

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1868.

No. I.

ART. I.—*The English Language.**

LINGUISTICS is gradually acquiring the consistency of a science. If not so definite as mathematics and other pure sciences, it has yet made good its claim to be regarded as a science, both by the character of its methods and the wide generalizations which it has reached. Languages have long, almost always indeed, been a subject of study. But one may be an accomplished linguist, reading and speaking many tongues, without being an adept in the science of language. This science, in its more recent and exact form, differs perceptibly even from philology. The material, or subject matter of the science, is not one language, or any one class of languages, ancient or modern, living or dead, but language itself, in its entirety. Its methods are to observe, arrange, and classify all the forms of speech that are, or ever have been, in use, and from them to deduce the necessary laws of speech for a race constituted as the human race is. It aims to show how language originated, that is, to show why we speak at all, and why we speak as we do, to show what is the inner life of language,

* *Language and the Study of Language.* By William Dwight Whitney, Professor of Sanskrit in Yale College. Charles Scribner & Co. New York. 8vo.

ART. III.—*Presbyterian Reunion.* By the Rev. HENRY B. SMITH, D. D. Reprinted from the "American Presbyterian and Theological Review," October, 1867.

THERE are two principles on which denomination churches may be organized. According to the one, the essential bond of union is the form of government; according to the other, it is the form of doctrine.

In the Romish Church, the principle of unity is submission to the pope, and to the authority of the church of which he is the head. If this be yielded, great latitude of opinion is allowed to its members and its priesthood. In all ages in that church its theologians have been Augustinians, Semipelagians, Mystics, and Rationalists. The Thomists and Scotists, Dominicans and Franciscans, Jesuits and Jansenists, have all been embraced, not indeed in peaceful fellowship, but in the bonds of external union.

In the Church of England the bond of union is submission to the reigning sovereign as head of the church; and the adoption of the same form of government and mode of worship. In that church all forms of Christian doctrine have ever been tolerated, from Romanism as a theology, down to the lowest Pelagianism. This has been regarded as the greatest glory of that church, and the essential condition of its prosperity and peace.

The same principle is almost of necessity adopted in all established churches. Submission to external authorities and forms, with great latitude in tolerating doctrinal differences, characterize all such churches, because in them the ministry is a state office.

There are churches, however, where the greatest stress is laid upon doctrine. The truth is held paramount to all forms of order or worship. Conformity to the standard of faith is exacted, and professed by every one who enters the ministry of such a church. Such being the understanding, it is dis-

honest in any man to profess to adopt those standards, who does not really believe the doctrines which they teach. We do not say that it is dishonest for a church to adopt the lax principle above stated, provided it be avowed and recognized by all parties to the engagement, but it is undeniably dishonest to profess to believe what we regard as false.

Now it is evident that if a union be proposed between two churches, one of which adopts the strict, and the other the lax principle of subscription, such union must result in constant conflict, unless one of the parties agrees to renounce its own principle, and to adopt that of the other. It is also obvious that wisdom and conscience alike dictate that such union should not be consummated, unless there be a distinct understanding upon this point. Any misconception of each other's views; any misapprehension as to the rule of action to be adopted in the united body, must issue in evil. In a matter in which such great interests are at stake, frankness and openness are imperatively demanded.

All are agreed that union without unity is an evil and not a good. Of what avail would be organic union between us and Baptists, when every celebration of either sacrament would be the occasion or the scene of alienation and conflict. How can Presbyterians and Episcopalians be united in the same church, if one party affirms, and the other denies, the validity of Presbyterian ordination? How can two churches unite with a good conscience, or with any hope of harmonious action, if the one be strict, and the other lax in adoption of the standards of doctrine? Stated *in thesi*, these questions admit of but one answer. All such incongruous unions would be wrong and of evil consequences. In the last case supposed, it is plain that the strict church must agree to become lax, or the lax must agree to become strict, or the union between them would be an offence and evil. So far we take it for granted there can be no diversity of opinion among intelligent and conscientious men.

These are the simple principles which we have to apply to the proposed union between the two great branches of the Presbyterian Church in this country. That this union is desirable is almost universally admitted. That it is in fact

earnestly desired by the great majority of the ministers and members of both bodies, recent events have rendered undeniable. With regard to the New-school this has been evident from the beginning; and as to the Old-school, the action of our Presbyteries has rendered it plain that they are of the same mind. Although the great majority of the Presbyteries, so far as reported, has decided against the adoption of the terms proposed by the joint committee of the two Assemblies, they have, almost without exception, expressed in the strongest language their desire that the union may be effected upon a satisfactory basis. In the recent Presbyterian Convention held in Philadelphia, scarcely a voice was raised against organic union. This is a fact therefore to be acknowledged. The reunion of the Old and New-school churches is by the great majority of both bodies earnestly desired. To this fact no man can shut his eyes; and no one can wisely refuse to give that fact its due weight.

Nevertheless it must be admitted that this union cannot be righteously or advantageously effected unless the two bodies are really one; one in principle and one in practice. If the Old-school be strict in the adoption of the Confession of Faith, and if the New-school be lax or liberal in that matter, either in theory or practice, then the one must adopt the theory and practice of the other, or the union between them would be not only undesirable, but morally wrong.

That our church from the beginning adopted the strict rule of subscription is plain, 1. Because all the members of the original Synod (except one), adopted in 1729 every doctrine of the Confession as expressing his own faith, save certain clauses relating to the power of civil magistrates in matters of religion. 2. Because the Synod in 1730 declared that they required all "intrants" to receive the standards as strictly as the existing members had done the year before. 3. Because in 1736, the same declaration was made in still stronger terms. 4. Because when the two Synods were united in 1758, after the schism, it was on the following basis as to doctrine—"I. Both Synods having always approved and received the Westminster Confession and Larger and Shorter Catechisms, as an orthodox and excellent system of Christian doctrine, founded on the word of

God, we do still receive the same as the confession of our faith; and also adhere to the plan of worship, government, and discipline, contained in the Westminster Directory, strictly enjoining it on all our ministers and probationers for the ministry, that they preach and teach according to the form of sound words in the said Confession and Catechisms, and avoid and oppose all errors contrary thereto."

"VI. That no Presbytery license or ordain to the work of the ministry, any candidate, until he give them competent satisfaction as to his learning, and experimental acquaintance with religion, and skill in divinity and cases of conscience; and declare his acceptance of the Westminster Confession and Catechisms as the confession of his faith, and promise subjection to the Presbyterian form of government in the Westminster Directory."

In 1788, when the present constitution was adopted, the same ground was taken. The Confession of Faith and Catechisms were declared to be the confession of the faith of the church, and pronounced unalterable, except at the suggestion of two-thirds of the Presbyteries. From that time to the disruption in 1837, all the prosecutions for false doctrines were made and sustained by those now constituting the Old-school. Those prosecutions were not made against mere explanations; nor against denials of particular propositions contained in the Confession, unessential to the system of doctrine therein taught. They were made against what the Old-school regarded as errors involving a rejection of the system; errors touching our relation to Adam; to original sin; to efficacious grace; regeneration; the satisfaction of Christ; justification; predestination and election. The Old-school church stands out before the world as a body pledged to maintain, on the part of its ministry, a strict adoption of the Reformed system of doctrine in its integrity. This is its character. This it cannot renounce without being false to its professions and engagements; without condemning all its past history; and, as we said in our July number, and say again with all seriousness, without forfeiting all moral right to its property and endowments. This, therefore, cannot be done. It is this which three-fourths of our Presbyteries, so far as reported, have declared must not be

allowed for the sake of any external advantages, or in obedience to any amount of external pressure. Such is the character and position of the Old-school body.

How is it with the New-school? It also as a party within the church, and as a separate organization since the disruption, has acquired a character and status in the presence of the Christian world. That character in many aspects is high and commanding; perhaps in some respects superior to our own. But the question is as to its distinctive character; the peculiarity by which it is distinguished from the Old-school. That peculiarity, as given and avowed by themselves, is liberality. They are a liberal body. They admit of a latitude in matters of doctrine and order, which the Old-school have conscientiously resisted. In saying this we make no derogatory imputation. We ascribe to our brethren nothing dishonourable or immoral. What is dishonourable and immoral is to profess to adopt a system in its strictness, and then to allow of a latitude of interpretation which destroys its integrity. But every church has a right to assume a broad doctrinal basis, for external ministerial communion, if this be understood and avowed. Presidents Dickinson and Davies were two of the greatest ornaments of our church, and they openly advocated this latitude of interpretation of the Confession of Faith. We do not see that any one has cause to resent as an injury the assertion that he adopts, either theoretically or practically, a principle, which those men publicly avowed. As our earnest desire is to avoid all personalities, and everything adapted to excite unpleasant feeling, we wish to disclaim any intention of impugning the sincerity or honour of any individual, or of any organization. But it is worse than infatuation for any two churches to come into organic union, unless they understand each other, and are agreed as to the true meaning of the terms on which they propose to unite.

We say therefore that the New-school, as distinguished from the Old, is a liberal body; it has hitherto admitted of a latitude in matters of doctrine to which the Old-school on conscientious grounds cannot consent. That this is true we suppose to be as clear and as generally admitted as that of the two great

English parties, the Tory and the Whig, the one is conservative and the other progressive.

The proof that the New-school has hitherto acted on the principle of a greater latitude of construction in adopting the Confession than the Old-school, is found partly in official declarations, and partly in the uniform practice of that body. As to the first class of proof, we find in the pastoral letter of the New-school Assembly in 1838, and in the declaration published by the following Assembly of 1839, such statements as these: 1. They refer the origin of the Presbyterian Church in America to the London Union formed in 1691, between Presbyterians and Congregationalists, which adopted certain general "Heads of Agreement," under which they were to act. 2. That body, we are told, sent one of their number, the Rev. Mr. McKemie, to this country, who established here "a modified form of Presbyterianism." 3. That in the year 1729 the Presbyterian Church in America adopted the Westminster Confession in "the articles essential or necessary in doctrine, worship, or discipline." 4. That "the rash departure from the tolerant and fraternal principles" of 1729, led to the schism of 1741. 5. That that schism was healed in 1758 by a return to those liberal principles, the terms of reunion being "a subscription to the Confession of Faith as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures, notwithstanding any such scruples with respect to any article or articles of said Confession, as the Presbytery or Synod shall judge not essential, in doctrine, worship, or discipline." 6. That the Church continued peaceful and prosperous until the union with the Associate Reformed church in 1821; but soon after that event, the difference of views on doctrinal points, which had been previously tolerated, "became the occasions of alarm, and whisperings, and accusations, and at length of ecclesiastical trials for heresy." 7. "That the result of these efforts to change the terms of subscription and union" was the separation effected in 1837.*

* Our object is not to comment on the historical correctness of the above statements. In our opinion, however, it is not true that the Presbyterian Church in this country owes its origin to the London Union of Congregationalists and Presbyterians formed in 1691. It is certainly not true that the Synod

It thus appears from these official documents that the New-school as a party and as a church has avowedly contended for a greater latitude in the adoption of the Confession of Faith than the Old-school was willing to concede. The prominent distinction between the two bodies has ever been that the one is strict, and the other "liberal" in its requirements as to matters of doctrine.

The same liberal principle is avowed in other official publications, and by the representative men of the New-school church. In 1850, the Synod of New York and New Jersey appointed a committee, consisting of five ministers and five elders, "to prepare and publish a brief history of the causes which produced" the division of the church in 1837. This distinguished committee accomplished the work assigned to them in 1852. Their history recites, from the official documents referred to above, the same statements respecting the origin and early character of our church; as to the qualified adoption of the Westminster Confession; as to the liberal principles on which the schism of 1741 was healed; and as to the attempts of the Old-school to alter the terms of subscription. It says that the preliminary act of 1729, which distinguishes between essential and nonessential doctrines, "does immortal honour to its authors and to those who received it as a bond of Christian union and fellowship." P. 87. In the eleventh chapter, in which the Committee state their position as a church, it is said, "In respect to doctrine, our position is between latitudinarianism, which tolerates error subversive of the gospel, on the one hand; and uniformity, which precludes all diversity of views on points not essential, on the other." P. 215. Again, "Our position in respect of doctrine, is that of agreement in things *fundamental*, and toleration and forbearance in things *not essential*, 'endeavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bonds of peace.'" P. 216.

of 1729 adopted the Westminster Confession only as to the articles deemed "essential or necessary in doctrine, worship, or discipline." It is certainly incorrect to say that the schism of 1741 was occasioned by an attempt to alter the terms of subscription. That schism had nothing to do with matters of doctrine or terms of subscription. It is not true that when the schism was healed in 1758, there was any reference whatever to essential and nonessential articles. And it is not true that the disruption of the church in 1837 was occasioned by any attempt "to change the terms of subscription."

In the *Independent* for April 9, 1863, there is an article entitled, "The Presbyterian Church in the United States (New-school). By Prof. Henry B. Smith, D. D. New York." In the second paragraph of that article, it is said, "New England accepted the Confession and Catechisms in 1648, and the Presbyterian Church, by its adopting act of 1729, declared that they were, 'in all essential and necessary articles, good forms, and sound words, and systems of Christian doctrine,' allowing, however, differences of opinion, provided they were, 'only about articles not essential or necessary.' This adjustment had respect to the fact that two tendencies, the New England and the Scotch-Irish, then nearly equal in numbers, united in the new organization. This is the basis of the American Presbyterian Church."

This documentary evidence proves, beyond reasonable contradiction, that the characteristic difference between the Old and New-school is, that the one is strict, and the other liberal in the adoption of our common standards.

The other source of proof is that the New-school admit men into its ministry, whom the Old-school consider unsound in doctrine to the extent of the rejecting some of the essential elements of the Reformed or Calvinistic system. It is a matter of painful surprise to us that our brethren will not distinguish between a rule of church action and the personal belief of its ministers. When we say that the Church of England admits Pelagians into its ministry, we do not say that the body of its clergy, or the church itself, is Pelagian. We only say that it allows great latitude in the interpretation of its standards. When we say that the New-school admits Taylorites into its ministry, we do not say that the mass of its ministers are Taylorites, or that the church itself professes the New Haven divinity. Nine-tenths, or ninety-nine-hundredths, of the New-school ministers may be perfectly orthodox, and yet they may think it right to give this latitude of opinion to those who choose to avail themselves of it. The men in our old Synod, as we remarked above, who were in favour of this liberality, were among the most orthodox, excellent, and distinguished ministers in the country.

The proof that the New-school are liberal to the extent of

admitting into its ministry men who deny some of the essential doctrines of our system, is found in the fact, that it receives avowed advocates of the New Haven divinity.

We trust no one will be so uncandid as to say that a man does not adopt the New Haven theology, because he may not agree with Dr. Taylor in all his opinions. Dr. Smith calls himself a Calvinist; but does he adopt all Calvin's opinions? We all call ourselves Augustinians, but there are many doctrines of Augustin, which we with one voice reject. Augustinianism or Calvinism is a known historical system of doctrine; and those who adopt that system in its distinctive features have a right to call themselves Augustinians or Calvinists, and to be so regarded by others. We trust therefore that our brethren will not consider that we impute sentiments to them which they distinctly disavow, when we say that the church to which they belong practically adopts this liberal construction of our common standards.

A presumptive evidence of this fact may be found in the ready admission which the graduates of the New Haven and Andover Theological Seminaries find in the New-school churches. As a general rule, students attend those seminaries where the theology taught suits their own views. With many exceptions doubtless, the students of such institutions imbibe the doctrines therein inculcated. We have never heard that students from Andover, trained under Prof. Park, who has a peculiar talent for making Old-school doctrines appear ridiculous and odious, find any more difficulty in being received into the New-school body than into the Congregational churches of Massachusetts. A slight inspection of the Andover triennial catalogue will show how many of those students are acting as ministers in good standing in New-school Presbyteries.

For direct proof on this subject we need at present to refer only to the article of Dr. Duffield, in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, reviewed in our last number; and to the resolution of the Tioga Presbytery. As to the former, although the author assumes to speak in the name of his church, we do not believe that he fairly represents the views of one-tenth of its ministers. We do not refer to his article as evidence of the general pre-

valence in the New-school body of the doctrines which he avows, but simply as evidence that those doctrines are tolerated by the New-school. Dr. Duffield goes over the whole ground, saying, as to each point, the Old-school teach so, and the New-school teach so. The two systems are contrasted. The one is denied and the other is affirmed. That which is affirmed is, in all important points, the New Haven system; which not the Old-school only, but the great body of New England divines, pronounce entirely incompatible with the system taught in the Westminster Confession. This is the judgment of such men as the late Dr. Woods of Andover, of Dr. Porter, Dr. Humphrey, Dr. Griffin, Dr. Tyler, Dr. Nettelton, as well as of the late Dr. Richards, Dr. Fisher, Dr. Hillyer, and others of the New-school Presbyterians.*

The Tioga Presbytery resolved that ministers holding the views of Dr. Taylor and Dr. Park are to be regarded as of unquestioned orthodoxy in the united church, provided the Old and New-school should be united on the plan proposed by the joint committee of the two Assemblies. The gentlemen named in the above resolution are men of great distinction. They have written abundantly for the press. Their views are universally known. The judgment not of Old-school men only, but also, as we have seen, of the larger part of the most eminent of the New England divines, has been pronounced, viz., that they are incompatible with the Reformed or Calvinistic faith. Any attempt to reverse this judgment must fail. The endeavour to show that Dr. Duffield's article is consistent with the system of doctrine contained in our Confession, does ten times more harm than good.

Any competent and candid reader can be convinced of the correctness of the judgment which pronounces the New Haven divinity inconsistent with Calvinism, by a very brief exhibition of the leading features of that system.

Every student of history knows that the Pelagian controversy had its origin in the offence which Pelagius took to a prayer of Augustin, *Da quod jubes, et jube quod vis*. This

* See Letters on the Origin and Progress of the New Haven Theology. By a New England minister to one in the South. P. 109.

Pelagius said was absurd, as it assumed that God could righteously command, what we of ourselves were not able to perform. His argument runs thus, Quærendum est, peccatum voluntatis an necessitatis est? Si necessitatis est, peccatum non est; si voluntatis, vitari potest. Iterum quærendum est, utrumne debeat homo sine peccato esse? Procul dubio debet. Si debet potest; si non potest, ergo non debeat. This intimate conviction that men can be responsible for nothing which is not in their power, led, in the first place, to the Pelagian doctrine of free will. It was not enough to constitute free agency, that the agent should be self-determined, or that his volitions should be determined by his own inward states. It is necessary that he should have power over those states. Liberty of will, according to this theory, is plenary power at all times, and at every moment, of choosing between good and evil; and of being either good or bad, sinful or holy. Whatever does not fall within this imperative power of the will, can have no moral character. Omne bonum ac malum, quo vel laudabiles vel vituperabiles sumus, non nobis oritur, sed agitur a nobis. (*Apud Augustin. de Peccato Orig.* 14.)

These views of the nature of free agency and ability, Dr. Taylor and the other New Haven divines constantly avow. "Moral agency," says Dr. Taylor, (*Lectures*, vol. i., p. 307,) "implies free agency—the power of choice—the power to choose morally wrong as well as morally right, under every possible influence to prevent such choice or action." Again, in the *Christian Spectator* for 1831, p. 632, "Men are free agents; by which we mean, not simply that they have the power to do as they please, or have command over the muscles of the body, but the power of choice itself; a power to place their hearts on idols, the objects of mere personal gratification, or to place their hearts on God—to choose either, as their supreme portion." It is here as distinctly asserted that free agency implies plenary ability, as that doctrine was ever stated by Pelagius himself. Dr. Taylor was fully aware of his agreement with Pelagius on this fundamental principle. In vol. ii. p. 132, he says, "Here I am constrained to ask, whether in all this theology, both Catholic and Protestant, theologians in maintaining the doctrines of grace, have not extensively main-

tained opinions—philosophical dogmas, unscriptural principles, and held them as essential doctrines of the word of God, which are palpably inconsistent with, and utterly subversive of, God's authority as a lawgiver? Without referring to more remote incongruities on this subject, may it not be said to be a prevalent doctrine of the Christian church from the time of Augustin, and emphatically in the two great divisions of the Reformed church, known as the Calvinistic and Arminian, that 'God commands what man *cannot* perform,' 'that man by the fall lost all ability of will to anything spiritually good;' 'that God did not lose his right to command though man lost his power to obey?' The error of Pelagius is, not that he maintained man's ability without grace, but that man does *actually* obey God without grace." It is a mistake to say that Pelagius held that "men do actually obey God without grace." So that this shadowy difference between him and Dr. Taylor on this point vanishes. Dr. Taylor here consciously places himself in avowed opposition to the whole Christian world, Catholic and Protestant.

As Dr. Taylor and Pelagius agreed in this fundamental principle as to free agency and ability, so they agreed in the conclusions which they drew from it. These conclusions follow by a logical necessity.

1. The first of these is, that all sin consists in the voluntary transgression of known law. In the quotation above given, Pelagius says, that sin "is something done by us," and his associate, Julian, says, "Nihil est peccati in homine, si nihil est propriæ voluntatis vel assentionis." (*Aug. Op. Imp.* i. 60.) Or, as is often expressed, "Quod nihil habet rationem peccati nisi fiat a volente et sciente." That such is the doctrine of the New Haven divines is universally admitted. To prove this was the great object of Dr. Taylor's celebrated *Concio ad Clerum*. It is so often reiterated by him and his disciples, that proof passages can hardly be required. The first position which that discourse endeavoured to establish is, that "there is no sin except such as consists in man's voluntary act." Moral depravity he defines, "A man's own act, consisting in the free choice of some object rather than God as his chief good." *The Christian Spectator*, 1831, p. 632, says, Men's sin

“consists wholly in their own voluntary act.” The uniform tenor of Dr. Taylor’s discourse is said by the *Christian Spectator*, 1829, p. 347, to be, “The agent is guilty for acting contrary to the demands of known duty.”

2. A second inference from these premises is, that there can be no original, or hereditary sin, no sin derived by descent from our first parent. Pelagius said, as all sin in us is something done by ourselves, it follows, *ut sine virtute, ita sine vitio procreamur, atque ante actionem propriæ voluntatis id solum in homine est, quod Deus condidit.* So Julian argued, *Tu autem concedis nihil fuisse in parvulis propriæ voluntatis; non ego, sed ratio concludit nihil igitur in eis esse peccati.* Dr. Taylor in his *Concio* says, by mankind being depraved by nature, “I do not mean that their nature itself is sinful, nor that their nature is the physical or efficient cause of their sinning; but I mean that their nature is the occasion of their sinning; that such is their nature, that in all the appropriate circumstances of their being, they will, and only sin.” In the *Christian Spectator*, 1829, for June, we find such statements as the following: A moral being “can be regarded only in two points of view—the substance of the soul with its essential attributes on the one hand, and its actions on the other. If there is sin in the mind previous to and independent of those actions, the substance of the soul itself must be sinful.” P. 347. “By a moral nature we mean the power of choosing and refusing, in view of motives, and with a knowledge of right and wrong.” “In accounting for this abuse (of our moral nature), we are not to say that a man’s nature is itself sinful; for no man, we think, can say this at the present day, without charging his sinful nature directly upon God, as its author.” P. 349. It is vain, says the *Spectator*, to appeal to the laws of propagation, for God established those laws. “Every soul, then, which becomes united to a human body, has either existed from eternity, or has been brought into existence by God. And every thing pertaining to such a soul, which is not its own act, must of necessity result from the act of God.” P. 348. When Mr. Harvey, says the reviewer, in order to account for the universality of sin, “talks of ‘a native depravity,’ which ‘was voluntary in the transgression of Adam, who acted as the represen-

tative of his race,' he carries us back, at once, to the most revolting statements of the doctrine of imputation." P. 352. In page 373, he examines Mr. Harvey's arguments for original sin. 1. "Infants die. The answer has been given a thousand times, brutes also die. But Mr. Harvey replies, 'animals are not the subjects of the moral government of God.' Neither are infants previous to moral agency, for what has moral government to do with those who are not moral agents." . . . "Animals, and infants previous to moral agency, do therefore stand on precisely the same ground in reference to this subject." 2. A second argument, "Why are infants baptized? Because God has permitted believing parents to put upon their offspring 'the seal and token of the covenant.' This seal is the pledge and assurance that of those to whom it is applied God will raise up children unto Abraham. But is there no significance in the use of the purifying element of water in this ordinance? Certainly. It indicates that the being to whom it is applied will need the purifying influences of the Holy Spirit, from the earliest moment that such influences from the nature of the case can take effect."* Far as the Romish church has departed from Augustinianism, its symbols pronounce this view of baptism a solemn mockery. They condemn all those who say that infants are not baptized for the remission of their own sin, *peccatum unicuique proprium*. All Christian churches hold that infants are in such a state as to need the application of the blood and Spirit of Christ for the removal of guilt and pollution. Dr. Taylor's views on this subject, therefore, are not only in conflict with the doctrine of the Reformed churches, but

* Several years before the delivery of Dr. Taylor's sermon on the Nature of Sin, the writer of this article, then just out of the Seminary, spent a few days in his family, and found him one of the most frank, cordial, and delightful men, whom, in a long life, he has ever met. It was the Doctor's habit, it would seem, to talk freely of his opinions, even to the young. At any rate, he condescended to expound his views to the writer, as to the freedom of infants from guilt and moral pollution. In answer to the question, What he made of infant baptism? he playfully snapped his fingers, and said, "There you've got me. I haven't got an answer to that yet; but I'll get one before long." The answer given in the text is doubtless the one found. Those who were most earnest in their protest against Dr. Taylor's doctrine, retained, universally, we believe, the highest regard for him personally.

of the whole Christian world; that is, of all the organized, historical churches of Christendom. 3. A third argument for the doctrine of original sin was drawn from the acknowledged fact that infants need redemption. All of the human family who are saved, are saved through the sprinkling of the blood of Christ and the renewing of the Holy Ghost. Infants, therefore, must be in a state of guilt and moral corruption. This argument is thus met by New Haven divines: "By salvation, in reference to those who are not moral agents, is meant deliverance from the future existence and consequent punishment of sin, and a title to eternal life."

These citations are sufficient for our purpose. They prove decisively that the New Haven theology involves the denial of original sin, as that doctrine has been held by the whole Christian world. It is true that Dr. Taylor admits that men are depraved by nature; that is, that such is their nature that they will certainly sin. But this was admitted by Pelagius, except in a case here and there among millions. What is meant by this depravity by nature we are clearly taught. "A child enters the world," says the *Spectator*, "with a variety of appetites and desires, which are generally acknowledged to be neither sinful nor holy. Committed in a state of utter helplessness to the assiduity of parental fondness, it commences its existence, the object of unceasing care, watchfulness, and concession, to those around it. Under such circumstances it is, that the natural appetites are first developed; and each advancing month brings them new objects of gratification. The obvious consequence is, that self-indulgence becomes the master principle in the soul of every child, long before it can understand that this self-indulgence will ever interfere with the rights, or entrench on the happiness of others. Thus by repetition is the force of constitutional propensities accumulating a bias towards self-gratification, which becomes incredibly strong before a knowledge of duty, or a sense of right or wrong, can possibly have entered the mind. That moment, the commencement of moral agency, at length arrives. Does the child now come in a state of perfect neutrality, to the question, whether it will obey or disobey the command which cuts it off from some favourite gratification? If the temptation presented

to constitutional propensities, could be so strong in the case of Adam, as to overpower the force of established habits of virtue in the maturity of his reason, how absolute is the certainty that every child will yield to the urgency of those propensities, under the redoubled impulse of long-cherished self-gratification, and in the dawn of intellectual existence?" *Christian Spectator*, 1829, p. 366, 367. The child, according to this, comes into the world, as Pelagius said, *sine virtute et sine vitio*. As he certainly stumbles in walking, and errs in reason, so also he certainly fails in the exercise of his moral agency. This is the probation for eternity on which the Heavenly Father places his infant children! It is not our business, however, to discuss these points. It is enough to say that the doctrine above stated was condemned in oecumenical councils, and has remained under the condemnation of the church universal from that day to this.

The New Haven divines are also willing to admit what they say may be called, although improperly, "a sinful bias," or propensity to sin in infants. This propensity to self-indulgence is called sinful, not in itself, but because it leads to sin. "There are those who," say these divines, "on the ground of this certainty alone, are accustomed to speak of human nature as itself sinful. By the term 'sinful,' they do not mean deserving of punishment, but certainly resulting in sin. And we believe that multitudes who imagine themselves to mean more than this, will find on examining closely, that this is the whole amount of their real and practical faith." P. 375. "Those who fancy themselves to believe in its existence, are, in our opinion, either misled by ambiguous language, or deluded precisely as Hume, Berkeley, and Edwards were in their speculations. The testimony of their consciences, their habits of prayer, and their modes of striving against sin, will furnish a complete demonstration, we think, that they truly and practically believe 'there is no sin except such as consists in a man's own voluntary acts.' As to the figurative use of the terms 'sin,' 'sinful,' and 'guilty,' &c., to denote certainty of sin, and not 'desert of punishment,' we think it unhappy in a high degree." P. 376. All the Romish, all the Lutheran, all the Reformed, all the Wesleyans or Evangelical Arminian symbols, teach that since

the fall all men are born with sin, *nascantur cum peccato*; that innate, hereditary corruption is truly sin. The Augsburg Confession, for example, says, "Hic vitium originis vere sit peccatum, damnans et afferens nunc quoque mortem his, qui non renascantur per Baptismum et Sanctum Spiritum." The Form of Concord says that this *hæreditarum morbum* is to be regarded "pro horribili peccato." This is precisely what the Pelagians, the extreme Remonstrants, and the New Haven theology, denies. The denial and affirmation of the same thing cannot be regarded as different forms of one and the same truth. It is not enough to save the universal church doctrine of original sin, to admit the existence of "a sinful bias" or propensity. This was admitted by those who regarded themselves, and were regarded by the church universal, as rejecting the doctrine of original sin. Thus the Remonstrant theologian, Limborch, (*Theol. Christ.* iii. 4, 1,) says, "Inclinatio illa (ad peccandum) proprie dictum peccatum non est, aut peccati habitus ab Adamo in illos propagatus, sed naturalis tantum inclinatio habendi id, quod carni gratum est."

We do not see, therefore, how it can be denied that the New Haven theology rejects the doctrine of original sin as it enters into the faith of the whole Christian church.*

* As long since as 1828, Dr. Beecher distinctly recognized the fact that the principle that all sin consists in voluntary action, involved a rejection of the Reformed doctrine of original sin. In the *Spirit of the Pilgrims* for that year he writes: "The Reformers with one accord taught that the sin of Adam was imputed to all his posterity, and that a corrupt nature descends from him to every one of his posterity, in consequence of which infants are unholy, unfit for heaven, and justly exposed to future punishment." "Our Puritan fathers adhered to the doctrine of original sin as consisting in the imputation of Adam's sin, and in a hereditary depravity; and this continued to be the received doctrine of the churches of New England, until after the time of Edwards. He adopted the views of the Reformers on the subject of original sin and a depraved nature transmitted by descent. But after him this mode of stating the subject was gradually changed until long since, the prevailing doctrine in New England is, that men are not guilty of Adam's sin, that depravity is not of the substance of the soul, nor an inherent physical quality, but is wholly voluntary, and consists in a transgression of the law in such circumstances as constitute responsibility and desert of punishment." None of the Reformers and no Christian church ever held that "depravity was of the substance of the soul." But Dr. Beecher assumed with Dr. Taylor that there is nothing "in the soul but its essence and its acts;" and therefore if depravity

3. A third inference which Pelagians drew from their views of free agency, is that God of necessity limits himself in the creation of free agents. They are from their nature beyond his absolute control. If free agency involves the ability to choose and act contrary to any amount of influence which can be brought to bear upon free agents, without destroying their freedom, then God cannot control them. He cannot prevent sin, or the present amount of sin, in a moral system. Neither can he convert whom he pleases. He can persuade and argue; but man may, and multitudes do, resist his utmost efforts to bring them to repentance. These inferences the New Haven divines adopt and avow. "Moral agency," says Dr. Taylor, "implies free agency—the power of choice—the power to choose morally wrong as well as morally right, under every possible influence to prevent such an action." *Lect.* vol. i. p. 307. "Moral beings, under this best moral system, must have power to sin, in despite of all that God can do under this system to prevent them; and to suppose that they should do what they under this system, viz., sin, and that God should prevent their sinning, is a contradiction and an impossibility. It may be true that such beings in this respect, will do what they can do—that is, will sin—when of course it would be impossible that God, other things remaining the same, should prevent their sinning without destroying their moral agency." Vol. i. p. 321, 322. In his sermon on sin, he says: "The error lies in the gratuitous assumption, that God could have adopted a moral system, and prevented all sin, or at least the present degree of sin." Again, "Would not a benevolent God, had it been possible to him in the nature of things, have secured the existence of universal holiness in his moral kingdom?" Again, "Who does most reverence to God, he who supposes that God would have prevented all sin in his moral universe, but could not; or he who affirms that he could have prevented it, but would not?" The doctrine held by all Christendom, that God can

was not an act, it must be of the substance of the soul. This is interpreting the doctrines of others by one's own philosophy. If the above principle be correct, there is no difference between a good man and a bad man, but in their acts; and there is no such thing as a character.

effectually control free agents, without destroying their nature, is regarded by the New Haven divines as a most dangerous error. *Spect.* 1832, p. 482.

God according to their theory prevents all the sin he can; he brings all the influence he can to secure the conversion of every man. If he fails, it is because men effectually resist his utmost exertions for their salvation consistent with their free agency. Let it be remembered that we are not giving our inferences from Dr. Taylor's principles; but simply stating the inferences which he and his associates draw for themselves and present as Christian doctrine.

Of course it also follows from this theory of free agency that there can be no such thing as "effectual calling" in the Augustinian sense of those words. By effectual calling is meant such an exercise of the power of the Holy Spirit on the soul of a sinner as effectually, or inevitably, secures its regeneration and conversion unto God. It is, as all Augustinians maintain, from its nature "irresistible," although its effect is not to coerce but to render the sinner willing in the day of God's power. The New Haven divines explicitly deny this. Regeneration is defined to be, not an act of God, but an act of the sinner himself. It is the act of choosing God as a portion, or source of happiness. But the fundamental principle of the system, repeated over and over, is that a free agent can and may act contrary to any amount of influence which can be brought to bear upon him, short of destroying his freedom. He can, therefore, and multitudes do, effectually resist the utmost efforts of the Spirit of God to secure their salvation. "In all cases," it is said, "it (the grace of God) may be resisted by man as a free moral agent, and it never becomes effectual to salvation until it is unresisted." "God offers the same necessary conditions of acceptance to all men; desires from the heart that all men, as free agents, would comply with them and live; brings no positive influence upon any mind against compliance; but, on the contrary, brings all those kinds, and all that degree of influence in favour of it upon each individual, which a system of measures best arranged for the success of grace in a world of rebellion allows, and finally, saves, without respect of kindred, rank, or country; whether Scythian, Greek, or Jew,

all who, under this influence, work out their own salvation, and reprobates alike all who refuse." *Spect.* 1831, p. 635. Again, "The means of reclaiming grace, which meet him in the word and Spirit of God, are those by which the Father draws, induces just such sinners as himself voluntarily to submit to Christ; and these means all favour the act of his immediate submission. To this influence he can yield, and thus be drawn of the Father. This influence he can resist, and thus harden his heart against God. Election involves nothing more, as respects his individual case, except one fact—the certainty of the Divine mind, whether the sinner will yield to the means of grace, and voluntarily turn to God, or whether he will continue to harden his heart till the means of grace are withdrawn." *Id.* p. 637. The Arminian doctrine of sufficient grace has never been stated in clearer terms than in the above quotation.

This New Haven doctrine makes infant regeneration, in which the whole Christian world believes, an impossibility. According to that doctrine regeneration is the choice of God as a portion. But of such choice the infant mind is confessedly incapable. It is no less incapable of being the subject of any such process as that described in the immediately preceding quotations, by which the Spirit "induces" sinners to make choice of God. Accordingly, when speaking of infant baptism, these divines say, that it is intended to indicate that children "will need the purifying influences of the Holy Spirit, from the earliest moment that such influences in the nature of the case can take effect." They do not need them while infants, because, from the nature of the case, they can take effect only on moral agents.

4. Once more, it follows the New Haven theory of moral agency and ability, that there can be no such thing as predestination and sovereign election in the ordinary and accepted sense of those terms. To foreordain is not simply to submit to the occurrence of what we cannot prevent. If God "out of his mere good pleasure" elects some to everlasting life, he does not elect them because he foresees they can be persuaded to repent and believe. In the latter case, he elects some and not others, because he foresees that some, and not others, will submit to

be persuaded. Every theologian knows that Augustinians when treating of the objects of God's knowledge, so far as things out of himself are concerned, divide them into the two classes of things possible, and things actual. In the exercise of simple intelligence, God knows whatever can be; in other words, all that omnipotence can effect. By the knowledge of vision he sees all that according to his purpose ever actually occurs. Under these two heads, all events are comprehended. The Jesuit theologians, in their controversy with the Jansenists, introduced a third category, intermediate between the knowledge of simple intelligence and the knowledge of vision. This they called *scientia media*. The objects of this form of knowledge are the acts of free agents. God foresees how such agents will act under given circumstances. This distinction was introduced with the conscious and avowed intention of getting rid of the Augustinian doctrine, held by the Jansenists, of predestination and sovereign election. God foresees who will, and who will not submit to the plan of salvation. Those whom he foresees will submit, he elects to eternal life; those whom he foresees will not submit, he predestinates to eternal death. The New Haven divines adopt the same distinction, and apply it to the same purpose. In the *Christian Spectator*, 1831, p. 628, it is said, speaking of the vessels of mercy, "These are the very persons who, God foreknew, (when he resolved on his works of mercy,) would be induced to believe, and whom in carrying forward those works, he prepares for glory. It was to *be* believers, and not *as* believers, that he chose them, under the guidance of his [*scientia media*] foreknowledge." The words "*scientia media*" included in brackets are not inserted by us, they belong to the text.

Again on page 618, it is said, "The quotation which Dr. Fisk gives from the Articles of Faith, is incomplete, and in the sense given to it, unfair. The framers of that article did not intend to affirm (as we suppose) that the foreknowledge of God has nothing to do with election. The qualifying phrase, which they have annexed, should have been added, 'without any foresight of faith and good works as conditions or causes moving him thereunto.' They did not mean to assert, that the faith and good works of none are foreseen, as the certain result

of God's work of grace. They meant only (we conceive) that the works of the elect (though foreseen) were not regarded as meritorious conditions, deserving those interpositions in their behalf, which secured their faith, and thus secured their acceptance in Christ, as children of an everlasting adoption. But, surely, the faith and subsequent adoption in Christ of certain individuals among the lost, were foreseen by God as the certain results of his own works of grace."

We are not aware that any Lutheran or Wesleyan, however opposed to the Augustinian doctrine, or however strenuous in asserting that election is founded on the foresight of faith and repentance, ever dreamed of regarding such faith and repentance as "the meritorious conditions" of election. Lutherans and Wesleyans refer all that is meritorious in the salvation of men to the person and work of Christ. We cannot see, therefore, that there is the slightest difference between their doctrine and that of the New Haven divines, as to this particular point. In any other aspect we regard the New Haven doctrine much the lower of the two. It teaches that God does all he can to convert every man, and elects those whom he succeeds in inducing to repent. Thus on page 634 of the same volume of the *Spectator*, it is urged that their theory "presents a fairer view of God's wisdom and goodness" than the Arminian, in that "without doing anything to procure the sin of men, or hinder their return to him, he does, on the contrary, in his works of grace, do everything to encourage and persuade them to return to him and secure their salvation, which he can do amid the obstacles opposed by their sins to the triumph of his law and grace."

The reader will not be surprised to learn that Dr. Fisk, in his reply to this review of his sermon, makes such remarks as the following: "If I understand the reviewer he is in principle an Arminian. The reviewer's whole ground of defence is this Arminian explanation of the doctrine of predestination." "The sermon was never written to oppose the decrees of God in an Arminian sense. Why, then, does the reviewer complain of the sermon? It seems that Calvinism, in its proper character, is as obnoxious to the reviewer as to the author of the sermon. If it is safer to attack Calvinism in this indirect way, I will

not object. But I cannot see that it would be safer. An open, bold front always ends best. As I understand the reviewer, from the days of John Calvin down to the present hour, there is, on this point, between the great body of Calvinists and himself, almost no likeness except in the use of words. Theirs is one doctrine, his another." Dr. Fisk was not alone in this judgment. "The late Dr. Griffin, after quoting the foregoing passages in his *Treatise on the Divine Efficiency*, makes the following observation: 'These remarks of the President of the Wesleyan University of Connecticut, appear to me to be candid and judicious, and go far towards exposing the unhappy incongruity between the language and sentiments of this review.'" *Letters on New Haven Theology*, p. 112.

The same doctrine concerning election is taught by Dr. Duffield, as shown in our last number. "The divine decree of election embraces all whom God foresaw that he could, by the blood and Spirit of Christ, bring to faith and repentance."

We say nothing of the New Haven doctrines concerning the atonement and justification, because they are not connected with the system. A man may agree with Dr. Taylor on those subjects, and yet reject his system; or, he may embrace his peculiar system and yet reject his views on those particular doctrines. The system contemplates God specially in his character as a Moral Governor, ruling over moral agents. Moral agents are free agents. Free agency implies plenary ability to do and to be whatever law or duty demands. Free agents must have the power to act contrary to any kind or degree of influence which can be brought to bear upon them. From this it follows that sin consists wholly in the voluntary transgression of known law. All mankind, therefore, did not sin in Adam and fall with him in his first transgression. Every man stands his probation for himself. He is neither under condemnation nor the subject of anything of the nature of sin, until he arrives at the stage in which moral agency begins, and deliberately transgresses the law of God. There can be no innate hereditary sin or sinfulness. As free agents can act contrary to any amount of influence which is not destructive of their freedom, they are beyond the absolute control of God. He can neither prevent all sin, nor the present amount of sin

in his moral kingdom. He cannot secure universal holiness, or a greater amount of holiness in that kingdom. He does all he can to convert every sinner, consistent with his moral agency. Those whom he foresees he can induce to repent and believe, he elects to eternal life. Regeneration is the choice of God as the portion of the soul; a choice which every moral agent can refuse to make in despite of all God can do, short of destroying his free agency. Of the choice which constitutes regeneration, infants are incapable.

Of this system we say, 1. That it is not Calvinism, in any fair or true sense of the term; but in all points directly antagonistic to it, so that the acceptance of the one is the rejection of the other.

2. We say, in the second place, that this system is not only inconsistent with the doctrines of the Reformed church, but with those of the church universal. It has never been embraced in the symbols of any organized, historical Christian church on the face of the earth. Even the Greek church, which takes the lowest position on all questions concerning sin and grace, maintains that infants are in a state of condemnation and sin, and need the remission of sin and regeneration, as signified, or, effected, (as the Greeks say), in baptism. The New Haven system is much below the Semi-Pelagian doctrine. It is still further removed from the doctrines of the Romish church as determined in the Council of Trent. It is below not only the Lutheran views on these points, but below the Arminian system as held by all Wesleyans.

3. In the third place, we say that system, although condemned by the church universal, has hitherto been tolerated in the ministry of the New-school body. On this point we beg to be understood. We therefore repeat *ad taedium*, that we do not say that the mass of our New-school brethren hold the New Haven system. We do not say that one in ten of their Presbyteries would license or ordain a candidate who professed that system, or receive a minister who avowed it. We only say that the New-school as a body, as an organized church, has up to the present time, tolerated in its ministry men who openly proclaim themselves its adherents. The proof of this has already been adduced. This is the system, which

the Tioga Presbytery says must be regarded as orthodox, and of which the New-school General Assembly of 1838 spoke of as a matter of little moment. In its Narrative on the State of Religion for that year, the hope is expressed "that shades of difference in prevailing theological views" may soon be forgotten. This is said of the difference between East Windsor and New Haven, between Dr. Tyler and Dr. Taylor.

4. A fourth remark is, that for the Old-school church deliberately, and with its eyes open, to bind itself to regard the New Haven divinity as consistent with our standards, would be simple apostacy. It would be to condemn all our past record. It would be to repudiate our solemn, and often reiterated declarations. It would be to violate our pledge; to be unfaithful to our trust, and completely to destroy our identity. And for our church to be led into such a compact without understanding what it was doing, would be to the last degree disastrous.

5. The reason why our Presbyteries have, with such unanimity, protested against the terms of union proposed by the joint committee is, that those terms do bind us to receive the Confession of Faith with the same latitude of construction with which it had been hitherto adopted by the New-school body. Our life-long friend, Dr. Beatty, the chairman of that committee, than whom there is not a man in our church more respected, loved, or trusted, thinks that we did him and the committee injustice in putting such an interpretation on their plan. He says that we materially alter its sense by inserting a comma after the clause, "as it is accepted by the two bodies," in the first article of the terms of union. It should read that the Confession of Faith shall continue to be adopted, "in its fair historical sense, as it is accepted by the two bodies in opposition to Antinomianism and Fatalism on the one hand, &c." We have to confess, with regret, that we are careless in matters of punctuation. Whether that comma was in the newspaper report from which we copied; or, whether the printer inserted it; or, whether we put it there ourselves, we cannot say. All we know is, that we did not insert it with any intention of altering the sense. And we do not see that it does affect the meaning in any material matter. Whether the comma be

there or not, the article binds the contracting parties to adopt the Confession of Faith, as it has been hitherto received by the two bodies. The one consents to be no stricter than the other. Besides, the second article of the proposed plan provides that every minister of good standing in either church shall be regarded as of good standing in the united church. That is, we cannot deem heterodox any minister whom any New-school Presbytery has pronounced orthodox. As the Tioga Presbytery declares the views of Drs. Taylor and Park to be orthodox, we should be bound to acquiesce in that judgment. In our July number we explicitly stated that we exonerated our committee of any intention to give up our principle of subscription. They understood the terms in which they acquiesced as securing that point. In this matter we are forced to differ from them. But whether we were right or wrong in this matter, is of subordinate importance. The action of our Presbyteries has rendered it clear, first, that they cannot conscientiously consent to any plan of union which shall involve the surrender of our principle of construction; and secondly, that they are satisfied that the New-school, as a body, has hitherto practically adopted a different, and much more liberal principle of construction.

It was to make this latter point apparent; to bring it home to the intelligence and conscience, especially of the younger portion of our ministry, that the preceding pages were written. We have no desire to renew old controversies; or to provoke any unkind feelings; or to operate against the reunion of the Old and New branches of the Presbyterian church. Our simple purpose is that we should understand each other. We have hitherto differed. We have so differed as to render reunion, on any terms satisfactory to the conscience of both parties, apparently impossible.

This was the posture of affairs up to the publication of the article on reunion by Dr. Henry B. Smith of New York. That article has changed the aspect of the case. Dr. Smith tells us that the New-school body is not now what it once was. "It gives in a more unreserved adhesion to our symbols, with entire unanimity, than it could then have done," *i. e.*, thirty years ago. P. 639. He assures us that it is perfectly willing to accede to the principle of subscription for which the Old-

school contend. That principle is, and is understood by Dr. Smith to be, 1. That the Confession of Faith is to be adopted as containing "the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures." 2. That by the system thus taught is to be understood the Reformed or Calvinistic system. 3. That this system is to be sincerely adopted in its integrity. 4. That to secure the integrity of the system, "the individual doctrines," and not one doctrine here and another there, but the several doctrines in their historical sense, must be adopted. See pp. 641, 642, 643. The Old-school have never demanded more than this. And they have no right to demand more. Dr. Smith, indeed, cannot bind his church. But no objection has been made to his statements, and his pamphlet, we understand, has been sent to all our ministers, to let them know what the New-school are willing to do.

The late Philadelphia Convention has placed the present status of the New-school church in a still clearer light. That Convention bids fair to be an epoch-making event. It consisted of over three hundred members, representatives of five Presbyterian denominational churches. It was pervaded by one spirit. We never saw the same degree of unanimity manifested in any similar assembly. As far as man can judge, the Spirit of God was present, controlling the action of the Convention in a manner truly remarkable. The conclusions arrived at were unexpected; yet they were wise, Christian, and catholic; such as will bear the test of cool examination and reflection. One of the most important results of that Convention was to bring the bodies there represented not only into closer Christian fellowship, but to a better understanding of the position which they were willing to assume. This is specially true with regard the Old and New-school Presbyterians. With regard to the former, the impression was, we hope, removed, that Old-school men are dissatisfied with our standards as they are; that they require that their own explanations, their philosophy, or speculations, interpreting and supplementing the language of our symbols, should be adopted. It was made apparent to all, that the Old-school is now, and always has been, ready to accept the standards with-

out note or comment; and that they desire nothing more of others.

With regard to the New-school, it was made to appear, that they are willing not only to adopt the Confession as containing the system of doctrine taught in the sacred Scriptures; but to take that system in its Reformed or Calvinistic sense. Such is the ambiguity of language however that even those statements are susceptible of very different interpretations. Dr. Tyler of East Windsor and Dr. Taylor of New Haven adopted the Saybrook Confession (which is, on all points in dispute, identical with our own). They considered themselves as adopting it in its historical sense. They both called themselves Calvinists. Yet their systems were diametrically opposed. Dr. Tyler declared that Dr. Taylor denied the essential principles of the Reformed faith. And Dr. Taylor said that Dr. Tyler's doctrines led by logical necessity to Universalism, Infidelity, and Atheism. It is a matter of gratitude therefore, that the Convention carried us two steps further. First, it was made apparent as a conceded point, that by the word "system" was to be understood, the concatenated series of doctrines contained in our standards. And secondly, that by "doctrines" is to be understood, not this or that view of certain truths, but the doctrinal statements given in our symbols. For example, it was conceded that if a man said he believed in the doctrine of the Trinity as one of the system of doctrines contained in the Confession of Faith, it was not enough that he should believe in a philosophical, or modal Trinity; but in that doctrine as stated in our standards. Again, with regard to the original state of man, it is not enough that one should hold that man was in some sense created in the image of God, but, if he adopts our standards, he professes to believe that man "was created in the image of God, in knowledge, righteousness, and holiness." With regard to our relation to Adam, the man does not adopt "the system of doctrine" contained in our Confession, who simply says that the sin of our first parent affected injuriously in some way the circumstances or physical or moral condition of his descendants. This, Pelagians, Semi-Pelagians, and Remonstrants, are willing to admit. He only adopts that system, who is able to say that all those descending

from Adam, by ordinary generation, "sinned in him and fell with him in his first transgression." They do not adopt our system, who simply say that the state, or circumstances of man, since the fall, results in the universality of sin; nor those who only acknowledge a bias, or propensity to sin, which may be called sinful because it tends to lead men into sin. This, those who avowedly reject the Reformed doctrine have ever been willing to say. Those only fairly receive the doctrine of our Confession on this subject, who are able to say, that our first parents "being the root of all mankind, the guilt of this sin (viz. their first transgression) was imputed, and the same death in sin, and corrupted nature, conveyed to all their posterity descending from them by ordinary generation;" and this corruption of nature, "both itself, and all the motions thereof, are truly and properly sin."

This doctrine, that all mankind since the fall are born in a state of sin and condemnation, (which involves the idea of imputation in some form), is not peculiar to the Reformed church. It is held by the Greeks, the Latins, the Lutherans, and even by evangelical Arminians, as well as by all the branches of the Reformed church in Switzerland, in France, in Germany, in Holland, England, Scotland, and America. We are contending for no confined sectarian dogma, when we contend for a doctrine thus universally received, and the denial of which, President Edwards says, renders redemption either unnecessary or impossible.

Again, our standards teach, that "from this original corruption, whereby we are utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all good, and wholly inclined to all evil, do proceed all actual transgressions." This inability men may explain as they please; but to deny the fact, and to assert that men, since the fall, have plenary power to be and to do all that the law of God requires, is to reject an essential element of the Reformed doctrine.

It is moreover clear that no one accepts the Reformed system, who does not hold that "God out of his mere good pleasure hath elected some to everlasting life." It is not enough, again, that a man should admit that we are saved "by the blood of Christ;" for this even Unitarians are accustomed to say. If

he adopts our system, he must be able to say that Christ, "by his obedience and death, did make a proper, real, and full satisfaction to the Father's justice."

Justification, according to our system, is "an act of God's free grace, wherein he pardoneth all our sins, and accepteth us as righteous in his sight, only for the righteousness of Christ imputed to us and received by faith alone." Those, therefore, who teach that it is mere pardon; or, that it is a subjective change effected by the Spirit in us; or a participation of the theanthropic nature of Christ, do not hold the doctrine as taught in our standards. So of the other doctrines which make up the Reformed system.

To the adoption of the Confession of Faith in this sense and in this way, the New-school delegates in the Convention, in the most unmistakable manner, gave in their adherence. This was done, not only by the explicit declaration of Dr. Fisher, their representative on the committee to prepare a basis of union, but by the undeniable approbation and acquiescence of the whole Convention, when it was stated in their presence. Against this statement of the proper principle of subscription, no voice was raised then, nor has been raised since, so far as we know and believe. It would seem therefore that, in the good providence of God, the Convention has enabled us to understand each other on this important point. There is no doubt that the Old-school ask this and nothing more than this. And if the New-school Assembly and Presbyteries will sanction what their representatives did on the floor of the Convention, the doctrinal basis of union may be considered as satisfactorily adjusted. Should the effort at reunion fail because the New-school authorities decline to ratify what was done by their delegates in this matter, the responsibility for the failure will rest on them, and not upon the Old-school.

There is another important end which we hope may be accomplished by the meeting in Philadelphia. Why may not the negotiation for union between the Old and New-school bodies be merged into the more comprehensive union proposed by the Convention? Many of our ministers and members, who, on different grounds, might be indisposed to the union of the Old and New-school branches alone, would cheerfully

acquiesce in a union which should comprehend the United and Reformed, and (if such a thing may be hoped for) the Dutch, Presbyterian churches. There is also an obvious incongruity in conducting a twofold negotiation for the same object at the same time. Our next General Assembly will be called upon to appoint a committee of five, to confer with a like committee from the New-school Assembly to negotiate a basis of reunion. We shall thus have two committees, one of five, and another of fifteen, members, negotiating at the same time. The reunion might be somewhat delayed, if it contemplated a more general union, but it would probably be accomplished in a way more satisfactory, and more likely to be permanently harmonious.

ART. IV.—*Homiletics and Pastoral Theology.* By WM. G. T. SHEDD, D. D., Baldwin Professor in Union Theological Seminary, New York City. New York: Charles Scribner & Co., 654 Broadway. 1867.

Lectures on Pastoral Theology. By ENOCH POND, D. D., Professor in the Theological Seminary, Bangor. Andover: Warren F. Draper. 1866.

Pulpit Talent. An Address before the Porter Rhetorical Society of Andover, at their late Anniversary. "Hours at Home," October, 1866.

It is a fact just coming to be duly recognized, that in every great forward step in human progress there is a "fulness of the times" as truly as there was for the advent of Christ. The providence of God makes the nation or the race ready for each great event, so that, when it comes, it finds men everywhere thinking and longing and toiling for it. So it results that, in the sphere of physical research and invention, two men, separated by vast distances, can at once announce to the world the possibility of the Magnetic Telegraph, the discovery of the planet Neptune, or the demonstration of the Doctrines of the Conser-