

THE  
BIBLICAL REPERTORY  
AND  
PRINCETON REVIEW.

---

INDEX VOLUME

FROM

1825 TO 1868.

---

PHILADELPHIA:

PETER WALKER, 1334 CHESTNUT STREET:  
CHAS. SCRIBNER & CO., NEW YORK; REV. A. KENNEDY, LONDON, ONTARIO;  
REV. WILLIAM ELDER, ST. JOHN, NEW BRUNSWICK;  
REV. ROBERT MURRAY, HALIFAX, N. S.;  
AND TRÜBNER & CO., LONDON.

1871.

Printed by ALFRED MARTIN.

BR  
I  
I

## P R E F A C E .

---

THIS volume has been called into existence by the earnest entreaties of the subscribers to the PRINCETON REVIEW, who needed some help to make available to them the valuable treasures in their possession.

Part I. is a RETROSPECT of the period in which the Review has been published, and of the share it has taken in the discussion of the various topics that have agitated the church and the world during the last fifty years. It is substantially a History of the Review, and is contributed by its venerable Editor.

Part II. is an INDEX TO AUTHORS. Like the other great Reviews of the period, the writers contributed to its pages anonymously, and for many years no one kept any account of their labours. Dr. Hope was the first who attempted to ascertain the names of the writers in the early volumes, and he was only partially successful. With the aid of his notes, and the assistance of Dr. John Hall of Trenton, Dr. John C. Backus of Baltimore, and Dr. Samuel D. Alexander of New York, the companions and friends of the Editor and his early coadjutors, the information on this head here collected is as complete as it is possible now to be given. A biographical notice is also given of the writers, as it was thought that many

facts concerning them, if not now chronicled, would in a few years pass into oblivion.

Part III. is an ANALYTICAL INDEX to the First Series, by Dr. John Forsyth of Newburgh, N. Y.

This series of four volumes gave the impulse to the study of Biblical Interpretation both in America and in Great Britain. Many of its treatises have been repeatedly reprinted. No four volumes extant contain so much useful matter on the subject, and the Index will add to their usefulness.

Part IV. is an INDEX TO TOPICS discussed in the succeeding Forty volumes. To its preparation Dr. Forsyth has devoted much time and labour, and to it is appended an Index to the Short Notices prepared under his supervision.

It is believed that this volume will be useful to all who have any portion of the work; and will also be a ready guide to any who are seeking information upon the ecclesiastical, political, educational, and religious movements of the church, especially in the first half of this century, whether they possess the volumes of the Review or not.

PETER WALKER.

# INDEX 7470

TO THE

## PRINCETON REVIEW.

---

---

### PART I.

#### RETROSPECT OF THE HISTORY OF THE PRINCETON REVIEW.

THE Journal for many years known as the *Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review*, was commenced in 1825. The volume for that year bears the title, "Biblical Repertory; a Collection of Tracts in Biblical Literature. By Charles Hodge, Professor of Oriental and Biblical Literature in the Theological Seminary at Princeton, New Jersey." It did not aspire to originality. It purported to be, what the title imports, a repository for tracts on biblical subjects, selected from various sources. It was designed to render accessible to American readers some of the fruits of the mature learning of English and German scholars.

The first four volumes were conducted on this plan. In the fall of 1826 the editor went to Europe, where he remained until the fall of 1828. During his absence the work was under the direction of Professor Robert Patton, at that time connected with the College of New Jersey.

In 1829 the character of the work was changed. It was deemed expedient to give it a wider scope, and to include in its contents articles on all subjects suitable for a Theological Quarterly Review. The volume for that year has the title, "Biblical Repertory. A Journal of Biblical Literature and Theological Science; conducted by an Association of Gentlemen. Vol. V. New Series, Vol. I." The volume for 1830

was numbered as the second; thus four years were dropped, and the volume for the present year, instead of being noted as the 45th, is called the 41st.

The Association above mentioned was not defined within very strict limits; nor was it controlled by any special terms of agreement. It consisted of the more frequent contributors to the pages of the Journal, who were willing to assume the responsibility before the public of its character and contents. It included the Professors of the Theological Seminary, and some of the officers of the College. Although the labouring oar was still in one pair of hands, it was of importance that the work had the sanction of a number of gentlemen who had the confidence of the public; and it was a real advantage that all contributions touching delicate or difficult questions were read and canvassed by the Association before being committed to the press.

The work, as its title indicated, had special reference to the department of theology. It was not intended, however, to be limited to that department. Questions of science, philosophy, literature, and history, were considered as legitimately within its sphere. The articles on literary topics, education, and philosophy, from the pens of Dr. Archibald Alexander, and his sons, Dr. J. W. and Dr. J. A. Alexander, and the numerous contributions of Dr. L. H. Atwater on mental and moral science, served greatly to increase the reputation and extend the usefulness of the Journal. The same may be said of the papers on natural and social science contributed by the late Professor Dod, Hon. Chief Justice Lowrie, Hon. Stephen Colwell, of Pennsylvania, and Dr. J. H. McIlvaine, Dr. Stephen Alexander, and others. Another large class of contributions outside of the sphere of theology consists of papers on popular education, of which the late lamented Frederick A. Packard, Esq., of the American Sunday-School Union, was the principal contributor.

To no one are the pages of this *Review* more indebted than to the late Dr. James W. Alexander. His communications were numerous, varied, and always instructive. The articles furnished by him were, for the most part, devoted to historical, literary, and practical subjects; such as his papers on "Pas-

cal's Provincial Letters," 1830; "Life and Times of John Livingston," 1832; "The Religious Condition of Holland," 1833; "Jansenius," 1834; "Monosyllabic Languages of Asia," 1834; "Civilization of India," 1835; "Life of Michael Servetus," and "Religion and Religious Literature of Europe," 1836; "Henry's Life of Calvin," and "Life of Savonarola," 1837; "Expository Preaching," and "Life of Wilberforce," 1838; "French Presbyterianism," and "Macaulay's Essays," 1840; and many others too numerous to mention. With these, however, were other articles, philosophical or theological in their character, as "Systems of Theology," 1832; "Transcendentalism," 1839; "Rauch's Psychology," 1840; "Emmons' Works," 1842; "Kant," 1863; "Metaphysical Theology of the Schoolmen," 1846; "Life of Hegel," 1848; "Immediate Perception," 1859; etc. No one of his associates at all approached him in the facility of production. Some of his most brilliant articles were thrown off almost at a single sitting. We have heard him say, that the only trouble he found in writing was turning the leaves.

The conductors of the *Princeton Review*, however, were Presbyterians. They firmly believed that the system of doctrine contained in the Westminster Confession of Faith, the system of the Reformed Church, and of Augustinians in all ages, is the truth of God revealed for his glory and the salvation of men. They believed that the upholding that system in its integrity, bearing witness to it as the truth of God, and its extension through the world, was the great duty of all those who had experienced its power. They believed, also, that the organization of the Presbyterian Church, its form of government and discipline, was more nearly conformed than any other to the scriptural model, and the best adapted for preserving the purity and developing the life of the Church. It was, therefore, the vindication of that system of truth, and of the principles of that ecclesiastical polity, the conductors of this Journal, from first to last, had constantly in view. In this world, life is a constant struggle against the causes of death. Liberty is maintained only by unsleeping vigilance against the aggressions of power; virtue is, of necessity, in constant antagonism to vice; and truth to error. That a

Journal consecrated to the support of truth should be controversial, is a matter of course; it is a law of its existence, the condition of its usefulness. The Bible is the most controversial of books. It is a protest against sin and error from beginning to end. To object to controversy, therefore, is to object to what is, in this world, the necessary condition of life. It is, consequently, no just ground of reproach to this Journal, that it has been engaged in controversy during the whole course of its existence. If it has always contended for the true and the right, and done this with due humility and charity, it has fulfilled its destiny. That it has often failed—at least in spirit and manner—may, and we fear must, be conceded. All such failures are to its surviving conductors matters of regret; but they can honestly say they have ever laboured to support the truth of God and to promote the interests of his kingdom to the best of their understanding and ability.

#### *Voluntary Societies and Church Boards.*

The first controversy in which the *Repertory* took an active part concerned the Education question. In 1829 the General Assembly had reorganized the Board of Education, and called upon the churches to sustain it in providing for the expenses of candidates for the ministry in their preparatory studies. At the same time the American Education Society, a voluntary association, having its origin in New England, and its chief seat of operations in Boston, Massachusetts, offered to grant its aid to all suitable candidates for the sacred office in any part of the United States. Branch Societies were organized in different parts of the country, and a large number of Presbyterian churches contributed to its funds in preference to the treasury of our own Board. In the July number of the volume for 1829, the late Dr. Carnahan, President of the College of New Jersey, published an article on "The General Assembly's Board of Education and the American Education Society," in which the objections to the plan of the American Society were briefly and clearly stated. This called forth a long communication from Professor Stuart of Andover, in reply. Professor Stuart's article was printed at length in our

October number, with a rejoinder from the conductors of this Review. A separate edition of Professor Stuart's article, with a postscript of sixteen pages, being published, that postscript was reviewed in our number for January, 1830. This ended the discussion so far as this Journal was concerned.

In this controversy the general question of Ecclesiastical Boards and Voluntary Societies was not brought under discussion. The simple point was the wisdom, propriety, and safety of the plan adopted by the American Society. That Society not only required its beneficiaries to make a quarterly report, detailing how the amount they had received had been expended, and what each had received from other sources, but regarded its contributions as loans. All the candidates under their care were required to give their notes for the sums received, payable in one, two, and three years after the close of their preparatory studies, with interest after the same had become due. All the candidates for the ministry were thus placed in the relation of debtors to the Society, and must enter on their work burdened by this load of pecuniary obligation.

To this it was objected, 1. That the whole plan proceeded on a wrong principle. It assumed that the candidates had no right to the aid afforded; that it was a pure gratuity, which the donors, if they pleased, were authorized to demand should be refunded. This placed the candidates in the position of "charity scholars." Being so regarded by their patrons, they were so regarded by their associates and by themselves. This was an injustice and an injury. This Journal took the ground, "That whenever any man devotes his whole time and talents to the service of any community, *at its request*, it is obligatory on that community to provide for his support." The recognition of this principle changes the whole status of the candidate. He ceases to be regarded as an object of charity. All ground for the minute inspection into his receipts and expenditures is done away with. He is regarded as a man receiving no more than he is entitled to, and for which he renders a full return. This principle, it was contended, was scriptural, lying at the foundation of the institutions and commands of the Bible. It was, moreover, evidently just and reasonable; and was acted on by all civilized govern-

ments in the education of young men designed for the public service, especially in the navy and army.

2. It was objected to the plan of the American Society that it was unjust to bring young men into the ministry burdened with debt. The salaries of young ministers are very seldom more than sufficient for their support, and in the majority of cases utterly inadequate for that end. If, in addition to providing for their necessities under these circumstances, they had to pay the money advanced for their education, they could not fail to be painfully embarrassed and harassed. To be in debt is to be in a state of depressing anxiety.

3. The Scriptures say, "The borrower is servant to the lender." If the plan of the American Society had been fully carried out, the great body of the younger ministry in the Congregational and Presbyterian Churches would have been in this state of bondage to that Society. Every one knows that virtually and effectively the power of such societies is in the hands of the executive committee. Thus, some half-dozen men, with no official relation to our church, would have this controlling power over our ministers. This was evidently intolerable. The objection was not that the power had been abused, but that it existed. The power in question "is a power of dictating to a large proportion of the pious youth of the country in what academy, college, or theological seminary they shall pursue their studies. It is the power of deciding under what theological influences our future ministers are to be formed. It is the power of holding and influencing these ministers as bondmen when they come out into the church."

4. This Society was in a great measure independent of public opinion; first, because it elected its own members; and, secondly, because its income, so far as derived from the payment of the notes given by its beneficiaries, was not derived from the churches.

The General Assembly's plan of operation was not subject to these objections. 1. Because the Assembly did not elect its own members, but was renewed every year by the Presbyteries. 2. Because its Board was not the creditor of those aided by its funds. 3. Because the candidates for the ministry were not under its control.

Much greater interest attached to the controversy respecting the conduct of the work of Missions, Foreign and Domestic. The General Assembly, in 1828, reorganized its Board of Domestic Missions. The American Home Missionary Society was at that time in operation, and rapidly increasing in influence. At first, it seemed to be hoped that the two organizations might operate harmoniously over the same field. The General Assembly, as did Dr. Green, Dr. Philips, and other leading friends of the Assembly's Board, expressed their cordial willingness that all Presbyterians should be left to their unbiassed choice as to which organization they should support. But it was soon found that in the existing state of the church harmonious action was impossible. There were so many interests at stake; so many causes of alienation between what became known as the Old and New-school parties, that the Assembly's Board under the control of the one, and the American Society under the control of the other, came into constant and painful collision. This of necessity gave rise to serious conflicts in the General Assembly. The friends of the American Society took the ground that the Assembly had no right to conduct the work of missions; that it was incompetent for that purpose; that voluntary associations were more trustworthy, more efficient, and more healthful; that two organizations for the same purpose were not only unnecessary, but injurious. They endeavoured, therefore, in every way to embarrass the Assembly's Board. In the Assembly of 1836 they nominated as members of that Board men known to be hostile to its very existence, and secured a hundred and twenty-five votes in their favour. In the same Assembly they succeeded in preventing the Assembly establishing a Board of Foreign Missions. One of the reasons most strenuously urged against the appointment of such a Board, was, that the Assembly had no right to conduct such operations. On this point Dr. James Hoge, one of the wisest and most moderate ministers of our church, said: "As the subject has been proposed in other forms, I have always objected. But the question is now brought before us in a new form, and is to be decided on the naked ground of the power and rights of the Assembly to conduct missions. And on this ground I

cannot abandon it while I love the faith and order of the Presbyterian Church." He further said, that if the majority pursued the course which they did actually take, "it would convulse the church to its very centre." And so it did. The action of the Assembly of 1836 in reference to matters of doctrine and to the Boards of the church, was the proximate cause of the disruption which occurred in the following year.

The question of Voluntary Societies was not an isolated one. Its decision did not turn upon the point, which mode of conducting benevolent operations was in itself to be preferred. It was far more comprehensive. The friends of the Assembly's Board not only contended that the Assembly had the right to conduct the work of Missions, Foreign and Domestic, but that it was highly expedient that that work should be under the control of the constituted authorities of the church; that the selection, sending forth, and locating ministers, was properly an ecclesiastical function; and that it was to the last degree unreasonable and dangerous that that work should be committed to a society meeting annually for a few hours, composed of all who choose to subscribe to its funds (as was the fact with the American Home Missionary Society), and to a large degree controlled by Congregationalists, hostile on principle to our polity, if not to our doctrines. Besides the objections founded on principle, there were others not less cogent founded on the action of the American Home Society. It was regarded as a great party engine, devoting, apparently, its immense influence to revolutionizing the church. It sent out men educated in New England holding sentiments condemned not only by Old-school Presbyterians, but by the Woods, Tylers, Nettletons, of New England, and by such men as Drs. Richards, Fisher, and Griffin, of our own church. Its friends and beneficiaries voted *en masse* in the General Assembly against the condemnation of those sentiments, and in favour of allowing men never ordained as elders, sitting and voting in our highest judicatories. It is no wonder, therefore, that this controversy excited so much feeling. Throughout the struggle this Journal sided uniformly and earnestly with the friends of the Assembly's Boards. We refer especially to the numbers

for July 1836, January 1837; and as to the controversy in another form, to those of July 1854, and July 1860.

*Prelatical Controversy.*

Attention from time to time was given to the prelatical controversy in various forms. Presbyterian principles were defended by Dr. Miller in his review of "Cooke on the Invalidity of Presbyterian Ordination," 1830; of "Brittan on Episcopacy," 1833; and of "Episcopacy Tested by Scripture," 1835. Also by Dr. J. Addison Alexander in numerous contributions, among which are the following: "Colton's Reasons for Preferring Episcopacy," 1836; "A Plea for Bishops," 1841; "Smyth's Lectures on Apostolical Succession," 1842; "Barnes on the Apostolic Church," and "Smyth on Presbytery and Prelacy," 1843; and the admirable papers on "The Eldership," "The Apostolic Succession," 1847; "The Official Powers of the Primitive Presbyters," "The Apostleship a Temporary Office," 1849; "The True Test of an Apostolical Ministry," 1851. Of these papers the least that can be said is, that they are unsurpassed in argument and style by any contributions to the pages of this Journal.

To the same head belong the articles on "The Oxford Tracts," 1838; "The Church of England and Presbyterian Orders," 1854; "The Church Review on the Permanency of the Apostolic Office," 1856, and the series of articles on the Church, viz., "Theories of the Church," a review of "The Unity of the Church, by Archdeacon Manning," 1846; "The Idea of the Church," "Visibility of the Church," 1853; "The Perpetuity of the Church," 1856.

*Doctrines.*

It is with unfeigned and humble gratitude to God that the conductors of the *Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review* can look over the comparatively long period of its existence with the conviction that from first to last it has been devoted to the vindication of that system of doctrine contained in our standards, and which, as all Presbyterians believe, is taught in the word of God. No article opposed to that system has ever appeared on its pages. Many of the distinctive doctrines

of the Reformed Churches have of late years been matters of discussion in different parts of the country, and especially within the bounds of our own denomination. As early in the history of this Journal as 1830, Dr. Archibald Alexander published two articles, one on "The Early History of Pelagianism," the other on "The Doctrine of the Church on Original Sin;" and, in 1832, another on "The Articles of the Synod of Dort." To the first of these the *Christian Spectator* for June 1830, published a critique, over the signature "A Protestant" (Prof. Stuart), which was reviewed in our October number for the same year. The discussion was continued in the *Spectator* in the number for March 1831, which contained two articles in reply to our review, one from "Protestant," and the other from the editors, continued and completed in the June number. Of these articles this Journal contained a review, published in October of the same year. See also the article entitled "Testimonies on the Doctrine of Imputation," 1839, of which twenty-four pages are filled with quotations from the Protestant Confessions and theologians in support of that doctrine. The same subject was discussed in the review of Prof. Stuart's Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, 1833, and of Mr. Barnes' Commentary on the same epistle, 1835, and incidentally in several other communications in subsequent years.

At the same time the doctrine of Regeneration was under discussion. It was maintained, by some prominent theologians among us, that regeneration was the sinner's own act; that it consisted in his making for himself "a new heart." What that was, was differently explained. According to some, it was loving God; according to others, it was the purpose to seek happiness in God instead of in the world; according to others, it was the purpose to seek the happiness of the universe. According to all the new views, man was active in regeneration. The idea of passivity, as it was called, was held up to ridicule. The old doctrine, common to all Christian churches, that regeneration is the act of God; that man is the subject, and not the agent of the change; and that it consists in the quickening of the soul, or imparting to it a new principle of life, a new disposition, or, in the old scholastic language,

“a new habit of grace,” was vindicated in the article on “Regeneration, and the Manner of its Occurrence.” To this article Dr. Samuel H. Cox replied at length in our number for October, 1831, which number contained our answer to his “Remarks.”

The controversies which agitated our Church during the last thirty or forty years had, however, reference mainly to the nature of sin; the nature of Adam's sin; the effect of that sin on his posterity; the relation between him and his descendants; the nature of the hereditary depravity (or original sin); the inability of sinners; the work of the Holy Spirit in regeneration and sanctification of the soul. To the discussion of these subjects a large portion of the pages of this Journal, from first to last, has been devoted. And in reference to all of them it has been the honest endeavour of its conductors to exhibit and defend the doctrines of our standards, under the abiding conviction that they are the doctrines of the word of God. They have advanced no new theories, and have never aimed at originality. Whether it be a ground of reproach or of approbation, it is believed to be true, that an original idea in theology is not to be found on the pages of the *Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review* from the beginning until now. The phrase “Princeton Theology,” therefore, is without distinctive meaning.

As the controversy concerning sin and grace assumed so many forms, and was so varied and long-continued, we cannot pretend to refer to the particular articles in which these doctrines are discussed. Besides the papers on the history of Pelagianism, on original sin, &c., above referred to, Dr. Archibald Alexander contributed an article in 1831, on “That Inability under which the sinner labours, and whether it furnishes any excuse for his neglect of duty;” another in 1833, entitled, “Melancthon on Sin,” and in 1835, a review of an “Essay on Native Depravity, by Leonard Woods, D. D.” On page 549 of that review Dr. Alexander says, “We are candidly of the opinion, that the integrity of the doctrine of original sin, as held by Augustine and the Reformers, is not affected by the peculiarities of the Andover school.” This was said of the theology of that school as represented by Dr. Woods in 1835.

Again, Dr. Alexander says, "Even on the subject of imputation, Dr. Woods concedes so much, and expresses himself so modestly and candidly, that, although his views do not entirely come up to our standards, we should not have felt it necessary, in this review, to make a single remark. But the sentiments expressed in the eighth chapter are so foreign from our notions, that we cannot pass them by without a few remarks, which we hope to make in the same spirit of kindness in which Dr. Woods writes." In the eighth chapter of his *Essay*, Dr. Woods teaches that infants are not only born in a state of sin, but that they commit actual sins from the moment of birth. This Dr. Alexander considered impossible, as moral action implies the action of reason and conscience, a knowledge of law, and that certain acts are sinful. This Dr. Alexander affirms cannot be predicated of infants.

We quote these passages because they go to show not only the status of this *Review*, but also of our church generally, in relation to this subject. For more than sixty years certain differences of opinion had prevailed in our body on the nature of the relation between Adam and his posterity, the nature of original sin, of the sinner's inability, of the influence of the Holy Spirit in regeneration and sanctification. But so long as all parties held that men are born into the world, since the fall, in a state of sin and condemnation; that this fact was due to the sin of Adam; that men are dependent on the Holy Spirit for their regeneration; and that it is due to the sovereign and supernatural interposition of the Spirit that one man is converted and not another, the authority of the church in the exercise of discipline was not invoked. But when it was taught that all sin consists in the voluntary violation of known law; that men, since the fall, are not born in a state of sin; that they are not chargeable with guilt or moral pollution until, having arrived at the years of discretion, they deliberately violate the divine law; that all men have plenary ability to avoid all sin; and, having sinned, to return unto God and do all that he requires at their hands; that God cannot prevent sin, or the present amount of sin, in a moral system; that he cannot effectually control the acts of free agents without destroying their liberty; that in conversion it is man, and not God, who

determines who do, and who do not, turn unto God; that election is founded on the foresight of this self-determined repentance on the part of the sinner;—when these doctrines came to be taught in our church, it was seen that the vital principles, not of the Reformed faith only, but even of Catholic Christianity, were involved.

It is to the discussion of these doctrines that a large class of articles in this *Review* for the last thirty years was devoted. It is unnecessary, and would be tedious, to refer particularly to these articles. Few only need be specified. The doctrinal articles contributed by Dr. Archibald Alexander already referred to, bring several of these topics under examination. The same is true of the articles on regeneration, above-mentioned, and of those entitled "The New Divinity tried," 1832, "Finney's Lectures on Theology," 1847; and the articles published in 1850 and 1851, on Professor Park's doctrine of the Theology of the Intellect as distinguished from the Theology of the Heart; the review of Dr. Edward Beecher's "Great Conflict," 1851, and of Dr. Samuel J. Baird's work on "The First and Second Adam," 1860. To these are to be added the numerous able articles from the pen of Dr. Atwater, philosophical and doctrinal, of which the following are a part: "The Power of Contrary Choice," 1840; "Doctrinal and Ecclesiastical Conflicts in Connecticut," 1853; "Modern Explanations of the Doctrine of Inability," 1854; "Old Orthodoxy, New Divinity, and Unitarianism," 1857; "Jonathan Edwards and the Successive Forms of New Divinity;" "Dr. Taylor's Lectures on the Moral Government of God," 1859; "Dr. George Duffield on the Doctrines of New-school Presbyterians;" 1867; "Prof. Fisher on the *Princeton Review* and Dr. Taylor's Theology," 1868.

The doctrine concerning the Person and Work of Christ has in different forms come up for discussion. To this head are to be referred the following papers from the pen of Dr. Archibald Alexander: "John Pye Smith's Discourses on the Priesthood and Sacrifice of Christ, and on Atonement and Redemption," 1829; "Symington on the Atonement," 1836; "Justification by Faith," 1840. To the same head belong, "The Review of Dr. Beman on the Atonement," 1845; "Bushnell's

Discourses on God in Christ," 1849; and "Bushnell on Vicarious Sacrifice," 1866; and numerous papers in which this subject is included in the discussion of the faith of the Reformed Churches.

As the modern German philosophy and theology have exerted great influence in America as well as in Europe, no Review in this country, devoted to theological literature, could fail of being called upon to discuss the principles which these new theories involved so far as they affected the integrity of Christian doctrine. The first article bearing on this subject in our pages was that on "Transcendentalism" in 1839. That article was a review of Cousin's *Psychology* translated from the French, with an Introduction and Notes, by Rev. C. S. Henry, D. D. The first twenty-four pages of that article, from the pen of Dr. James W. Alexander, presented a general view of the recent German philosophy; the remaining forty pages, by Prof. Dod, were devoted to an examination of Cousin's system. Few articles ever published in the *Princeton Review* have attracted such general public attention. It was reprinted both in this country and in Europe. Prof. C. S. Henry, in the preface to a subsequent edition of his work, animadverted with great severity on Prof. Dod's critique. It was in 1856, more than ten years after the death of Prof. Dod, that the most severe attack upon his article was made. This called forth a reply intended to vindicate his memory, by showing that the exhibition which he had made of Cousin's philosophy was perfectly correct. That reply fills fifty-four pages of the April number of the volume for 1856.

To the same class of articles belongs the review of Dr. J. W. Nevin's work on "The Mystical Presence," 1848. The first part of that review is devoted to an examination of the true doctrine of the Reformed Churches on the Lord's Supper; and the last twenty pages to an examination of Dr. Nevin's own doctrine, which we hold to be the application of the modern German philosophy to the explanation and subversion of Christian doctrines. The review of Dr. Schaff's *Apostolic Church*, 1854, is a discussion of the doctrine of "historical development," involving another phase of the German philosophy. The article in answer to the question, "What is

Christianity?" 1860, belongs to the same class. A certain class of modern theologians deny that Christianity either is, or involves a system of doctrine. It is a life; and that life is the theanthropic, but, at the same time, the purely human life of Christ, developed by a natural process in the church, as the life of Adam was developed in his race; so that redemption, (atonement and justification, as well as sanctification,) is purely subjective.

The articles on the Positive Philosophy, the one by Dr. Atwater, in 1856; the other by Dr. Shields, in 1858, were also designed to vindicate the fundamental principles of religion from the assaults of modern speculations.

### *Slavery.*

The conductors of this *Review* have always endeavoured to adhere faithfully to the principle that the Scriptures are the only infallible rule of faith and practice. Therefore, when any matter, either of doctrine or morals, came under discussion, the question with them was, What saith the Lord? Nothing that the Bible pronounces true can be false; nothing that it declares to be false can be true; nothing is obligatory on the conscience but what it enjoins; nothing can be sin, but what it condemns. If, therefore, the Scriptures under the old dispensation permitted men to hold slaves, and if the New Testament nowhere condemns slaveholding, but prescribes the relative duties of masters and slaves, then to pronounce slaveholding to be in itself sinful, is contrary to the Scriptures. In like manner, if the Bible nowhere condemns the use of intoxicating liquors as a beverage, if our Lord himself drank wine, then to say that all use of intoxicating liquor as a beverage is sin, is only one of the many forms of the infidelity of benevolence. It is as much contrary to our allegiance to the Bible, to make our own notions of right and wrong the rule of duty, as to make our own reason the rule of faith.

It is well known that both slavery and intemperance were matters of national importance, and awakened earnest and continued controversy. As to slavery, so far as the North was concerned, it was universally regarded as an evil, which ought in some way to be brought to an end. The difference of opinion

related to the means by which that end was to be accomplished. The Abolitionists, so called, maintained that all slavehood, as inconsistent with the inalienable rights of man, and with the law of love, is sinful; and, therefore, that immediate and universal emancipation was an imperative duty. Another necessary consequence of the assumption that "slaveholding is a heinous crime against God and man," is that no slaveholder could properly be admitted to Christian fellowship. As the people of God, under the old dispensation, were allowed by law to purchase slaves, and to hold those of heathen origin in perpetual bondage; as slavery existed among the Romans, Greeks, and Jews during the apostolic age; as neither Christ nor his apostles denounced slaveholding as a crime, nor taught that emancipation was an imperative and immediate duty; and as beyond doubt the apostles admitted slaveholders to the communion of the Christian church, the conductors of this *Review*, from first to last, maintained that the doctrine that slaveholding is in itself a crime, is anti-scriptural and subversive of the authority of the word of God. The articles specially devoted to this subject, are those on "Slavery," 1836; on "Abolitionism," 1844; on "Emancipation," 1849; besides incidental references in other articles, particularly in those published during the late war.

The principles maintained in those articles are, 1. That slavery is, as defined by Paley, "An obligation to labour for the benefit of the master, without the contract or consent of the servant." It involves the deprivation of personal liberty, obligation of service at the discretion of another, and the transferable character of the authority and claim of service of the master. 2. The slave, according to this definition, is the property of his master. But property is merely the right of possession and use. The rights therein involved differ according to the nature of the thing possessed. A man has the right of property in his wife, his children, in his houses and land, his cattle, his servants. Property in a horse does not involve the right to treat it as a log of wood; and property in man does not involve the right to use him as a brute. He can be used only as a rational, moral, and immortal creature can, according to the divine law, be rightfully used. All the rights

conceded to him by the word of God must be faithfully regarded. 3. The master, therefore, is bound to provide for the intellectual and moral education of the slave. Every human being has the right to be taught to read the word of God, and learn the way of salvation for himself. Secondly, the master is bound to respect the conjugal rights of his slaves; and this forbids the separation of husbands and wives. Thirdly, he is bound to respect their parental rights, and this prevents the separation of parents and their minor children. Fourthly, he is bound to give them a fair compensation for their labour, which supposes the right, on the part of the slave, to hold property. Any laws inconsistent with these principles are unscriptural and unjust, and ought to be immediately abrogated. 4. The consequences of acting on these principles would be the speedy and peaceful abrogation of slavery, and the gradual elevation of the slaves to all the rights of free citizens. This is the ground taken in the article of 1836. In the conclusion of that article, it is said, "It may be objected that if the slaves are allowed so to improve as to become free men, the next step in their progress is that they will become citizens. We admit that it is so. The feudal serf first became a tenant, then a proprietor invested with political power. This is the natural progress of society, and it should be allowed freely to expand itself, or it will work its own destruction."

The great popular mistake on this subject—a mistake which produced incalculable evil—was confounding slaveholding with slave laws. Because a despotic monarch may make unjust and cruel laws, in order to keep his people in a state of degradation, that his power may be secured and rendered permanent, it does not follow that an absolute monarchy is "a heinous crime in the sight of God and man." In like manner, because the laws of a slaveholding state may be unscriptural and wicked, it does not follow that slaveholding is itself sinful.

#### *Intemperance.*

That drunkenness, or the excessive use of intoxicating liquors, is a soul-destroying sin, and one of the most prolific sources of misery and crime; and consequently, that it is the duty of every man to do everything, in itself right, which may

be in his power to counteract this great evil, is of course universally admitted. It is also generally conceded that voluntary and total abstinence from the use of all intoxicating liquor, may under some circumstances be expedient and obligatory. And it is moreover generally admitted, that a public pledge of such abstinence, and the formation of societies to secure such pledges from all classes of the people, as a means of influencing the public mind, are both allowable and useful. Against these principles and measures no objection was made on the pages of this *Review*. Almost all its conductors became members of such societies. But when the friends of temperance took the ground that all use of intoxicating liquor as a beverage is sinful, and a just bar to Christian communion, they were constrained to enter their solemn protest against both of those propositions, as unscriptural and fraught with great evils.

The ground taken in this *Review*, on this subject, was,

First. That the moderate use of intoxicating liquors as a beverage is not sinful. 1st. Because such use is nowhere forbidden in the word of God. 2d. Because such use is everywhere sanctioned in the Scriptures, not only by its being uncensured, but by its being forbidden to the priests only when engaged in the service of the altar, which implies that it was lawful on other occasions, just as its prohibition to the Nazarites implies it was lawful for other men; by the increase of corn and wine being pronounced a blessing; by the use of wine being introduced in such sacred services as the Passover and the Lord's Supper; and finally, because our Lord drank and made wine.

Second. It was conceded that the use of a thing, lawful in itself, may become wrong, when such use causes others to offend. As Paul exhorts the Corinthians not to act uncharitably by such an use of meat as tended to lead their brethren into sin; and avows his own purpose not to eat meat while the world standeth, if meat make my brother to offend.

Third. The right to judge, whether the law of love, or expediency, renders a particular course of conduct obligatory, every one must decide for himself. No one has the right to decide for him. "Let not him that eateth despise him that eateth not; and let not him which eateth not, judge him that eateth :

for God hath received him. Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? to his own master he standeth or falleth." Rom. xiv. 3-4.

Fourth. Nothing which is matter of expediency; which is right or wrong according to circumstances, can be made a matter of universal or permanent obligation, or term of Christian fellowship. This common sense and the apostle Paul expressly forbid. He circumcised Timothy in Asia Minor, but positively refused to allow Titus to be circumcised in Jerusalem. Dr. Archibald Alexander, as a general rule, never drank wine; but when the use of wine came to be pronounced sinful, he would sometimes, in company, take a glass for conscience' sake, and in so doing, we doubt not, he did nobly right.

Fifth. For conventions or ecclesiastical bodies to pronounce that to be sin which the Bible does not condemn, or to make that a condition of Christian communion which Christ has not enjoined, is an usurpation, which every man, by his allegiance to God, is bound to resist.

The most elaborate discussion of this subject to be found in our pages, is the able review by the Rev. John Maclean, D. D., of two Essays, the one entitled Bacchus, the other, Anti-Bacchus, in the volume for 1841.

#### *The Disruption of the Church in 1837—1838.*

In all the controversies culminating in the division of the church in 1837—38, the conductors of this *Review* were in entire sympathy with the Old-school party. They sided with them as to the right, and, under existing circumstances, the duty, of the church, to conduct the work of education and foreign and domestic missions by ecclesiastical boards, instead of voluntary, independent societies. They agreed with that party on all doctrinal questions in dispute; and as to the obligation to enforce conformity to our Confession of Faith on the part of ministers and teachers of theology under our jurisdiction. They were so unfortunate, however, as to differ from many, and apparently, from a majority of their Old-school brethren, as to the wisdom of the measures adopted for securing a common object. In our number for January 1837, it is said, "Our position we feel to be difficult and delicate. On the

one hand, we respect and love the great mass of our Old-school brethren; we believe them to constitute the bone and sinews of the Presbyterian Church; we agree with them in doctrine; we sympathize with them in their disapprobation and distrust of the spirit and conduct of the leaders of the opposite party; and we harmonize with them in all the great leading principles of ecclesiastical policy, though we differ from a portion of them, how large or how small that portion may be we cannot tell, as to the propriety and wisdom of some particular measures. They have the right to cherish and express their opinions, and to endeavour to enforce them on others by argument and persuasion; and so have we. They, we verily believe, have no selfish end in view. We are knowingly operating under stress of conscience, against all our own interests, so far as they are not involved in the interests of the church of God."

The first point of difference related to the Act and Testimony, and the measures therewith connected.

Such departures from the standards of the church in matters of doctrine and order; such diversity of opinion as to ecclesiastical Boards and voluntary Societies; such alienation of feeling and agitating controversy, had for years disturbed the peace and impaired the efficiency of the church, as to produce a state of things which on all sides was felt to be intolerable. With the view to reform these evils, and secure the peace and purity of the church, a meeting of ministers and elders was held in Philadelphia, May 26th, 1834. At that meeting it was determined to issue an Act and Testimony, setting forth the evils under which the church was labouring, and proposing means of redress. This document was originally signed by thirty-seven ministers and twenty-seven elders. It was sent forth among the churches, and all the friends of sound doctrine and of Presbyterian order were exhorted to sign it. "We recommend," say the original signers, "all ministers, elders, Church Sessions, Presbyteries, and Synods, who approve of this Act and Testimony, to give their public adherence thereto, in such manner as they shall prefer, and communicate their names, and when a church court, a copy of their adhering act." It was further recommended, that on the second Thurs-

day of May 1835, a Convention be held in the city of Pittsburgh, (where the General Assembly was to meet), to be composed of two delegates, a minister and ruling elder from each Presbytery, or from the minority of any Presbytery, who may concur in the sentiments of this Act and Testimony, to deliberate and consult on the present state of the church, and to adopt such measures as may be best suited to restore her prostrated standards."

Many Old-school men, as zealous as any others, could not sign this document. They did not object to it as a testimony against false doctrine; nor as a means for arousing the attention of the church; nor as designed to concentrate the energies of its sounder members for the reform of existing evils, but, 1. Because it contained assertions as to matters of fact and expressions of opinion, (not however as to matters of doctrine), in which they could not conscientiously concur. 2. Because it operated as a new, unauthorized, and invidious test of orthodoxy and fidelity. Those who did not sign it were looked upon as timid and recreant. The editor of the *Presbyterian*, (Aug. 21, 1834), said, "We verily believe that every orthodox minister and elder, who refuses his signature under existing circumstances, will throw his weight into the opposite scale, and strengthen the hopes, and confirm the confidence of those who aim to revolutionize the church." 3. Because its obvious tendency, and, as the event proved, its actual effect, was to divide, instead of uniting, the friends of orthodoxy and order. The document was never signed by a moiety of the Old-school body. 4. Because the issuing a document of this kind, calling for the signatures of all sound men, who by their delegates were to meet in convention, and prepare for further action, was an extra-constitutional and revolutionary measure, which many good and true men could not approve. They believed that when evils exist in any organized community, civil or ecclesiastical, redress should be sought in the regular exercise of the constitution and laws, unless the evils be such as justify revolution. 5. Because, from the natural tendency of the measures adopted, and from the open avowal of some of the leaders in this movement, it was believed that if the party represented by the Act and Testimony did not gain ascendancy

in the church, the result would be secession and schism. There were, however, many who believed that secession, under the circumstances, would be a violation of principles and a breach of trust. They, therefore, stood aloof, and abstained from taking part in measures of which, as it seemed to them, schism was the natural consequence, if not the intention. They held that so long as the standards of the church were unaltered, and its ministers were not called upon to profess what they did not believe, or prevented preaching what they believed to be true, or required to do what their conscience condemned, to withdraw from the church was the crime of schism, which the Scriptures so expressly forbid. Moreover, they regarded the funds, the institutions, and influence of the church, as a trust committed to their care, which they were not authorized to throw up, or to leave in the hands of those whom they regarded as likely to abuse or pervert it. To abandon the church whenever an adverse majority gained ascendancy for a time in its administration, would lead to never-ending divisions and incalculable evils. Many of the signers of the Act and Testimony disclaimed any intention to secede from the church; but others, among whom was the venerable Dr. Green, openly declared that such was their purpose. Happily the matter was not brought to that issue. The reform of the church was effected without that sacrifice. Candid men, we think, will admit that the above-mentioned reasons are sufficient to justify the course of those who dissented from the Act and Testimony movement. Their conduct, at least, can be accounted for on other grounds than those of faint-heartedness or unfaithfulness.

The second point on which Old-school men were divided, was, the proper grounds of ecclesiastical discipline. Our ministers and elders are required to adopt the Confession of Faith as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures. No doctrine, therefore, consistent with the integrity of that system is the proper ground of discipline. It is not enough that a doctrine be erroneous, or that it be dangerous in its tendency; if it be not subversive of one or more of the constituent elements of the Reformed faith, it is not incompatible with the honest adoption of our Confession. It

cannot be denied that ever since the Reformation, more or less diversity in the statement and explanation of the doctrines of Calvinism has prevailed in the Reformed Churches. It is equally notorious that for fifty or sixty years such diversities have existed and been tolerated in our own church; nay, that they still exist, and are avowed by Old-school men. If a man holds that all mankind, since the fall of Adam, and in consequence of his sin, are born in a state of condemnation and sin, whether he accounts for that fact on the ground of immediate or mediate imputation, or on the realistic theory, he was regarded as within the integrity of the system. In like manner, if he admitted the sinner's inability, it was not considered as a proper ground of discipline that he regarded that inability as moral, instead of natural as well as moral. If he taught that the work of Christ was a real satisfaction to the justice of God, it was not made a breaking point, whether he said it was designed exclusively for the elect, or for all mankind. If regeneration was referred to the supernatural and almighty power of the Holy Spirit, and election to eternal life to the sovereign grace of God, the integrity of that doctrine, as presented in our standards, was secured. If justification was regarded as a forensic or judicial act of God, declaring the sinner just, on the ground of the righteousness of Christ, and not because of anything done or experienced by the sinner himself, then the essentials of that cardinal doctrine were retained.

We do not say that the diversities above referred to are unimportant. We regard many of them as of great importance. All we say is, that they have existed, and been tolerated in the purest Calvinistic churches, our own among the rest.

But within the last forty years other doctrines came to be avowed. Men came to teach that mankind are not born in a state of sin and condemnation; that no man is chargeable with either guilt or sin until he deliberately violates the known law of God; that sinners have plenary ability to do all that God requires of them; that regeneration is the sinner's own act; that God cannot certainly control the acts of free agents so as to prevent all sin, or the present amount of sin in a moral

system; that the work of Christ is no proper satisfaction to Divine justice, but simply symbolical or didactic, designed to produce a moral impression on intelligent agents; that justification is not judicial, but involves a setting aside of the law, as when the Executive remits the penalty incurred by a criminal. These latter class of doctrines were regarded as entirely inconsistent with the "system of doctrine" taught in our Confession of Faith. In the General Assembly of 1868 a protest was presented against the adoption of the plan of union then before the churches, urging, as an argument against the union, the alleged fact that such doctrines were tolerated in the other branch of the Presbyterian Church. The majority of the Assembly, in their answer to that protest, denied that allegation. They pronounced it to be incredible, on the ground that such doctrines were so obviously subversive of our whole system, that no church professing to be Calvinistic could tolerate them within their borders.

When, in 1830, and the years immediately following, church-discipline was invoked to arrest the progress of error, the Presbytery of Philadelphia included among the doctrines to be condemned, those included in the first, as well as those belonging to the second of the classes above mentioned. This was objected to by a large class of Old-school men, and by the conductors of this *Review* among the number: 1. Because, if the errors in question do not affect the integrity of the system, they were not the proper grounds of discipline. One of these doctrines was, that "faith is an act, and not a principle." But surely a man may hold that opinion, and yet be a Calvinist. When we are commanded to believe, we are commanded to act. Saving faith is the act "of receiving and resting on Christ alone for salvation, as he is offered to us in the gospel." It may be called a principle, as the abiding purpose of a man to serve his country, is, for him, a principle of action. Spiritual life, as imparted in the soul at regeneration, is a principle, manifesting itself in all holy acts and states; but we cannot see the necessity for assuming a separate principle for all holy exercises—a principle of repentance, a principle of faith, of hope, of love, and so on. However this may be, it must be

admitted that this was not an adequate ground for ecclesiastical discipline.

The immediate imputation of Adam's sin we regard as a very important doctrine; not so much on its own account as on account of the principle of representative accountability on which it is founded, and which those who deny the doctrine are wont to reject. But that principle runs through the whole Bible, and is involved in the vital doctrines of atonement and justification. It is the ground on which God has administered his providence from the beginning. Nevertheless, it is notorious that the doctrine of immediate imputation has not been considered by our church as essential to the integrity of the Calvinistic system. This is plain, because it has been, and still is, openly denied with impunity by men of the highest standing in the church.

2. It was considered unreasonable and unfair to condemn one man for errors which had been, and continued to be, tolerated in others.

3. This course was deemed unwise, because it could not fail to embarrass the administration of discipline, and to divide the friends of truth and order in the church. It was impossible that they could be brought with unanimity to concur in sustaining charges so heterogeneous, embracing doctrinal statements with which only a small minority of the church could agree. We are constrained to say, with great respect for the Presbytery of Philadelphia, that the censure which that body pronounced in 1830, on the sermon entitled "The Way of Salvation," contains doctrinal principles which we do not know a single minister in the Presbyterian Church who is willing to adopt. It makes the penal character of the sufferings of Christ to depend on their nature and intensity, and not on the design for which they were inflicted. Any suffering inflicted for the satisfaction of law and justice, is punishment; and no suffering, no matter what its nature or intensity, is penal, unless inflicted for that purpose. Christ did not suffer the penalty of the law, because his sufferings were equal to the pains the redeemed would have endured throughout eternity, or even to what a single soul would thus endure; but because they were judicially inflicted in satisfaction of justice. He

bore our sins. You incarcerate a man to save him from a mob, and it is an act of kindness. You incarcerate him in execution of a legal sentence, and it is punishment. We think that any candid man will admit that those who disapproved of such a judicial judgment, did not deserve, on that account, to be deemed lacking in fidelity or zeal for the truth.

We do not wish to intimate that the books on which the Presbytery, and afterwards the Synod, of Philadelphia, founded their judicial action did not contain errors which called for the exercise of discipline. We believe they did contain propositions, which, according to the unanimous judgment of the Assembly of 1868, any minister should be required to retract, as the condition of his remaining in connection with the Presbyterian Church. The complaint is, that matters were included in the charges which even the friends of sound doctrine could not regard as proper grounds of discipline.

The third point about which Old-school men differed was the wisdom of some of the acts of the Assembly of 1837. When that Assembly met, it was found that the Old-school had a decided and determined majority. The opportunity had occurred to rectify some of the abuses which had so long and so justly been matters of complaint. It was not to be expected or desired that the opportunity should be lost. The abuse which was most immediately under the control of the Assembly, was the admission of Congregationalists as constituent members of our church courts. This was as obviously unreasonable and unconstitutional as the admission of British subjects to sit as members of our State or national legislature. To put an end to this abuse, the Assembly adopted the following report of their committee. "In regard to the relation between the Presbyterian and Congregational Churches, the committee recommend the adoption of the following resolutions:

"1. That between these two branches of the American Church, there ought, in the judgment of this Assembly, to be maintained sentiments of mutual respect and esteem, and for that purpose no reasonable effort should be omitted to preserve a perfectly good understanding between these two branches of the church of Christ.

"2. That it is expedient to continue the plan of friendly intercourse between this Church and the Congregational Churches, as it now exists.

"3. But as the 'Plan of Union' adopted for the new settlements in 1801, was originally an unconstitutional act on the part of that Assembly,—these important standing rules having never been submitted to the Presbyteries—and as they are totally destitute of authority, as proceeding from the General Association of Connecticut, which is invested with no power to legislate in such cases, and especially to enact laws to regulate churches not within its limits; and as much confusion and irregularity have arisen from this unnatural and unconstitutional system of union; therefore, it is resolved, that the Act of the Assembly of 1801, entitled a 'Plan of Union,' be, and the same is hereby abrogated."

These resolutions were carried by a vote of 143 yeas to 110 nays. Dr. Archibald Alexander, and all the other delegates from the Presbytery of New Brunswick, voted for their adoption.

The question then arose, How was the above resolution to be carried into effect? In other words, How was the Congregational element to be eliminated from our body? Three methods were proposed. First: To cite the judicatories charged with this and other irregularities to appear at the bar of the next Assembly. This was actually adopted, but afterwards abandoned, as likely to be cumbersome and interminable.

The second method was that proposed by the Rev. Dr. Cuyler, who introduced a series of resolutions, the substance of which was a direction to the judicatories embracing Congregational churches, to require them to become Presbyterially organized, or to withdraw from our connection; and refusing to such judicatories the privilege of being represented in the General Assembly, until this elimination of Congregationalism had been effected.

The consideration of these resolutions was postponed to await the report of a committee consisting of five members from either side of the house, to consider the question of the amicable separation of the church. That committee reported that they

unanimously agreed, 1st. That in the present state of the church such a separation was desirable; 2d. They agreed as to the terms on which it should be effected; but 3d. They disagreed as to the time when it should be accomplished, and as to the legal succession. The committee representing the majority, insisted that the separation should be accomplished at once, during the sessions of that Assembly; the committee on the part of the minority, insisted that it should be deferred for a year, by a reference of the matter to the presbyteries.

On the failure of this attempt, the Assembly, instead of taking up the resolutions of Dr. Cuyler, proceeded to effect the separation from Congregationalism by its own authority. This was done by what are called the "Abscinding Acts." It was resolved first, "That by the operation of the abrogation of the Plan of Union of 1801, the Synod of the Western Reserve is, and is hereby declared to be, no longer a part of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America."

And subsequently it was resolved, "That in consequence of the abrogation by this Assembly, of the Plan of Union of 1801, between it and the General Association of Connecticut, as utterly unconstitutional, and therefore null and void from the beginning, the Synods of Utica, Geneva, and Genesee, which were formed and attached to this body, under and in execution of the said 'Plan of Union,' be, and are hereby declared to be, out of the ecclesiastical connection of the Presbyterian Church of the United States of America, and that they are not in form or in fact an integral portion of said church."

It was stated on the floor of the Assembly that less than one in four of the churches in the Synod of the Western Reserve was Presbyterian. We do not see how any one can censure the Assembly for refusing to recognize that Synod as a Presbyterian body, when three-fourths of the churches of which it was composed were Congregational. Dr. Alexander, who had voted for the abrogation of the Plan of Union, felt free, therefore, to vote for the disowning of the Synod of the Western Reserve as a constituent part of the Presbyterian Church. For the resolution disowning the three Synods in western New York, he could not vote.

It appears, from a minute made at the time, that the article

on the General Assembly, in the *Princeton Review*, as first prepared, did not meet the views of its conductors. "The conductors of the *Repertory*," the minute states, "met a second time (July 19, 1837) to decide on the article on the Assembly. Dr. Miller and Dr. John Breckinridge approved of the action of the Assembly respecting the three Synods *in toto*. Professor John Maclean thought it might be justified, but would have preferred Dr. Cuyler's plan. Dr. Alexander disapproved of it on the ground on which it was placed by the Assembly. Professors J. W. Alexander, Dod, and Hodge, disapproved, and would have preferred Dr. Cuyler's plan. These three wished that idea to be expressed in the *Repertory*. It was decided to leave out the portion containing that expression—leaving it, as was supposed, undecided how the conductors viewed the matter. To this course all ultimately assented except Professor Hodge. He objected on the ground that the impression made by the article as it now stands, would be that the conductors decidedly sustained the measure in question." As his associates did not agree with him as to that point, he was, of course, overruled. The above details are of little interest to the church generally, but they are of interest so far as the history of this journal is concerned.

The grounds on which the majority of the conductors of this *Review* dissented from the act of the Assembly disowning the three Synods of Utica, Geneva, and Genesee, were: 1. That it was not a legitimate consequence of the abrogation of the Plan of Union that those Synods, with all their presbyteries and churches, were out of connection with the Presbyterian Church in the United States, and neither in form or fact an integral portion of that church. Even if originally formed on the Plan of Union, if they had become, and so far as they had become, Presbyterian in their organization, and had been duly recognized, they were entitled to be regarded and treated as Presbyterian churches and judicatories. This is all the constitution required. This the Assembly itself admitted, as it promised to recognize any of the constituent churches or judicatories of those Synods as soon as they reported themselves as constitutionally organized. But if presbyterial organization entitled

them to recognition, it was a valid reason why they should not be disowned.

2. The presence of a few Congregationalists in a church court did not destroy its character, nor afford a reasonable ground for refusing to recognize it as in connection with the church. Committee-men (*i. e.* Congregationalists) have been allowed to sit as members of the General Assembly; and so were the delegates from the several Associations in New England. If their presence rendered the Assemblies in which they sat unconstitutional bodies, then all the acts of those bodies were null and void, and we have lost our legal succession.

It is to be remembered that the excision of the Synods in question was not an act of discipline; it was not founded on the prevalence of error in doctrine, or of "new measures." This the Assembly expressly disclaims. In the answer to the protest of the commissioners from those Synods, it is said, "There was no judicial process instituted." "Without impeaching the character or standing of the brethren composing those Synods, this Assembly, by a legislative act, merely declares them, in consequence of the abrogation of the Plan of Union of 1801, no longer a constituent part of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States." (*Digest*, 743). The objection to this action is, that the presence of a small minority of Congregationalists in a church court did not so vitiate its character as to justify its being disowned.

3. There were Presbyteries within the bounds of the Synods of Albany and New Jersey composed in part of Congregational churches; and yet the General Assembly did not disown either those Synods or the delinquent Presbyteries. This was an admission that the presence of Congregational members did not destroy the character of those bodies as Presbyterian organizations.

4. The action of the Assembly in disowning the Synods of Western New York was not necessary to secure the reform of the church. That end would have been attained by the due operation of the abrogation of the Plan of Union. The legitimate effects of that abrogation were: 1. To prevent the recep-

tion of any new churches formed upon that Plan. 2. To render it obligatory on all the Presbyteries to require the churches within their bounds to adopt an organization in accordance with our constitution, and to refuse to allow the representatives of Congregational churches to sit and act as elders. 3. To justify, and, it may be, to render it obligatory on future General Assemblies, to refuse to allow Presbyteries continuing their connection with Congregationalism, to be represented in those bodies. This would have effectually accomplished the reform contemplated by the abrogation of the Plan of Union of 1801. After having allowed for more than thirty years this union of Congregationalists and Presbyterians in our church courts, all that the Assembly had the right to do was to require that such union should forthwith and thenceforth cease. This was the ground taken by Dr. Alexander and the majority of the conductors of this *Review* in 1837, and on which the few of their number who still survive, still stand. What, however, was regarded as very lukewarm Old-schoolism in 1837, has now come to be looked upon as obsolete and narrow-minded. The Assembly of 1869, by a vote nearly unanimous, not only admitted (the abrogation of the Plan of Union notwithstanding) that Presbyteries do not forfeit their connection with the Presbyterian Church, although they include Congregational churches, but authorized, as far as it could do so, their being represented in the General Assembly for at least five years to come.

#### *The Late War.*

On the course pursued by the conductors of this *Review* in reference to the late war for the preservation of our National Union, little need be said. The first article having reference to our national difficulties was written before the secession of South Carolina, but did not appear in print until after that event, viz., January 1861. The article is entitled, "The State of the Country." It began by saying, "There are periods in the history of every nation when its destiny for ages may be determined by the events of an hour. There are occasions when political questions rise into the sphere of morals and religion; when the rule for political action is to be sought,

not in considerations of state policy, but in the word of God. On such occasions the distinction between secular and religious journals is obliterated." It was on this ground that we, as conductors of a Theological Review, felt justified in entering upon the discussion of questions involving our national life. In taking this course we were sustained by the example of the whole religious press of the country, South as well as North.

The design of the article in question was, in the first place, to consider the complaints of the South against the North, which we endeavoured to show were either altogether unfounded, or did not furnish any justification for the dissolution of the national union; and, in the second place, to prove that secession was not a constitutional mode of redressing evils, whether real or imaginary. That article was received at the South, to our surprise, with universal condemnation, expressed in terms of unmeasured severity. At the North it was pronounced, "moderate, fair, and reasonable," except by the Abolitionists, who rivalled their Southern brethren in their denunciations.

In April of the same year (1861) appeared another article, on "The Church and the Country." Secession was then an accomplished fact, and the war with all its uncertainties was about to commence. The article was designed as a plea for the unity of the church, even in the event of the dissolution of the national union. The two great sources of apprehension that the political troubles of the country would lead to a division of the Presbyterian Church, were the alienation of feeling on the part of our Southern brethren, and the new, unscriptural, and anti-Christian sentiments which the leading men among them avowed on the subject of slavery. Instead of regarding it as merely allowable under certain circumstances, they had come to advocate it as a good; as the best organization of labour; as an institution to be conserved, extended, and perpetuated. They also maintained that slavery was founded on natural, and not on municipal law; that it did not depend on the *lex loci*, and therefore that slaveholders had the right to carry their slaves and to retain them as such, wherever they could carry any other kind of property, provided the holding of that kind of property was not specially forbidden by the sovereignty into

which they went. On this ground it was claimed that slavery went of right into all the "territories" of the United States; that Congress had no authority to prohibit slaveholding in the "territories," but was bound to protect property in slaves as well as any other kind of property. The assertion of the right of Congress to prohibit slavery in a territory of which it was the local legislature, was declared to be "a thorough and radical revolution—it proposes new and extraordinary terms of union. The old government is as completely abolished as if the people of the United States had met in convention and repealed the Constitution."\* How new this astounding doctrine was, is plain from the fact that the act of Congress prohibiting slavery north of latitude 36° 30' was, as Mr. Benton tells us, "the wish of the South, sustained by the united voice of Mr. Monroe's cabinet, (including John C. Calhoun and William H. Crawford), the united voices of the Southern senators, and a majority of the Southern representatives."†

It is to a discussion of the extreme views above-mentioned that the article in question is principally devoted.

In 1862 an article appeared, entitled, "England and America." The Christian public in this country were very slow to believe that England sided with the South in our recent struggle. This was so unexpected, so unreasonable, so contrary to the professed principles of both the government and people, that Americans could not believe it until the conviction was forced upon them. The whole secular press of that country, whether metropolitan, provincial, or colonial, with few exceptions, were as vituperative and denunciatory of the North, as the Southern papers themselves. The same is true, scarcely with the same number of exceptions, of the religious press, whether controlled by Episcopalians, Presbyterians, or Congregationalists. This is a fact for which we have never seen or heard any satisfactory explanation. The article in question was written as a protest against this unrighteous judgment. It was designed to show that the rebellion was made in the interest of slavery. This was proved from the fact that the grievances complained of had almost exclusive reference to

\* Dr. Thornwell on the State of the Country, p. 26.

† Thirty Years in the Senate, vol. i. p. 8.

that institution. Those grievances were the denunciations of abolitionists; the obstructions thrown in the way of the restoration of fugitive slaves; the refusal to admit slaveholding in the free territories; the election of an anti-slavery president, and the like. It was proved by official declarations of public bodies; by the avowals of the leading politicians of the South; by the appeals of the Southern press to slaveholders to sustain a war made for their special interests. That English anti-slavery Christians should sustain a rebellion made to "conserve, perpetuate, and extend slavery," was a moral phenomenon that astonished the Christian world. In the second place, the article was designed to show that even with regard to slavery the South had no serious grounds of complaint; that the abolitionists, who denounced all slaveholders as criminal, were a small minority of the people of the North; that the general government, on which alone rested the obligation of executing the fugitive slave-law, so far from being remiss in the discharge of that duty, had erred in the opposite extreme; and that in refusing to sanction slavery in the free territories, Congress had acted on the principles, not only of Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, Lowndes, and of all the great representative men of the South, but of the civilized world. Judge McLean, of the Supreme Court of the United States, said from the bench, that the great principle decided by Lords Mansfield and Stowell, against which *there is no dissenting authority*, was, "that a slave is not property beyond the operation of the territorial law which makes him such." He further said, the Supreme Court of the United States has decided that "slavery is a mere municipal regulation, founded on and limited to the range of the territorial law." Judge Curtis, of the same Court, said, "Slavery being contrary to natural right, is created only by municipal law. This is not only plain in itself, and agreed to by all writers on the subject, but it is inferable from the Constitution, and has been explicitly declared by this Court." He further said, "I am not acquainted with any case or any writer questioning the correctness of this doctrine." It was the practical assertion of this doctrine which men at the South said worked a repeal of the Constitution, and absolved them from all allegiance to the national government. That

England should desire the success of a rebellion having such an object, and sustained by such reasons, was a grief and a marvel to the Christian world.

The article on "The War," January 7, 1863, was written during the gloomiest period of the struggle. The South, although inferior in point of numbers, had many advantages. They operated near their resources; they were united; their labouring population being slaves were not combatants, who could carry on the work of production, while the whole white population were at liberty to take the field. The North laboured under the disadvantage of operating at a great distance from their resources, and over a territory a thousand miles in extent, and the people were far from being united. A large party was opposed to the war from the beginning. A still larger portion of the people was opposed to the administration, and did all they could to prevent its success. Many who at the commencement of the struggle sided heartily with the national government, had become alienated and hostile on account of the measures which had been adopted. The design of the article was to promote harmony among the people of the North. There could be no hope of such harmonious action unless the conscience of the people was on the side of the government. "There never was a time," the writer said, "when the public conscience was more disturbed, or when it was more necessary that moral principles in their bearing on national conduct should be clearly presented." It was then urged that the great principle that the moral law, or, the will of God, however revealed, binds nations as well as individuals, should be the rule of public action. The dictum of Coke, one of the greatest legal authorities, "That any act of Parliament which conflicts with the law of God, is null and void," should be written in letters of gold in every legislative hall and in every court of justice in the country.

On this principle the article urged that the legitimate and avowed object of the war, viz., the preservation of the union, should be religiously adhered to; and that the war itself should be conducted in strict observance of recognized military law. The two great subjects on which public sentiment was dangerously divided, were the right of the President to suspend the writ

of *habeas corpus*, and his authority as commander-in-chief, and as a war measure, to decree the emancipation of the slaves. The article took the ground that both these rights belonged to the President during times of war, and for military ends, *i. e.*, for the preservation of the country and for the suppression of the rebellion.

While the conductors of this *Review* were thus earnest and constant in their support of the national government, they were so unfortunate as to differ from the majority of brethren as to the propriety of some of the acts of the General Assembly in reference to the war. The difference concerned the true limits of the authority of the church. The conductors of this journal took for their guidance in this matter the principle announced in a resolution adopted unanimously by the General Assembly of 1860. That resolution is in the following words, *viz.*, "The General Assembly, on the one hand, disclaims all right to interfere in secular matters; and, on the other, asserts the right and duty of the church, as God's witness on earth, to bear testimony in favour of truth and holiness, and against all false doctrine and sin, wherever professed or committed." As Presbyterians, in common with all Protestants, hold that the word of God is the only infallible rule of truth and duty, it follows that the Scriptures are the standard according to which the church must form her judgments; and consequently that she cannot properly condemn as sinful anything which the Scriptures do not forbid; or declare anything to be obligatory as a matter of faith or duty which the Bible does not teach or enjoin. Nothing, therefore, which cannot be judged by the Scriptures as a standard, comes legitimately under the authority of the church. The church has no right to pronounce judgment on such questions as protection and free trade, internal improvements, banking, finance, or commerce. It cannot interpret the laws of the land, and adjudicate in questions of property. It cannot authoritatively expound the Constitution of the United States, and decide whether it does, or does not, recognize the right of secession, and, whether the paramount allegiance of the citizen be to his State or to the United States. Any act of the General Assembly violating these obvious principles; any act censuring Presbyterians for obeying their

States rather than the United States, or calling on them for a confession of sin and profession of repentance for obeying the former instead of the latter, as a condition of either Christian or ministerial communion, the conductors of this *Review* regard as wrong in itself and disastrous in its tendency. This, to the best of our knowledge and belief, is the only point connected with the war in which we had the misfortune to differ from our brethren.

*Reunion of the Churches.*

The course pursued by the conductors of this *Review* on this subject was determined by the following assumptions and principles: 1. That at the time of the disruption in 1837-1838, serious differences existed between the Old and New-schools. These differences related principally to matters of polity, and to the latitude allowable in the interpretation of our doctrinal standards.

2. That these differences were so great as to lead both parties to the conviction that an amicable separation was desirable.

3. They assumed, further, that reunion should not take place so long as these differences continued.

4. The Old-school, believing that their distinctive principles were right and obligatory, repeatedly declared that they had not, could not, and would not abandon them.

5. The New-school, with equal distinctness, declared that they had not, and would not change their ground. Under these circumstances it would seem that no party could wish a reunion of elements which had proved themselves so discordant as to render harmonious action impossible.

In fact, however, many Old-school men believed that the New-school had so far changed as to render reunion desirable. On the other hand, the majority of the New-school believed that the Old-school had so far changed that they were willing to be reunited with them.

The result is that the vast majority of both parties have come to the conclusion that both have so changed, that a wise regard to the interests of the cause of Christ demands that the

reunion should be consummated. God grant that such may prove to be the case!

Some few, on both sides, do not believe in this change, and, therefore, do not approve of the union. To this small number the senior editor of this *Review* belongs. All, however, recognize it to be their duty to bow to the will of the majority constitutionally expressed, and to unite their prayers with those of their brethren that the blessing of God in rich abundance may rest on the reunited church.

#### *Articles on the Assemblies.*

Beginning with the year 1835, this *Review* has given annually, in its July number, an account of the proceedings of each successive General Assembly. The object of these articles was not merely to record the action of the Assembly, but to present a condensed outline of the discussions on all important points. No attempt was made to give the speeches of the several speakers, but a summary of the arguments on each side of disputed questions. As the period from 1835 to 1869 is one of the most important in our ecclesiastical history, these articles, it is believed, have an historical value, as they give information not elsewhere easily accessible.

#### *Conclusion.*

This *Review* has always laboured under one great disadvantage. It never had an editor devoted to its management. It has always been a by-business; taken up in intervals allowed by more imperative duties, and laid aside as soon as possible. Nevertheless it has cost a great deal of time and labour; yielding little compensation other than the hope of doing good.

The above retrospect of the history of this journal is due to its conductors, living and dead. It is due to them to vindicate their course during the past forty-five years of almost constant conflict. This vindication is the rather due because their course has been often misunderstood and misrepresented. That they have at times erred in judgment, may be taken for granted; that they have sometimes been unduly severe in their criticisms, we fear must also be acknowledged. For such severity the few who survive would be glad to make any pos-

sible atonement. Nevertheless we feel called upon to thank God that on no important question of doctrine or polity do our present convictions of truth and duty conflict with what we find recorded on the pages of this journal. Discarding all other claims, its conductors do claim credit for fidelity and consistency.

What is to be the future of the *Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review*, it is not for us to predict. If those whose views it has hitherto represented, wish it to live, they must sustain it. Our hope is, that now when the senior editor, who for forty-five years has borne the chief responsibility of its management, lays down the burden, the work will enter on a higher and more enlarged sphere of usefulness.