woman of the inn, and, in a very short time, she placed venison, fruit, tarts, and tea before me; all very clean, and the venison excellent. It was a refreshing repast, and the demand on my purse was only twenty-five cents. 'How long have you been here?' I said to my hostess, who stood by me fanning the dishes to keep off the flies. 'Only came last fall.' 'How old is this town?' 'Twenty-three months, sir; then the first house was built.' There are now about 500 persons settled here; and there are three good hotels." We should think this would satisfy even an Englishman. It is an undoubted fact, that, even in our newest states, a man can travel more securely, expeditiously and comfortably, and find better accommodations on the road, than he can in many parts of some of the oldest parts of Europe. It is not the mere mention of the incidents of a journey, pleasant or unpleasant, the statement of the fact that the country is thinly inhabited, the roads rough or miry, the taverns indifferent, the people rude, where such is actually the case, but it is the tone of complaint and disparagement with which these things are stated that we object to in this narrative. Where such wonderful progress has actually been made, it is rather ungracious to find fault with us for not achieving impossibilities. We confess that the whole of the narrative portion of this book is not exactly to our taste. The tone of gentleman-like superciliousness which pervades Dr. Reed's portion of it, is not adapted to conciliate his readers, who, we suspect, will regret that he has crowded Dr. Matheson so much in a corner.

We turn with pleasure, therefore, to the second volume. The discussions of the various topics introduced into this portion of the work constitute its chief value. Dr. Reed has here raised himself to a level with his subject, he has felt its dignity and importance, and, on almost all the topics introduced, he has presented with great ability an array of facts and arguments which must produce a strong impression in favour of the cause which he espouses. As might naturally be expected the first subject presented is REVIVALS. Dr. Reed correctly remarks, that this term has become conventional, "and that it describes the fact, that within a limited and comparatively short period, a church is greatly renovated in pious feeling, and a considerable accession is made to it from the classes of the formal and the ungodly." If this be a correct definition of the term, it is very obvious that the fact which it describes is of common occurrence in every part of christendom, and in every period of the church. Revivals are not a phenomenon peculiar to the American churches, and should not be so spoken of or regarded. We apprehend that great evil has resulted from the manner in which this subject has often been represented, both in this country and in Europe. As Christianity is everywhere the same, there is reason to suspect all accounts of results purporting to be peculiar to any one age or country. We do not wonder, therefore, that English Christians have been led to stand in doubt as to the genuineness and value of religious revivals, so long as they were represented as something peculiarly American. Dr. Reed's account will contribute, we hope, to dispel this erroneous and injurious impression. So far from revivals being peculiar to America, it may almost be doubted whether they are of more frequent occurrence here than in Great Britain. If they are, it is only because religion, at this particular period, happens to be more flourishing here than there. It can hardly be questioned that in every church there are seasons when "it is greatly renovated in pious feeling, and considerable accessions made to it from the classes of the formal and the ungodly." What evangelical minister in England or Scotland, Episcopal, Presbyterian, or Independent, has failed to witness and rejoice in such seasons once and again? Yet these are revivals. We fear that the only difference is that we make more noise about them; that we number the people more frequently, and publish the result more ostentatiously. Dr.

Reed says he detailed a case to the brethren of Connecticut, which (although "the half was not told,") satisfied them that it was exactly what they called a revival. Yet this was not so called in England, nor was it published in all the papers as a remarkable event. Such occurrences are familiar wherever the gospel is preached; yet even when remarkable and extensive, they seldom, in Europe, excite general attention.

Although Dr. Reed presents a correct view of the nature of a revival, and seems fully aware that they are not peculiar to this country, yet he at times yields to the idea that they are, if not peculiar to America, at least in a high degree characteristic of the state of religion here. He accordingly gives what he considers satisfactory reasons why religion should advance in this form amongst us rather than in any other. The first is, that *we expect it*; and the second is, that *we labour for it*, in this form. There is perhaps some truth in the assumption, and some correctness in the reasons assigned why such is the fact. But we apprehend that there is less than is generally supposed. We have already seen that it is a vague and incorrect idea of the nature of a revival, and our custom of giving general publicity to every such occurrence, which have produced this impression. If every case in which a church in Great Britain, Germany, or Switzerland, experienced a decided renovation of pious feeling, and received considerable accessions from the world, were regularly published in the newspapers, we are persuaded that revivals would cease to be regarded as an American peculiarity. It is only so far as religion is more prosperous here than elsewhere, that revivals are more common. If religion advances at all, it advances everywhere, more or less distinctly, in this form. As in every individual Christian there are seasons of more or less devotional feeling, fidelity, and activity, so it is in every church. These successive periods of decline and revival are incident to our state as sinful men, and evidence of our imperfection. When an individual or church has thus declined there is obviously a call for special efforts for improvement; and if by saying the Americans expect and labour for revivals, is meant that they expect and labour for deliverance from coldness and formality in the church, and for the conversion of sinners unto God, it is saying nothing more, we trust, than can be said of the churches abroad. But if it is intended that we lay it to our

account that religion should advance only by fits and starts; that we make great efforts for a short time, and then relapse into indolence and indifference, there may be some truth in the statement, but it is assuredly a great defect in our religious character. A revival is, of all blessings, the most precious to a church or community in a state of spiritual declension; and those who have witnessed such seasons of the manifestation of the divine power can no more doubt their reality or their divine origin, than they can doubt the truth of evangelical religion. And yet it may be true, as Dr. Reed intimates, that we wish to have our religion all together; to have a great feast and then a long lent. If American religion is assuming this form, it should be generally known, and the evil assiduously counteracted. It may be that the efforts for the promotion of religion are sometimes pressed beyond the point at which they can be sustained. Where this is done, a relapse occurs as a matter of course; and comes to be looked for as a season of repose from unnatural excitement. This is an evidence of an unhealthy state of feeling; it may be a vital action, but still irregular and injurious. It would not be conducive to the health of the body, to take such exercise one day as to produce exhaustion and debility for the six following days. Nor can it be desirable in spiritual matters, to adopt such measures, and to produce such a state of feeling, as to render intermission and declension a matter of necessity. To judge from accounts in the religious papers, it would appear that some churches send for a "revival minister," get up a round of special meetings and exciting measures, with the deliberate purpose of inducing a state of religious feeling which is to continue only while the revival lasts; and to consider the departure of the preacher a signal for a cessation of labour and a collapse of feeling. It can hardly be doubted that such a course must be ultimately injurious. It is here as with extra efforts in behalf of benevolent societies. They do good indeed, but much more harm. So long, then, as individuals and churches are subject to declensions, so long will revivals continue to be essential to the prosperity and progress of religion, but they should not be regarded as affording an excuse or even an occasion for relapsing into comparative indifference and sloth; nor should they lead us to consider the advance of religion by means of seasons of periodical excitement, as the only or the best mode of its progress. It is indeed, as already remarked, everywhere its common

mode; but it is so from the facility with which individuals and churches decline from the elevated state to which a revival leads them.

In adverting to the circumstances which favour the occurrence of revivals more frequently in this country than in Europe, Dr. Reed refers to the fact that they are matters which every one expects. We are not disposed to deny that there is some force in this remark, but still there is no small amount of fallacy connected with it. While it is true that the expectation and desire of a divine blessing not only prepares the mind for its reception, but is a common precursor of its enjoyment, yet an expectation excited and founded upon the supposed efficacy of particular measures, or the skill of particular preachers is generally a source either of disappointment or of a spurious excitement. Dr. Reed says, that frequently the mere notice that a revival preacher is about to visit a town is the means of producing a revival. We question this very much. It is much more likely to produce the directly opposite effect. We have often admired the wisdom of those men whose ministrations have been so pre-eminently blessed, in purposely avoiding to excite any such expectation. It was almost an invariable rule for them not to go where they had been specially invited and great expectations aroused of the results of their visit. They appeared among the people without any flourish of trumpets, or note of preparation, and without allowing the word revival to be mentioned, laboured to awaken the church and to bring the careless under the power of the truth. This we know is very different from the plans of the new race of revival preachers, and the results are no less different. An expectation founded on earnest desire and humble faith in God, cannot be too strong, and is seldom disappointed; but when founded on any human devices, or human agency, is uniformly productive of evil.

Dr. Reed asserts strongly and frequently that revivals are always the result of special means. "The means may be proximate or remote, more or less apparent, but always they do exist;" "I am prepared to say, I know of no case in which means have not been employed. There were, indeed, some cases reported to me before I visited the country, and some, also, while there, that were spoken of as unconnected with all means to the end. But I am now satisfied that the parties making such statements had too limited conceptions of the order of means; and, led away

by the natural love of the marvellous, reported things to have happened without instrumentality, when, in truth, it was only an instrumentality which they were too short-sighted to discern!" If this means any thing at all, it means that revivals are always the result of some special effort; of efforts in some measure proportionate to the result, and which tend to account for its occurrence. Dr. Reed could hardly suppose his informants meant to say that the ordinary means of grace were suspended, and that revivals occurred in the entire absence of all the usual dispensation of the word and ordinances. Their statements doubtless went no farther than this, that revivals often occur without any peculiar expectation, or special application of means for bringing them about. And these statements are unquestionably correct. In a large proportion, if not a majority of cases, the work commences silently in the hearts of a few praying people; the sacred fire gradually spreads through the church; the word is preached with more point and fervour; prayer is offered with greater importunity and faith; the Spirit descends with power upon the people, and they are in the midst of revival before the word has been pronounced. The array of means which Dr. Reed mentions, are the usual methods in which an incipient revival manifests itself, and by which its power is spread; but it would be like the ineffectual beating of cold iron to get up all this array before the revival had actually commenced. This is often attempted, and the result is commonly an increased degree of deadness, or a factitious excitement.

Dr. Reed seems to estimate much more highly than we do the value of the publicity given to revivals in this country. It has indeed its advantages, but we fear these are more than counterbalanced by its evils. All the desirable ends of publicity might be attained by the regular annual reports of ecclesiastical bodies, without the evils attending on the loose and exaggerated accounts with which the newspapers abound. As our author correctly remarks, "Revivals have often been used as advertisements. A feeble, or a vain man, doubtful of his standing, or thirsting for illegitimate distinction, has looked to a revival, as he would call it, as his instrument." The temptation, to those desirous of notoriety, which the eclat connected with a great revival presents, is so great, that it is not to be wondered at that the most improper means should at times be adopted to produce an excitement, which may afford an excuse for a

newspaper paragraph. The result is, that the public confidence in all such accounts is greatly impaired, and, when they appear in connexion with the new measures, it is, in many portions of the church, entirely destroyed. Who imposes the least reliance on the statement that at the close of a meeting "fifty persons professed submission to God"? Or what confidence is placed in the annunciation of conversions which are known or suspected to be assumed on no better evidence than merely walking from one room to another?*

The mournful truth is, that spurious and fanatical excitements have so commonly been dignified by the name of revivals, that that term, so dear to the American churches, has in a measure lost its sacred import, and no longer stands as the certain symbol of the manifestation of the divine power. This result is, we fear, to be attributed, if not directly at least indirectly, in a great measure, to the notoriety given to every case of religious excitement.

We think Dr. Reed in most respects does justice to this all-important subject. He fully recognises the genuineness and value of those revivals which have so long been the joy of our churches. He admits their fruits, as proved by experience, to be quite as good, and frequently better, than those produced under ordinary circumstances. There is, however, one point on which his statements need explanation, and his judgment some correction. In answer to the question, Are there any evils attendant on the approved revivals? he says, Yes, there are. They are liable to run into wild fanaticism. This answer seems rather strange, when viewed in connexion with his definition of the term, as describing the fact, "that within a limited and comparatively short period, a church is greatly renovated in pious feeling, and a considerable accession is made to it from the classes of the formal and ungodly." A revival, then, is but the increase of pure religion. Can this be productive of evil? It is indeed very true that this, as all other things good in themselves, is liable to be perverted and abused; but this affords no sufficient reason for regarding them as sources of evil. Dr. Reed would probably not have proposed, or if proposed, not have answered affirmatively the question, Are there any evils attendant on Christianity? and yet an affirmative answer would be quite as appropriate in this case as in the other. As the worst of crimes have found

* See Vol. II. page 34.

shelter under the sacred name of religion, so many extravagances have been connected with revivals; but there is not, and obviously cannot be, any greater connexion between revivals and the evils complained of, than between religion and the sins and follies which incidentally become associated with it. We seldom or never heard of the evils of revivals in this part of the country, until the rise of the new measures, and the new divinity. It is the unanimous testimony of the pastors and churches that these seasons of the special manifestation of the grace and power of God, came attended only with good. The church was elevated and strengthened; its graces as well as its numbers increased; and the permanent results in all respects desirable. We do not mean to say, that sinful human nature is not prone to make every good the occasion of evil; or that the excitement, which from the nature of the case attends the rapid progress of religion, is not liable to be abused in various ways; nor yet that in fact many extravagances have not been connected, in some cases, with genuine revivals. All we wish to say is, that the form in which this matter is presented is not sufficiently guarded; that a revival in itself is good, and only good; and that whatever evil is connected with it, is to be attributed to its perversion and abuse precisely as when the gospel itself is made the occasion of evil.

An interesting and able letter is devoted by Dr. Reed to the "New measures." As this subject is discussed at length in a succeeding article in this number of our Review, we shall do little more than state the results to which the English delegates were led, in reference to it. It must be acknowledged that they had the best opportunity of looking at the new measures in their most favourable aspects. They were associated, on their arrival, with their most decided advocates, and heard from friendly lips the history of their rise and progress. The unfavourable judgment, therefore, which these gentlemen express, cannot be attributed to partial or prejudiced accounts. The two measures to which Dr. Reed particularly refers, are protracted meetings and anxious seats. With regard to the former, he correctly remarks, that it "existed before, and the principle of them enters into the very nature of a revival; but they existed under other names, and had a different character." "With the friends of the new measures, the protracted meeting does not arise out of the urgency of the case; it is a component part of the system. It is, agreeably to its

name, rather a lengthened meeting, than a number of meetings admitting of intervals for worldly and social duties. It is seldom less than four days in duration, and is often run to seven or more."

"The evils of making it an essential part of a system appear to be, that an undue importance may be given to it at the expense of ordinary and stated means; that the means supplied may be so far in advance of the spirit to use them, as may abate, rather than improve desire, and end in weariness; that many excellent ministers, in meeting the claims of such a period, will break down under them, as indeed they have done, and be unfitted for their fair share of labour. Besides, where the length of the meeting becomes amongst the people the popular test of its excellence, there will be no bounds to this easy mode of competition. Already a seven-days' meeting has a sound of reputation about it, which is denied to one of three or four days. Of course, empirical teachers have taken advantage of this impression, and have outdone all outdoing. They have held, some of them, fourteen days; some twenty-one; and recently an attempt has been made to hold a forty days' meeting. This party then, if length be excellence, has excelled all; and has, moreover, the benefit of a number which is frequent in scripture, and is associated with sacred recollections. As you might expect, long before the forty days were expired, all patience and all feeling were exhausted. The pastor whom he professed to assist, I was told on the best authority, sought to meet his congregation on the usual evening, for the usual service on the following week, and he could not get enough people together to compose a prayer meeting."

"The other measure which has been lately adopted, and which is, I believe, altogether new, has received the somewhat barbarous and canting denomination of 'Anxious seats.' The practice is so styled from the circumstance, that after a sermon which is supposed to have impressed the people, a seat, or seats, before the pulpit, and in the face of the congregation, is cleared, and persons willing to profess anxiety for their salvation or conversion to God, are challenged to come forward, and use them for that purpose. They are then made mostly the subject of particular address and supplication." Dr. Reed is mistaken in supposing that this measure is "altogether new." It is in fact, as is the case with almost every feature of the system, old, and is simply by courtesy called new, in the same way that the antiquated heresies of former days are now called the New Divinity. These doctrines and measures are not new in themselves, they are only new among the churches professing Calvinism in the north and east. We are the more surprised at this mistake, as the "anxious seat" is a measure as rife among the "Ranters" of England as it has ever been in America. The course running by the new measure

men of the present day, has been disastrously run before, and the evils which it produced stand as a warning to the churches, and as a condemnation to the misguided men who are labouring to bring upon us the desolations of former generations. Dr. Reed's remarks on this particular are so excellent, and so well-timed, that we give them in his own language.

"1. In the first place, I am disposed to submit, that we have no right to establish such measures. It is certainly not an apostolic method. It is not within the limits of our commission. It is our duty to urge the authority of Christ on the conscience, and to insist on an entire submission to it; but, as I conceive, we have no right to make this particular movement the visible test of that submission. It is an undue encroachment on the rights of a congregation assembling on the authority of Christ, and professedly for his worship; and there is no reason why they should obey such a call to show their discipleship.

"2. It is a bad auxiliary to the success of the ministry. That some good may arise from it, is not denied; this may be predicated of the worst things. Its general tendency is not to support the effect of the preached word, if it is wisely administered. Where it is introduced as a novelty, there is, indeed, excitement enough; but it is of the wrong complexion. I have seen a whole congregation moved by it; but their attention has been withdrawn from themselves to others; or from what was spiritual in themselves to an overt action of no importance any way to their welfare. The question has then been amongst the people, 'Will *any* go? Will *they* go? Shall *I* go?' Questions which many are glad to entertain, as a diversion to the conscience, from more serious and inward inquiry.

"3. Then, as an evidence of character, it is certainly among the worst that can well be employed. It is a measure highly inviting to the ignorant, the vain, and the self-conceited; and it is equally repulsive and difficult to the timid, the modest, and reflective. I can hardly conceive of a delicate and well-educated young female, being able to meet such a demand in the face of a large congregation, unless she regards it as a duty to Christ, and a term of her salvation; and then, in obeying, she does violence to those feelings, which are the safeguard and the beauty of her character. I have seen such persons shrink and shudder at the call, through modesty, and then comply through fear; and, when complying, writhing from distress under hysterical tortures. But who has a right to exact all this amount of suffering? And is it not the worse, if it is not only unnecessary, but prejudicial, to the end proposed, by diverting the attention to a bodily service, from what alone is of acknowledged importance?

"4. Let me again observe, that where it is used as an evidence of state, it is likely to lead to hazardous and precipitate conclusions. I know that many ministers are very guarded on this subject; but with this caution it is difficult to prevent the anxious inquirer from regarding it, and similar signs, as evidences of condition. And in many instances, especially among the Methodist denomination, the anxious seat, or the altar, and the acts of rising or kneeling, are in reality, if not with formal design, made terms of state. They are used, too, not only to express the reality of awakened concern; but as tests of having 'submitted to Christ,' 'found hope,' and of being 'true converts.' Such notices as the following are common in the several religious papers:—

“‘Last Sabbath day I attended a camp meeting; it was orderly and solemn; and thirty-one professed to *indulge hope.*’

“‘On Saturday, an awful solemnity was on the assembly. On Sabbath morning three persons *gave themselves away* to Christ, and *were admitted to the church.*’

“‘A protracted meeting began on Monday. On the following Saturday the session examined twenty-one; *all of whom were next day admitted to the church.*’

“‘On the second day of the meeting, the *anxious* and the *converts* were called on to separate themselves from the rest of the congregation.’

“‘On the last day,’ at another meeting, ‘about four hundred, if I mistake not, assembled in the anxious room. The converts being called on to separate themselves from the anxious, about one-third *declared themselves converts.*’

“A revival preacher, after delivering a sermon, called on the anxious to meet him in the lecture-room. About two hundred obeyed. He called on them to kneel in prayer; and he offered an alarming and terrific prayer. They arose. ‘As many of you,’ he said, ‘as have given yourselves to God, in that prayer, go into the New-Convert-room.’ Upwards of twenty went. ‘Now,’ he said to the remainder, ‘let us pray.’ He prayed again in like manner. He then challenged those who had given themselves to God in that prayer, to go into the New-Convert-room. Another set followed. This was repeated four times. The next morning he left the town, having previously sent a notice to the newspaper, stating, that Mr. ——— had preached there last night, and that sixty-one converts professed religion.

“Need I multiply cases? or need I remark on those I have adduced? Apart from the last, which is too blameworthy to be common, has not the *spirit* of these measures a strong tendency to beget, on the part of ministers and people, an impatience of results; not of actual determination of mind, which we cannot ask, nor the sinner yield, too soon; but of outward and visible evidence, when, in truth, the case does not really admit of such evidence? Regeneration is, indeed, the work of an instant; but the evidence of it is the work of time. The mere assurance on the mind that I am converted, is not evidence to me; and the mere assertion of it, can be no evidence to others. The proper fruits of conversion are the only safe evidence in either case; and there has not been time to produce or ascertain them.

“The effect of such a course is, undoubtedly, to create a fearful amount of premature and unscriptural hope, and, therefore, of dangerous and destructive delusion. The effect again, on the church, is to fill it with unconverted, ignorant, and presumptuous persons, and to produce defection on the one hand, and corruption on the other. And this, in fact, has been the result. Of revivals, *so managed*, it is considered that not one-fifth, sometimes not one-tenth, have stood; and many of those who have remained in the church, have given painful evidence of the want of renewed character and conversation. If one-half of those sixty-one, who were so hastily reported by the minister to whom I have referred, to be converted on one evening, should retain a false hope through life, and die with it in their right hand, where would the responsibility lie? or who would dare to incur such responsibility?

“5. Besides the objections to the new measures thus taken, it must be stated, that they seem to have the faculty of generating a spirit worse than themselves, and which is chiefly to be apprehended. Rash measures attract rash men. Those who would have felt it difficult enough to manage an argument, or discriminate between a right or wrong affection,

are struck by what is so tangible and so visible, and so capable of impressing the grosser and animal sensations. Without the power, and perhaps the piety of their teachers, they quickly usurp their places. As they have attained their stations by deviating from the usual way, they reckon that it is only to be retained by the same course; and their onward and devious path is tracked by the most unsanctified violence and reckless extravagance.

“In fact, a number of young and raw men, previously unknown to the ministry, and without pastoral experience, instead of giving themselves ‘to reading, meditation, and prayer,’ have chosen this shorter method to ministerial efficiency; and the effect, wherever it has reached, has been exceedingly calamitous. They have announced themselves as the revival preachers; and have chosen to itinerate over the church; unsettling every thing, and settling nothing. They have denounced pastors, with whom they could not compare, men of tried and approved piety, as hypocrites, formalists, ‘dumb dogs,’ and as ‘leading their people to hell.’ They have denounced the Christians who listened to them; and have made submission to their mechanism the test of their conversion. They have addressed the sinner, under the name of fidelity, in harsh, severe, and bitter terms; and have been covetous either of submission or opposition. The endearments and ties of relative life have been sacrificed to the bitter zeal which has taught the child to disrespect the parent, and the parent to cast off the child. They have made, as many have recently in our own land, great, if not full pretensions, to inspiration; and have taught people to rely on impulse and impression in offering what has been called the prayer of faith. They have encouraged females to lead in prayer in promiscuous and public assemblies; and, in fact, have revived all the irregularities of the Corinthian church, as though they had been placed on record, to be copied, and not avoided.

“The consequence has been most disastrous. Churches have become the sport of division, distraction, and disorder. Pastors have been made unhappy in their dearest connexions; they have stayed to mourn over diminished influence and affection; or they have been driven away to find in calmer regions a field of renewed labour. So extensive has been this evil, that in one presbytery of nineteen churches, there were only three that had settled pastors; and in one synod, in 1832, of a hundred and three churches, only fifty-two had pastors; the rest had stated supplies. The general effect has been to discourage revivals in their best form; to cast down the weak, to confound the sober-minded, and to confirm the formalist; and to dispose the censorious world to ‘speak evil of the good way.’”

Dr. Reed closes this interesting letter with extracts from Dr. Beecher’s famous letter against the new measures. Widely as this publication has been circulated, we should be tempted to borrow largely from its pages, did our limits permit. We know not where a more able, solemn and faithful warning to the churches on this momentous subject is to be found, than in this master-piece of Dr. Beecher’s pen. It will stand a lasting monument to his glory, and a beacon to coming generations, when the apparent defection of its distinguished author from his own standard is forgotten, and the disastrous consequences of that defection forgiven,

in gratitude for the benefits of this powerful exposition of the evils of fanaticism and spurious revivals.

Although Dr. Reed nominally confines his remarks to protracted meetings and anxious seats, it will be perceived from his own exposition of the subject, that they are but subordinate features of the complicated system, of which "New Measures" is merely the technical name; that there is a style of preaching and praying, a mode of dealing with professed inquirers, a regular machinery for excitement and effect, peculiar to the system, and that the whole is instinct with a corresponding and characteristic spirit. That the new measures and the new divinity should have formed an intimate alliance, can surprise no one aware of their natural affinity. We know, indeed, that they may be disjoined, and that they have in fact existed separately; but their close relationship cannot be denied. The new theory of plenary ability seems essential to the new mode of effecting conversions; and making religion to consist in a change of purpose, analogous to the change of a profession, is necessary to justify the assumption and annunciation, that a man is a Christian who rises in his place and says he has submitted to God. No better method therefore could be devised to secure the adoption of the new doctrines, than the introduction of the new measures. The attempt has accordingly been made. The cold, Pelagian system of the new divinity has been attached to the engine of fanaticism. Whether this union will not prove disastrous to both, time must show. If we may judge from the report, the locomotive has exploded, and left the heavy train attached to it, hopelessly at a stand. Dr. Reed also, it seems, received strongly the impression, that the new measures had lost most of the little share of public confidence they once enjoyed. On page 37 he says, "Those ministers of most talent and character, who were partially carried away by the heat and interest of the period, are now reviewing their course. The madness of others will make them perfectly sober. The leading ministers of the country, and among them the best friends of revivals, have entered their testimony against them." On page 57, he says, "The new divinity and the new measures have greatly coalesced; and they have given for a time, currency to each other. Many pious and ardent persons and preachers, from the causes to which I have adverted, were disposed to think that the new opinions had all the advantage in a

revival, and this gave them all the preference in their judgment. Where they, in connexion with the new measures, have been vigorously applied, there has, indeed, been no want of excitement. The preacher who firmly believes that the conversion of men rests on the force of 'moral suasion,' is not unlikely to be persuasive. And the hearer who is told, 'he can convert himself;' that it is 'as easy for him to do so as to walk;' that he has only 'to resolve to do it, and it is done,' is not unlikely to be moved to self-complacent exertion. But it may be asked, do either the preacher or hearer possess those sentiments, which are likely to lead to a true conversion, and to bring forth fruit meet for repentance? By their fruits shall ye know them. There has certainly been good done where there has been much evil; for with this evil, there has still been a large portion of divine truth. But I fear not to say, that where there has been the largest infusion of the new divinity into the new measures, there has been the greatest amount of unwarrantable extravagance. There has been great excitement—much animal emotion and sympathy—high resolves, and multiplied conversions; but time has tested them, and they have failed. Many see this; the candid are weighing it; and the effect will be, as I have already intimated, that the truth will be separated from the error," &c. &c. Again, on page 59, "Before I left this country, (England,) some attempts were made to supply us with the *rationale* of Calvinism, by the adoption of some of the more objectionable opinions of the new divinity; and since my return, a clergyman, who has seceded from the Episcopal church, has been strangely allowed to enact the objectionable parts of the new measures in the Methodist pulpits of the metropolis. I am fully desirous that we should import what good we can from America; but it would be sad indeed if we should covet the evil and despise the good; and it would be ridiculous as well as pitiable, to be adopting, as interesting novelties here, what have already become obsolete nullities in the estimation of the wise and the good there. For my own part, all that I have seen of the new methods, both of thought and action, incline me to think that our true wisdom will consist in 'asking for the old ways.'"

The opinions which the English delegates formed of the new divinity are sufficiently obvious from the preceding extracts. The meaning of the term new divinity, in this connexion, can hardly be mistaken. It should constantly be

borne in mind that there are three leading classes of theological opinion prevalent in the Presbyterian and Congregational churches in this country. The first is the old Calvinistic; the second, the somewhat modified Calvinism of New England; and the third, the new divinity of New Haven. The rise of this latter form of doctrine has had the happy effect of bringing the advocates of the two former much nearer together. It has led to such discussions and explanations, that prejudice and want of confidence have been in a great measure removed; and as they share in the deep and conscientious conviction that the new divinity is hostile to the truth and detrimental to religion, they are disposed to make common cause against a common enemy. We believe the number is very small indeed among the old-school Calvinists, who feel the least disposition to cast out as evil the names of any who adopt the system of which the late Dr. Porter, Dr. Woods, Mr. Nettleton, and others of the same class, may be considered as representatives; and we believe the number is still smaller, in either of these classes, who are disposed to regard the errors of the new divinity as either trivial in themselves or consistent with the honest adoption of the Westminster Confession or the Saybrook Platform. It would, indeed, be deplorable should these classes spend their strength, and divide their ranks, by contending among themselves, while their cordial and peaceful union would secure the triumph of all that either deems essential. A great part of the distraction and difficulty experienced in the Presbyterian church has arisen from these two sections not understanding each other. The fact, however, that they have now a common ground of anxiety, and a common enemy to contend with, will, it is to be hoped, lead them to avoid all minor points of difference, and present an undivided front to all opposers of the truth and order of the church.

The course which Dr. Reed has adopted in the exhibition of this subject, although the most convenient for himself, is not the best adapted to lead to correct results. He first gives a summary of the peculiarities of the new divinity, which, "though from a warm friend of orthodoxy, is," he thinks, "drawn by a careful hand, and with much concern to make an impartial statement;" he then offers a condensed view of these doctrines as presented by their leading advocates, in their formal protest against the charge of heresy. These statements he considers may in a measure neutralize

each other, though he admits the differences of opinion still to be considerable. It is very evident that in order to get a correct view of any theological system, we should go neither to the expositions of avowed opponents, nor to those statements of its friends which are made with the express purpose of showing that they are not heretical, and which must of course be softened down to the extreme point which the conscience of the writers will allow. The only proper way is to go to the writings of its advocates in which they unfold their doctrines, and in which they oppose the opinions of others and defend their own. The adoption of this course would have imposed on Dr. Reed a little more reading, but it would have led him to more correct views. There are some things in the statement of the "friend of orthodoxy," which it would be difficult to sustain against the new divinity as a system; while, on the other hand, it would be impossible to form the slightest conception of that system from the view Dr. Reed has presented of the New Haven protest. Who that is not in the secret could divine what the expression "entire depravity by nature" means in the language of New Haven? Who would suspect any thing amiss in the clause "justification, by faith, through the atonement of Jesus Christ"? And yet, what a melancholy substitute for the old doctrine of atonement do the pages of the *Christian Spectator* present us? Dr. Reed makes this protest deny that the advocates of the new divinity maintain that God cannot prevent sin in a moral system; and yet a very moderate acquaintance with their writings would have led him to see that they first stated this proposition hypothetically; they then positively affirmed it; that they argue to prove that it must be assumed, that the contrary is absurd, and inconsistent with the divine character; that they make it the ground of other arguments, and of expostulations and exhortations; and, in short, that they affirm it, directly and indirectly, in every way in which a doctrine can be asserted to be true. This opinion, though not the radical, is yet the most characteristic point in the whole system; and is essential to its correct diagnosis. It is like the fatal boil in the plague. No great knowledge of the history of theology is necessary to discover that this doctrine has ever been the dividing line between Augustinian and Pelagian systems; between those which exalt God, and those which exalt man. As soon as it assumed that such is the nature of free agency, that God cannot certainly

control its operations; that "God has limited his own efficiency by the creation of free agents;" whatever may be thought of the truth of the assumption, it can hardly be questioned, that the vital spirit of all such doctrines as efficacious grace, personal election, and perseverance of the saints, at once departs.

Imperfect as Dr. Reed's idea of the new divinity obviously is, he learned enough to get some insight into its nature. He correctly regards a fondness for "speculative opinion" as one source of the discrepancies in question. "Many," he says, in no very flattering vein, "delight in metaphysical inquiry, though very few can master it. It is astonishing how much has been written in this discussion, and most of it with acumen and power; though little of it with that command of the subject which reduces the complex to the simple, and sheds light where darkness was before." He says the speculators have had "an ardent passion to relieve Calvinism of the burden by which they thought it to be oppressed. At present, unwilling to think they have laboured so long in vain, they flatter themselves they have succeeded. When they shall have had time to look more soberly on the subject, they will find the burden still remains." "The very reference to discoveries in this connexion is somewhat ominous, as it implies a forgetfulness of historical testimony which is improper to the occasion. I say not, that no farther light shall be thrown by devoted study on the relations and harmony of revealed truth; but I do say, that this discussion has little of such honour or distinction. This new divinity is, in fact, many centuries old, and for as many centuries it has been exploded."! He bids us be "careful of a philosophy which is 'heady and high-minded,' and which is 'falsely so called;' it will assuredly lead from Calvinism to Pelagianism; from Pelagianism to Socinianism; and from Socinianism to Theism. All heresy, the most subtle, the most mischievous, from the time of Origen to the present, has wormed its way into the churches under these refined pretences; and we have nothing to learn on this subject, beyond what the schools and the schoolmen have taught us."

A little better acquaintance with his subject would have preserved Dr. Reed from the mistake of representing the new divinity as a recoil from "old orthodoxy." It is impossible to understand any one period of the history of theology, without a knowledge of those which preceded it.

New-Havenism, therefore, is not to be understood by looking at it apart from its connexions. It had nothing to do with "old orthodoxy;" it sprung up in New England, where little or nothing of what Dr. Reed means by *old* orthodoxy has existed for two generations; it is the pressing out of one corner of the system of President Edwards, to results from which that good and great man would have revolted; it is but one of the many phases of doctrine assumed by the planetary orbs which revolve in changeful and dubious light around that central body.—The advice which Dr. Reed gives to the old orthodox, though very kindly meant, and very good in itself, being founded on his limited knowledge of the state of the case, cannot be deemed of any special weight.

It is impossible for us to notice particularly the contents of the following letters. Dr. Reed presents an interesting account of the several christian denominations and of the religious and temporal economy of the churches. Under this latter head he exhibits with great force the ability of religion to sustain itself without any alliance with the state, and shows that with all the amazing disadvantage of our rapidly increasing population, the supply of the means of religious instruction is greater in proportion to the number of the people than in Scotland itself. Thus in New York the case stands—

Population	1,913,508
Ministers	1,750
Churches	600 (1600 ?)
Communicants	184,583

In Pennsylvania—

Population	1,347,672
Ministers	1,133
Churches	1,829
Communicants	180,683

While Scotland stands thus—

Population	2,365,807
Ministers	1,765
Churches	1,804
Communicants	(uncertain.)

Even the ten Western States last admitted to the Union exhibit the following results:

Population	3,641,000
Ministers	2,690
Churches	3,701
Communicants	286,560

A similar result is afforded by a comparison of the principal cities of Great Britain and America. For example, Liverpool has—

Population	210,000
Ministers	57
Churches	57
Communicants	18,000

New York has—

Population	220,000
Ministers	142
Churches	132
Communicants	31,337

Edinburgh has—

Population	180,000
Ministers	70
Churches	65
Communicants	(uncertain.)

Philadelphia has—

Population	200,000
Ministers	137
Churches	83
Communicants	(uncertain.)

Dr. Reed continues his comparison much farther, and uniformly with similar results. "After the statements already made," he adds, "there can be no difficulty in concluding, that the general supply of the whole country is, in comparison with any other country, astonishingly great. The figures would stand thus:

Population	13,000,000
Ministers	11,450
Churches	12,580
Communicants	1,550,890."

It must be acknowledged that these statements are exceedingly auspicious for the "voluntary principle," and must tell powerfully in those countries where the people have been long groaning under the burden of establishments.

We cannot follow Dr. Reed in his notice of the various religious societies of which he speaks in terms of high commendation. His praise of the Temperance Society is peculiarly earnest and well deserved. Instead of copying his statement of the progress of this great work as it appeared in the year 1834, we give the following account from the Annual Report of the American Temperance Society for

1835. "It is supposed that 2,000,000 of persons in this country have ceased to use distilled liquor. More than 8,000 Temperance Societies have been formed, embracing, it is thought, more than 1,500,000 members. Twenty-three of these are state societies; and there is now one in every state, with one exception, throughout the Union. More than 4,000 distilleries have been stopped, and more than 8,000 merchants have ceased to sell ardent spirits; and many of them have ceased to sell any kind of intoxicating liquor. More than 1,200 vessels sail from our ports in which it is not used; and more than 12,000 persons who were drunkards, and, it is supposed, more than 200,000 other persons, have ceased to use any intoxicating liquor." These are indeed splendid results; sufficient to call forth the gratitude and admiration of all friends to human happiness. Dr. Reed candidly acknowledges that he considered this noble cause as labouring under a temporary reaction when he was in this country. This reaction he attributes to the intemperance with which it has at times been urged, and to the attempt to extend the pledge to wines and other things, by which its simplicity and power have been destroyed. "No people," he says, "know better than the Americans how to bear with manly and united energy on any portentous evil of the day; they have only one fault—they know not when to stop." Whatever may be thought of the correctness of the assumption as to the existence of a reaction in this case, or of the reasons assigned to account for it; we are constrained to say that the cause of temperance has long suffered, and is now suffering more than ever, from the weak, and in some cases the revolting arguments by which it is advocated. The case has always appeared to us a very plain one. Here is an evil of undeniable extent and magnitude; the question is, how may it be abated? Experience answers, by inducing men to abstain from the liquor by which intemperance is produced. How are men to be induced to take this step? Experience again answers, by forming societies whose members agree to practise this entire abstinence. Since no one doubts that ardent spirits produce ninety-nine hundredths of all the drunkenness of the land, the friends of temperance therefore are ready to abandon their use entirely. Now, if any one will prove that entire abstinence from beer, wine, tea, coffee, bread, meat, or any thing else, is necessary to prevent intemperance, and to stay this desolating plague, we admit that the

obligation to abstinence is fairly made out. But to urge this duty on the ground that these things, or any of them, are not necessary; that they are not the creatures of God; that the Bible forbids their use; is something far more injurious than mere trifling with a sacred subject. We regard the attempt now making to prove from the word of God the use of wine to be a sin, as one of the most ominous of the indications of fanaticism which our country has ever witnessed. The advocates of this doctrine evidently feel themselves, and are clearly seen by others, to be in direct conflict with the *obvious* meaning of the Bible. That obvious meaning must be got rid of to make way for an opinion formed on other grounds than scriptural authority. This is itself a dreadful evil and a great sin. Whenever men have such confidence in their own conclusions as to feel that they know better than the Bible; that the obvious sense of the scriptures must be wrong, and are therefore disposed to look far and near for means to set it aside, they sever the bond which connects them with truth, morality, and religion, and are loose upon the broad sea of human passions and speculations, and no mortal can tell on what dark shore they may be cast. They have assumed another and a higher standard of truth and duty than the word of God, and virtually proclaim themselves wiser than their Maker, and better than their Saviour. What can be more revolting to a mind, unblinded by the spirit of fanaticism, than to hear men denounce as the "cup of devils" the cup, which even these men allow it is presumable the Saviour blessed, and which almost all other christians who have ever lived, regard as certainly that of which Christ himself partook! There is scarcely a step farther to be taken. Men have got to the extreme limit, when they can deliberately pronounce that to be sinful which they themselves, until within a few days, ever believed that Christ repeatedly performed.

These remarks are not intended as an argument on the wine question,—for this is not the place for such an argument,—but as the expression of the indignant feelings with which every christian must regard what he considers an aspersion on the Redeemer's character.

We must pass over the interesting letters relating to education, and would be glad here to conclude our notice of the work before us. The letters, however, on slavery, we consider so unworthy of the character of these English brethren, and so unjust in themselves, that we cannot consent

to let them pass without remark. We can, of course, have no objection that Dr. Reed should have and express his own opinions on this subject, and of the conduct of Americans in relation to it; but we do object to his making statements at once incorrect and injurious, especially as they are made without any adequate opportunity or effort to gain accurate information. As to Dr. Reed's personal knowledge of the state of slavery in this country, it is as near nothing as possible; and Dr. Matheson's absolutely nothing. Yet these gentlemen, especially the former (for he is the real author of the book,) appear as reporters or witnesses, and bear testimony to facts which they have ascertained by their visit to this country. The case is the more objectionable, because the little that Dr. Reed did see (as appears in his narrative) is in direct contradiction to his general statements in these letters. Any one who will compare the letters on slavery with those on revivals, on the state of religion, and on education, will be convinced of the carelessness with which this momentous subject is presented. There is no discussion of the principles which it involves; no statistical details by which the moral, physical, and intellectual condition of the slaves can be ascertained; no citations of authentic documents containing such information. Dr. Reed ought not to have touched this subject; he ought to have gone home and reported that his personal inspection having been almost exclusively confined to the non-slave-holding states, he was not prepared to speak as a witness in the case. All that he saw of slavery was in a very hasty journey through part of Kentucky and part of Virginia; too little surely to justify him in making the statements found in these letters. He gives the general features of slavery as enacted by law, which amount to little more than that it is slavery; a state of hereditary and compulsory bondage, in which the individual is regarded as the property of the master. This is saying what all England and America of course knew before. But when he says, "the actual condition of the coloured population is worse than the law contemplates; and severe and despotic as it is, it knows no relaxation, except what may spring from individual charity; and where slavery is found charity does not often dwell;" we cannot but regard the statement as not only unjust, but as inconsistent with his own accounts and admissions. The law forbids the slaves to be taught to read, yet "many, very many" masters, he tells us, instruct

them and assist them to worship God. The law makes no provision as to the labour which may be exacted of them; as to the food and clothing which must be allotted them; and yet, as a general rule, they perform less labour than the freemen at the north (southern men say not more than one-third as much,) and are well fed, clothed and lodged. The most unworthy feature of Dr. Reed's account is, that he selects from various quarters individual cases of hardship and cruelty, and presents them as specimens of the general treatment of the slaves. This is entirely beneath such men as the authors of this book; it is the flimsiest and easiest of all methods of producing a popular impression. Any one who seriously felt the responsibility and importance of the task of representing to the christian public of Great Britain the state of slavery in America, would have taken care to be accurately informed on the whole subject. He would have ascertained their external condition and circumstances; their moral and intellectual state, and their opportunities of religious instruction; and he would have presented this information in a shape to command confidence in its accuracy. Dr. Reed has not done this, but contented himself with common-place declamation, or loose and exaggerated statements. Had he taken the course just suggested, we have little doubt, from our knowledge of the case, that he would have found that the slaves are far less severely tasked,—that they are far better fed, clothed and lodged, and all their physical wants better provided for, than the operatives in the English manufactories. We very much question whether their moral condition is not also much superior. Dr. Reed's representations would lead his readers to a conclusion directly the reverse of the truth on all these points. How is it that men who can shut their eyes, their ears and their hearts to the appalling oppression, cruelty, and vice connected with the establishments of their own country, should dwell so much on the condition of the American slave, so much less pitiable, as far as all the comforts of life are concerned? As it regards the religious advantages of the slaves, Dr. Reed's accounts are still more incorrect and injurious. "Education," he says, "has been felt to be incompatible with slavery; and it has been refused. To the honour of religion, it has been open to the same objection; and the slaves must not meet to rest their griefs on their Maker, unless a white man will condescend to be present and watch their conduct." This is evidently meant to

be understood as being equivalent to a denial that the means of grace are permitted to the slave. This is the obvious meaning of the passage, because in the conclusion of the paragraph he represents the American planter as deliberately determining to sustain slavery at the expense of christianity, on the ground of his conviction that religion and slavery are incompatible. There never was a more unfounded charge brought against any community, and Mr. Reed's own observations, as far as they went, contradict his assertions. He attended a meeting of slaves in Lexington, Virginia, and was delighted with the evidence of religion which they afforded; nay, he heard no discourse in America, whose peroration was superior to that of the black preacher on this occasion. At the protracted meeting, of which he gives such a graphic and touching account, the slaves are found sharing all the religious advantages of the whites. The fact is, that wherever the gospel is preached in the south to the whites, it is preached regularly to the blacks; they are considered as an important part of every minister's charge; Sunday-schools are extensively established among them; many devoted and able men consecrate all their time to their religious instruction; and a very considerable portion of the communicants in every church are slaves. In the state of South Carolina it is estimated that there are thirty thousand communicants belonging to the slave population. "Our elergy," says the Rev. Rufus Bailey, in the *Portland Mirror*, September 1835, "generally pay a particular attention to their black congregations. Many of them give the entire afternoon of the Sabbath to them. Sunday schools among them are almost universally organized." It is also well known that in religious families the instruction of the slaves is an object of general solieitude. It is by no means unusual for individual planters, or two or more in connexion, to support a chaplain for the exclusive benefit of their coloured people. It is not that we love slavery that we write thus, but it is that we love truth, and are convinced that no good end can be accomplished by false and exaggerated statements. If the evils of slavery are to be mitigated, or slavery itself abolished, it will not be by means of misrepresentations or abuse.

Dr. Reed concludes his work in a spirit of kindness and conciliation. His general impressions of the state and prospects of our country are decidedly favourable. We are happy in being able to follow his example. While there

are many things in these volumes from which we have felt constrained to dissent, there is a great preponderance of what is true, kind, and important; and we are persuaded that our English brethren have performed a service of great and permanent value by the publication of their Report.

ART. VI.—*Lectures on Revivals of Religion.* By CHARLES G. FINNEY. New York: Leavitt, Lord, & Co. Boston: Crocker & Brewster. 1835.

WE proceed to redeem the pledge we gave in our last number, to exhibit to our readers, the *measures* recommended, and the *spirit* displayed, in Mr. Finney's Lectures on Revivals. We do this at the known hazard of being denounced as enemies to revivals, and friends of Satan. But it is a very small thing with us that we should be judged of Mr. Finney's judgment. We, in common with all the friends of pure and undefiled religion, have a sacred duty to discharge in relation to this subject, from which no considerations of fear or favour should deter us. Mr. Finney, and his followers, have shown a resolute determination to persevere in their course. It is surely, then, the duty of those who believe that course to be detrimental to the best interests of religion, to proclaim their dissent. We believe, therefore will we speak.

Our first remark is upon the disingenuousness of which Mr. Finney is guilty, in stating the question of New Measures. These measures, he says, are opposed "on the ground that *they are innovations.*" Now he knows perfectly well, and all the world knows, that this is not the ground on which they are opposed. Of the many testimonies against them, which have been published, we defy him to point to a single one in which their novelty is made the cause of their condemnation. And yet he seeks continually to make upon his reader the impression, that naught has been, or can be said against them, save that they are *new*. Who, but himself, ever supposed that they were *new*? Who does not know that he has picked up his measures, as well as his theology, among the cast-away rubbish of past times? The only novelty in the matter is, that these measures should be em-