

THE
EVANGELICAL GUARDIAN
AND REVIEW.

VOL. I.

JUNE, 1817.

NO. 2.

PRAYER.

THE liberty of presenting our weak supplications to the Ruler of heaven and earth, with the assurance of an answer, is undoubtedly the noblest of Christian privileges. There is something so unutterably sublime in the very *idea* of a creature holding converse with its Creator, that it has been incorporated in every system of religion which hath prevailed in the world. But it is to the Christian system, and that alone, we can look for a clear and satisfactory account of its nature, foundation, and object. Whatever may have been the relations and rights of man in original innocence and perfection, it is certain that *now* there can be no access to the living God, but upon the ground of express revelation. As rebels against our legitimate Sovereign, we are in a state of distance and alienation, and are to be considered as having forfeited any claim that may have been originally bestowed. In addition to this, we are, by reason of transgression, under positive wrath. "How then can we come before God? how can we bow ourselves before the Most High?" To restore intercourse between heaven and earth, is the sole prerogative of an offended Deity. Unless He by a positive act of pardon and reconciliation reveal himself gracious, "no flesh can abide in his presence."

There is another consideration of radical importance. It is not enough that the sinner be furnished with the discovery that the great God has "thoughts of peace;" he must moreover be satisfied as to the *manner* in which a holy and just

In the merits of his blood, and the efficacy of his grace and intercession, place your trust, and all your backslidings shall be healed. Trust to this, and you shall be preserved blameless until the coming of our Lord; and then you shall unite with the unnumbered host of the redeemed in the glorified anthem, Worthy is the Lamb, that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing—For thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood.

REVIEW.

1. *A Brief View of Facts which gave rise to the New-York Evangelical Missionary Society of Young Men, together with the Constitution. Published by direction of the Society. New-York. Day & Turner. 1817. 8vo. pp. 20.*
2. *History of the Young Men's Missionary Society of New-York, containing a correct account of the recent controversy respecting Hopkinsian Doctrines. Published by order of the Society. D. Fanshaw. 1817. 8vo. pp. 40.*

WE take these two pamphlets together, because they relate to the same event—the first *actual schism* effected by Hopkinsian doctrines in the city of New-York. The organization of a Missionary Society, with design to patronize and propagate these doctrines, forms an era, in the religious history of this city, to which the ecclesiastical historian may hereafter find it necessary to refer. We have now, before us, two distinct, and, in some instances, contradictory accounts of the event: but it may be of use, as introductory to our review of these productions, to make some retrospective remarks.

The five religious denominations in the city of New-York, which have assumed the Presbyterian polity, had dwelt together in equal friendship and harmony for many years. The

Presbyterian Church, the Reformed Dutch Church, the Associate Reformed Church, the Associate Church, and the Reformed Presbyterian Church—Each of these denominations, having its own distinct organization, always laboured to maintain and to promote its own individual prosperity : but all rejoiced in the success of each, and *provoking one another to love and to good works*, they proceeded, growing up together, some with greater and some with less rapidity, and without personal litigation or public strife, to mar their harmony in the holy doctrines of their common salvation. The ministers lived in habits of private and intimate friendship ; and their people, generally, either set or copied the example. They indulged a free and frequent interchange of Christian fellowship ; and, such as deemed it both prudent and consistent with public ecclesiastical order, held occasional communion with each other, in ministerial services, and in the ordinance of the Lord's Supper. Private Christians made their profession of godliness in the Church to which their affections inclined ; and in the exercise of those rights, which are guaranteed to them by the laws of the land, they continued in their religious connexion, or changed it, at their discretion, without affecting the intimacy or alienating the friendships of the different Pastors.

The Presbyterian Ministers of New-York, it is true, looked with some alarm at the prevalence, in many of the New-England Churches, of certain opinions, which they deemed of dangerous tendency to the interests of true religion—opinions which they judged to be not only a deviation from the faith of the ancient Puritans who planted those Churches, and from the acknowledged Standards of all the Churches of the Reformation, but also at variance with the scriptural doctrine. They perceived, with regret, an acute and enterprising people misled with the reasonings of science falsely so called, and growing up in habits of substituting for the forms of sound words, which the Reformers employed in public instruction, the more general and indefinite phraseology, which the loose philosophy of the seventeenth century had rendered current among writers upon moral subjects. They beheld, with anxiety, cur-

rency given, in their country, and among a people so closely connected with them, to those indistinct notions of theology which are commonly denominated Hopkinsian tenets.

Dr. Hopkins first embodied into a system of theology, otherwise Calvinistic, a few of those opinions borrowed from the ancient Controversialists of the European continent. Who could see, without concern, the Pastors of the Churches professing to believe (and probably sincere in their profession) with such men as Calvin, Ursinus, Owen, and Edwards, while, in the very important articles of Christian doctrine, they differed entirely from those eminent men, and while they cherished sentiments which had been, often, before exposed and refuted by the word of God, although to them they now appeared in all the charms of novelty? It must, however, be confessed, that if we find no new ideas in the system of Hopkinsianism, as at present existing, we do behold the long line which separated the most extravagant Supralapsarians from the disciples of Arminius, so turned and twisted together, by ingenious hands, as to make both extremes meet and adhere.

There were, indeed, certain existing circumstances, which tended to allay the apprehensions of the Ministers of New-York at the time of which we speak. It was seen, with pleasure, that, in the Eastern States, there was still a great body of pious and intelligent people, strongly attached to the faith of their fathers, who, if they did not oppose the New Divinity, were either not zealous in its propagation, or unacquainted with its peculiarities. The ministers, themselves, were known to be, in general, men of correct habits, and honest designs; and many of them possessed of distinguished talents and piety. They were far from being united in Hopkinsian doctrine. The Lord of the world, too, appeared, from time to time, to shine upon his Churches, in that part, as well as in other parts of our country, and to give them awakening and refreshing seasons, owning with his blessing those plain truths which flowed from the heart in despite of the obliquities of intellect occasioned by the perplexed subtleties of misguided reasonings. There was, moreover, ground to hope, that through the

instrumentality of the many excellent and distinguished Divines, who then served the Church in the city of New-York, their people would be so well indoctrinated, and so habituated to primitive truth and order that no apprehension could exist of a speedy defection from the faith. No human sagacity could have foreseen the change which was brought about in a very few years in the ministry of the Churches in this city.

The Rev. Dr. Rodgers, Dr. Livingston, Dr. M'Knight, Dr. Linn, Dr. Abeel, and Dr. Miller, were removed by death, or called to occupy important stations in other parts of the Church. Since their day, all efforts to preserve harmony in doctrine, or establish reciprocal and confidential friendship have failed.

Discord prevails, and the spirit of private party succeeds to the place of *practical* disinterestedness. Symptoms of this state of things have existed for several years. These came first into notice in the dissolution of what was called the Clerical Association, and afterward in the extraordinary prosecution carried on against the author of *THE CONTRAST* of Calvinistic and Hopkinsian doctrines, the Rev. Ezra S. Ely, before the Presbytery of New-York. The unhappy effects of party spirit appear in the alienation of Christian affection; and in the disruption of the ties of former friendship. There are instances of Christians who, in the day of their anxiety for the consolations of the grace of God, unbosomed their feelings to certain pastors, and derived instruction and comfort from their doctrines, who, now, have enrolled their names with the Hopkinsian band, in publicly denouncing their former friends, as men of an *intolerant spirit, resolved to burden the Church of Christ with incoherent and unintelligible dogmas*; while it is acknowledged that these ministers preach and teach the same doctrines which they have uniformly taught from the commencement of their public ministry. *Tempora mutantur et nos mutamur cum illis.*

The history of the rupture, to which the pamphlets before us refer, is short. Mr. Samuel Hanson Cox, whose trials for license before the Presbytery of Philadelphia were arrested on

account of some Hopkinsian tenets, was, under the patronage of the Rev. Gardiner Spring, passed through the Presbytery of New-York : and his patron, who had him some time under his own tuition, was desirous to find him employment and a salary. Mr. Spring accordingly proposed Mr. Cox to the Young Men's Missionary Society of New-York. The Committee of Missions, intrusted with the power of examining candidates, thought proper to examine Mr. Cox before they would recommend him to the service. Mr. Spring, at that time Chairman of the Committee, proposed an examination by proxy ; and offered himself as the substitute for his pupil, Mr. Cox.* The Committee, with some reluctance, accepted the offer ; examined the teacher for the taught ; but did not sustain the examination. The Chairman, as was very natural, was displeased with this decision : his personal friends in the Society took it as an insult ; and defied the Committee and their friends to public combat. The Hopkinsian doctrines were of course made the subject of controversy. The Society decided in favour of the Calvinistic system, and Mr. Spring and his friends seceded, and organized an opposition Society, appointing Mr. Cox forthwith their Missionary.

The first of the two pamphlets before us, is written in a style of impassioned declamation, and not very courteous. We quote from page 16, in which, it would seem to us, as if the writer, in order to effect a very splendid peroration, had collected all those energies which had been awakened during the struggle which he had with mighty men of "intolerant bigotry," who had "cloven the temple with a ruthless blow."

"It has been an event which in prospect we deplored, and which in its approaches has been resisted by every expedient which truth and charity could dictate. It has been a struggle for all that

* This is an instance of extraordinary tactics. Should the example be followed by the Colleges and the Courts, we should have an able set of examinations, but probably a feeble set of licentiates. We do not know which is most to be esquired, the assurance which should propose to examine the tutor for the pupil, or the tameness which would submit to such absurdity. Happily in this case the precedent is not dangerous, seeing the teacher himself did not stand the test.

is dear in religious liberty. It has been a conflict for gospel truth. It has been the birth-pang of the daughter of Zion for the souls of the *Heathen*."*

The writer proceeds, and lifting up the mantle of a late distinguished orator of our own city, upon an occasion of almost equal importance, he exclaims,

"The agony is over. We are troubled on every side, yet not distressed; we are perplexed, but not in despair; persecuted, but not forsaken; cast down, but not destroyed. Though disfranchised, we inherit; though excommunicated, we commune; though amputated from the body, we hold the head.—It is of little purpose that we should be thought to have gained the victory; it is sufficient to have gained a release from that spirit of intolerant bigotry to which we are willing to bid adieu for ever."—*Brief View*, p. 16.

All this is very fine; but really it does not appear to us that the *agony is yet over*, with the mind which dictated such a rhapsody, merely because the Young Men's Missionary Society did not sustain Mr. Spring's examination, and give an appointment to Mr. Cox. We cannot consent to have any voluntary association of gentlemen considered as persecutors of others, merely because they employ in their service only those whom they themselves approve.

The other pamphlet which lies before us appeared some weeks after the first. It is written in a plain style, with a mild spirit, and very much in the manner of a man of business, who prefers the simple truth, in relating his story, to any effort at producing stage effect. There is nothing like a haughty or intolerant disposition, nothing like *agony*, or even recrimination, displayed in its composition. Indeed the Hopkinsian party must have expended all their patience, and the old Calvinists all their intolerance, before they commenced writing their respective histories; for it is obvious, from a comparison of the style and the statements of the two pamphlets, that all the *tameness* is with the latter party, and all the *ferceness* with the former. Appearances, however, we confess, are often deceptive; and it is not always the stroke, which is accompanied

* Mr. Cox was sent to preach to the people of New-Jersey.

with the greatest flourish and the most noise, that cuts the deepest.

There are some statements of matter of fact, in the two documents under review, which would, at first, leave the impression on the mind of the reader, that one of the parties had done violence to the ninth commandment. There are indeed frequent contradictions; but it is possible, perhaps, and, surely, it is desirable, if possible, to account for them, without any implication of veracity. We shall at any rate make the attempt.

“Circumstances of no equivocal import very early indicated that there were some *unhappy jealousies* in the Board of Directors on the subject of Christian Theology—These *miserable jealousies* had *never slept*.”—*Brief View*, p. 4.

“The spirit of unanimity did not appear to have forsaken us. Especially in the Board of Directors, the members seemed to feel as brethren. The majority felt *no jealousies*, nor *suspected them* to exist in the minority.”—*History*, p. 7.

Here is, no doubt, a contradiction: but we think it is more apparent than real. Jealousies are well described, by the one party, as *sleepless, unhappy, and miserable companions*. Whether this description proceeds from experience, or an abstract knowledge of the operations of the human mind, its accuracy is unquestionable. Ambitious and restless men are doomed in providence to such unhappiness; and if the simple and unsuspecting are generally worsted by their adversaries, they seem to us, upon the whole, to have quite as much felicity as designing men. There is some truth in the old proverb, *Honesty is the best policy*. Of the problem before us, rather than suspect the veracity of either statement, we would give a hypothetical solution. If one of the parties happened to be conscious of jealousy, and felt the accompanying misery, it was natural to infer that the other was jealous also. What more natural, for one who distrusts himself, than to imagine that he is distrusted by others? The History before us seems to justify our hypothesis, by mentioning that the Rev. Mr.

Spring expressed his willingness to receive the first article of the original constitution, *putting his own construction upon it.*

Every set of words may be safely subscribed by any man, who is permitted, whatever may be their ordinary meaning, to attach his own ideas to them : but there must be some jealousy where there is a consciousness of equivocation ; and might it not then have been written in truth, " These miserable jealousies had never slept ?"

" They entreated them not to lose sight of the grand object of the institution, and forget the claims of the *perishing Heathen.*"

Brief View, p. 10.

" It was determined" (at the separation of the Young Men's Missionary Society from the New-York Missionary Society) " that the efforts of the former should be directed towards the destitute *Whites in any part of our country*, where missionary service should be thought most useful."—*History, p. 6.*

Here too the contradiction may be only apparent : for by the right of construction the American whites may be denominated Heathen.

" The Rev. Arthur J. Stansbury had called upon the Rev. Mr. Mathews, and stated, that having been disannexed from his former pastoral charge, he was at that time without regular employment as a minister. A mission for some months in the employment of the Young Men's Missionary Society was proposed to him, and he immediately signified his consent, should the Board think proper to appoint him. It was replied, that he would be proposed, and with that expectation he left the city."—*History, p. 8.*

In contradiction to this statement, the opposite party affirm, that

" The object to be secured by the majority, was *not the appointment of Mr. Stansbury*, so much as the rejection of Mr. Cox."

Brief View, p. 5.

Here, to be sure, the parties are at issue. The one affirms, and the other denies. It would appear to us, with no other aid than common sense to guide us, that Mr. Mathews knew best what conversation he had himself held with Mr. Stansbury : and that of course the charge brought against him and

his coadjutors, by the New Association, has really no foundation in fact. But, yet, with the right of construction, the whole may be explained away.

It is often good policy to provide before-hand a door of escape from dilemmas or other difficulties : and there is no method so well calculated to answer this purpose, as to be in the habits, on all very important occasions, of using equivocal expressions ; or, in case the form of words be definite, to assent to them with a secret reservation. One is, in this way, always left at liberty, notwithstanding contracts, to use his time, his property, and his other talents, for the *general good*, without involving himself in what are termed inconsistencies.* This is the mode of reasoning by which they, who would set aside as sinful, the exercise of the private affections, and resolve all virtue into a regard for *abstract being*, satisfy themselves while overlooking whatsoever is included in punctuality to *pledged veracity*. If this plan of action were to become general, it is obvious there would be an end to all leases, deeds, mortgages, and titles whatsoever ; there would be an end to all creeds, and confessions, and bonds, and contracts, and bargains, and commerce ; an end to the marriage covenant itself, to all personal confidence, and, of course, to civilized society. It is probable that Godwin, himself, intended that this rule of virtue should be confined to those master spirits who are qualified to be the guardians of *general being*, and so should be at liberty to dispense with the ordinary laws of morality : and we think that every member, even of the New Society, exercising for *himself*

* "Why should we observe our promises? The only answer that can be made is, because it tends to the *welfare of intelligent beings*. Can my engagement always render that which before was injurious, agreeable to, and that which was beneficial, the opposite of duty? *Promises are*, absolutely considered, *an evil*, and stand in opposition to the genuine and wholesome exercise of an intellectual nature. If, therefore, right motives and a pure intention are constituent parts of virtue, promises are clearly at variance with virtue. Every promise is considered as given under a reserve for unforeseen and imperious circumstances. *Every engagement*, into which I have entered, an adherence to which I shall afterwards find to be a material obstacle to my utility, *ought to be violated*."—*Godwin's Political Justice*.

the right of mental reservation, would be satisfied that his *associates* were explicit in *their* declarations, and true to *their* engagements with *him*.

Among the positive contradictions, in the statement of facts, which appear upon comparing these two pamphlets, the most extraordinary, and the last of which we shall take notice, is that which respects an appeal to the Holy Scriptures. An attempt, in this age of Bible Societies, to proscribe the sacred volume, by forbidding quotations from it in proof of Christian doctrine, is so very great an absurdity that it is difficult to believe any Protestant Minister could be guilty of such an insult to any Christian Assembly. It would have been impious to wish for such proscription; and it is a bold impiety which would express publicly such a desire.

“They (the Hopkinsians) were not a little surprised to hear a reverend gentleman of the majority (the Calvinists) rise and express his hope, that if any person should introduce arguments from the Bible in support of his positions, he should be considered out of order. Nor was their mortification diminished, to hear another reverend gentleman of the majority concur in this extraordinary proposal.”—*Brief View of Facts.* pp. 12, 13.

This is the charge; and an extraordinary one it is. We disclaim entirely, as the representatives of the orthodox in this good city, every man capable of making such a proposal: for assuredly he is unworthy of a rank among the witnesses of the Reformation. The charge is, indeed, denied by the Calvinists, in pp. 20, 21, of the History: and the best solution which we can give of the contradiction is a reference to the right of construing words differently from their ordinary usage.

We cannot close our remarks upon the documents before us, without adverting to the charge of intolerance, urged so *fiercely* by the new Society against the old, and repelled so *softly* by the latter. “Sectarian prejudices”—“The littleness of party distinctions”—“The spirit of alienation and bigotry”—“That spirit of intolerant bigotry,” &c. &c. are the phrases by which the Hopkinsians describe the disposition of the Calvinists in New-York in the years 1816 and 1817. Had we lived at a

distance from New-York, without any knowledge of the vigilance of its magistracy, and the excellence of its police; had we been ignorant of the abundant peace in which every religious denomination lives with every other, we should be alarmed at such representations, lest something like the revocation of the edict of Nantes, another St. Bartholomew's, or the massacres of Nismes, might approach our doors. When, however, we reflect, that nothing more has happened, than that some religious young men assembled peaceably for deliberation upon missionary plans, refused, upon examination of the Rev. Mr. Spring, to vote that he is orthodox, and so appoint his pupil, Mr. Cox, to a mission, we confess that we feel some surprise that any one should raise the cry of persecution in our city.

Besides, it is manifest, that they who gave the alarm were themselves the aggressors. The Young Men's Missionary Society were originally a Calvinistic association. Their Constitution is Calvinistic. The minority urged the appointment of Mr. Cox; they proposed that he be examined by proxy; they urged upon a reluctant majority the debates about doctrine; they urged on to every step; and then, because the minority could not persuade the majority to relinquish their own sentiments, they are posted up before the world as *intolerant bigots*; and the new Society appeal, to that public, for the compassion due to a persecuted people. There may be some art in this kind of management; but it is unworthy of those who act for eternity.

The history of those arts, which avail for some immediate temporary purpose, is confessedly of less consequence, than the statement given of Christian doctrines. Principles are permanent. We see with regret, that in one of these pamphlets a caricature is given instead of a fair statement of Calvinistic principles: and that in the other the error is not sufficiently corrected; nor is the evangelical doctrine maintained, with all that energy, which we had a right to expect on the occasion. It is painful to be under the necessity of repelling unjust accusations; and as the mistatement of the doctrines

taught in the Presbyterian Churches in this city comes before the public sanctioned by respectable names, a Review of them is indispensable. It is questionable, indeed, whether all, whose names, as officers, managers, and honorary directors, of what is, strangely enough, called The Evangelical Missionary Society of Young Men, are published with the Constitution, gave their assent to charges so indelicately, as well as unjustly, preferred against several members of the Presbytery of New-York, and against all the ministers of the other Presbyterian Churches, in the pamphlet called a Brief View, &c. We know many of those men, whose names are annexed to this work: we love them; and we feel confident that, individually, they are incapable of misrepresentation and calumny: and yet, collectively, they seem to have yielded the sanction of their names to a charge which implicates all the ministers referred to, in very high crimes—*with local intolerance, resolved to burden the Church with incoherent and unintelligible dogmas.* As if they could not be satisfied with this *general* charge, so courteously preferred against their friends and their pastors, they descend to *specifications*, and, in six distinct propositions, proclaim to the world the faith of them whom they oppose. We transcribe them, *verbatim, in perpetuam rei memoriam.*

1. "*We actually sinned in Eden, six thousand years before we were born.* 2. The inability of the unregenerate to comply with the terms of salvation, is the same as their inability to pluck the sun from his orbit. 3. The depravity of man *destroys* his accountability. 4. The atonement is made exclusively for the elect. 5. The elect are *invested* with a title to eternal life, on principles of distributive justice, and that while *destitute of regenerating and sanctifying grace.* 6. The Christian's love of God is founded in *selfishness*, as completely as the miser's love of gold." *Brief View*, pp. 6, 7.

These propositions are all distinctly expressed: but as it happens, that, with the exception of one, they are charged erroneously upon the ministers of New-York, it might be deemed sufficient to declare that this is the case. The 4th is the only one of the six that is true. All the rest are CARICATURES;

and the fact of charging them, upon any one to whom they are intended to apply, is calumny. The 4th is true, and the charge is just. "The atonement is made exclusively for the elect." This doctrine, however, is taught, not with an intolerant spirit, but with love and delight; not as a burden to the Church, but as a matter of joy unspeakable, and full of glory. It may be called a *dogma*, it is true; but we cannot conjecture what they have done with their own intellect, who declare the proposition, in itself, "incoherent or unintelligible." Few words are more *easily* understood, or, in fact, *better* understood, by friends and foes, than these words, "The atonement is made exclusively for the elect." The proposition, moreover, which the Hopkinsians oppose to this, appears itself rather more to deserve the character of incoherent and unintelligible. It is in these words, p. 7. of the Brief View, "The atonement is unlimited in its nature, and limited only in its application." We doubt very much whether any two men in New-York would agree, without previous concert, in declaring the meaning of these expressions. Were they asked, what is atonement? What is the nature of Christ's atonement? How is that nature unlimited? What is the application of the atonement? How comes that which is in its nature unlimited, to be limited in its application? What is the use or worth of the unapplied atonement? We suspect, even the Hopkinsians would be puzzled in giving intelligible and coherent answers. Let them make the experiment. By examining one another they can test the truth of this remark. If we understand the meaning of the assertion, "the atonement is *limited* in its application," it amounts to this, the atonement is applied exclusively to the elect; and in that case we are furnished with this contrast.

<i>The Calvinistic Principle.</i>		<i>The Hopkinsian Principle.</i>
Christ <i>made</i> atonement exclusively for the sins of the elect of God.		The atonement made by Christ for sin is <i>applied exclusively</i> to the elect of God.

Now we wish to know what but obscurity or evasion is gained by the Hopkinsian statement? It will be granted, that Christ

is God *manifested in the flesh*—omniscient, unchangeable, and omnipotent. Therefore, if Christ's atonement is *applied exclusively* to the elect, it was *designed* to be so applied. It was unchangeably and *eternally purposed*, that Christ's atonement *should be limited, in its application*, to the elect. Christ, in making the atonement, and God the Father, in providing his Son to make atonement, *determined that it should be applied, exclusively*, to the elect. Is not, then, *the whole benefit* of Christ's atonement *limited*, in the purpose both of God and of Christ, to the elect? And what atonement is that which is not applied, which never was intended to be applied, which is without any use in the Christian system? Is this the Hopkinsian atonement?

We urge this point no further: but we will not close the Review, without warning the Presbyterian Churches of New-York of their danger from party spirit. A day of trial approaches. Adherence, faithful adherence, to the attainments of the Reformation, is, under the blessing of God, the means of escaping with safety. Let every one make it his business to inquire with diligence, and maintain truth with fidelity. Truth is not local. Country and kindred are, without truth, of no avail to the salvation of the soul. The Fathers of the Church call upon us to imitate their example, and to improve the inheritance transmitted to us. The pastors and the people are united by the bonds of the word of God and their Confessions of Faith. By these, let them try every doctrine. Let them oppose innovations with discretion and firmness: *for thus saith the Lord, Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls.*

distance from New-York, without any knowledge of the vigilance of its magistracy, and the excellence of its police ; had we been ignorant of the abundant peace in which every religious denomination lives with every other, we should be alarmed at such representations, lest something like the revocation of the edict of Nantes, another St. Bartholomew's, or the massacres of Nismes, might approach our doors. When, however, we reflect, that nothing more has happened, than that some religious young men assembled peaceably for deliberation upon missionary plans, refused, upon examination of the Rev. Mr. Spring, to vote that he is orthodox, and so appoint his pupil, Mr. Cox, to a mission, we confess that we feel some surprise that any one should raise the cry of persecution in our city.

Besides, it is manifest, that they who gave the alarm were themselves the aggressors. The Young Men's Missionary Society were originally a Calvinistic association. Their Constitution is Calvinistic. The minority urged the appointment of Mr. Cox ; they proposed that he be examined by proxy ; they urged upon a reluctant majority the debates about doctrine ; they urged on to every step ; and then, because the minority could not persuade the majority to relinquish their own sentiments, they are posted up before the world as *intolerant bigots* ; and the new Society appeal, to that public, for the compassion due to a persecuted people. There may be some art in this kind of management ; but it is unworthy of those who act for eternity.

The history of those arts, which avail for some immediate temporary purpose, is confessedly of less consequence, than the statement given of Christian doctrines. Principles are permanent. We see with regret, that in one of these pamphlets a caricature is given instead of a fair statement of Calvinistic principles : and that in the other the error is not sufficiently corrected ; nor is the evangelical doctrine maintained, with all that energy, which we had a right to expect on the occasion. It is painful to be under the necessity of repelling unjust accusations ; and as the mistatement of the doctrines

taught in the Presbyterian Churches in this city comes before the public sanctioned by respectable names, a Review of them is indispensable. It is questionable, indeed, whether all, whose names, as officers, managers, and honorary directors, of what is, strangely enough, called The Evangelical Missionary Society of Young Men, are published with the Constitution, gave their assent to charges so indelicately, as well as unjustly, preferred against several members of the Presbytery of New-York, and against all the ministers of the other Presbyterian Churches, in the pamphlet called a Brief View, &c. We know many of those men, whose names are annexed to this work: we love them; and we feel confident that, individually, they are incapable of misrepresentation and calumny: and yet, collectively, they seem to have yielded the sanction of their names to a charge which implicates all the ministers referred to, in very high crimes—*with local intolerance, resolved to burden the Church with incoherent and unintelligible dogmas.* As if they could not be satisfied with this *general* charge, so courteously preferred against their friends and their pastors, they descend to *specifications*, and, in six distinct propositions, proclaim to the world the faith of them whom they oppose. We transcribe them, *verbatim, in perpetuam rei memoriam.*

1. “*We actually sinned in Eden, six thousand years before we were born.* 2. The inability of the unregenerate to comply with the terms of salvation, is the same as their inability to pluck the sun from his orbit. 3. The depravity of man *destroys his accountability.* 4. The atonement is made exclusively for the elect. 5. The elect are *invested with a title to eternal life, on principles of distributive justice, and that while destitute of regenerating and sanctifying grace.* 6. The Christian’s love of God is founded in *selfishness, as completely as the miser’s love of gold.*” *Brief View, pp. 6, 7.*

These propositions are all distinctly expressed: but as it happens, that, with the exception of one, they are charged erroneously upon the ministers of New-York, it might be deemed sufficient to declare that this is the case. The 4th is the only one of the six that is true. All the rest are CARICATURES;

and the fact of charging them, upon any one to whom they are intended to apply, is calumny. The 4th is true, and the charge is just. "The atonement is made exclusively for the elect." This doctrine, however, is taught, not with an intolerant spirit, but with love and delight; not as a burden to the Church, but as a matter of joy unspeakable, and full of glory. It may be called a *dogma*, it is true; but we cannot conjecture what they have done with their own intellect, who declare the proposition, in itself, "incoherent or unintelligible." Few words are more *easily* understood, or, in fact, *better* understood, by friends and foes, than these words, "The atonement is made exclusively for the elect." The proposition, moreover, which the Hopkinsians oppose to this, appears itself rather more to deserve the character of incoherent and unintelligible. It is in these words, p. 7. of the Brief View, "The atonement is unlimited in its nature, and limited only in its application." We doubt very much whether any two men in New-York would agree, without previous concert, in declaring the meaning of these expressions. Were they asked, what is atonement? What is the nature of Christ's atonement? How is that nature unlimited? What is the application of the atonement? How comes that which is in its nature unlimited, to be limited in its application? What is the use or worth of the unapplied atonement? We suspect, even the Hopkinsians would be puzzled in giving intelligible and coherent answers. Let them make the experiment. By examining one another they can test the truth of this remark. If we understand the meaning of the assertion, "the atonement is *limited* in its application," it amounts to this, the atonement is applied exclusively to the elect; and in that case we are furnished with this contrast.

<i>The Calvinistic Principle.</i>		<i>The Hopkinsian Principle.</i>
Christ <i>made</i> atonement exclusively for the sins of the elect of God.		The atonement made by Christ for sin is <i>applied exclusively</i> to the elect of God.

Now we wish to know what but obscurity or evasion is gained by the Hopkinsian statement? It will be granted, that Christ

is God *manifested in the flesh*—omniscient, unchangeable, and omnipotent. Therefore, if Christ's atonement is *applied exclusively* to the elect, it was *designed* to be so applied. It was unchangeably and *eternally purposed*, that Christ's atonement *should be limited, in its application*, to the elect. Christ, in making the atonement, and God the Father, in providing his Son to make atonement, *determined that it should be applied, exclusively*, to the elect. Is not, then, *the whole benefit* of Christ's atonement *limited*, in the purpose both of God and of Christ, to the elect? And what atonement is that which is not applied, which never was intended to be applied, which is without any use in the Christian system? Is this the Hopkinsian atonement?

We urge this point no further: but we will not close the Review, without warning the Presbyterian Churches of New-York of their danger from party spirit. A day of trial approaches. Adherence, faithful adherence, to the attainments of the Reformation, is, under the blessing of God, the means of escaping with safety. Let every one make it his business to inquire with diligence, and maintain truth with fidelity. Truth is not local. Country and kindred are, without truth, of no avail to the salvation of the soul. The Fathers of the Church call upon us to imitate their example, and to improve the inheritance transmitted to us. The pastors and the people are united by the bonds of the word of God and their Confessions of Faith. By these, let them try every doctrine. Let them oppose innovations with discretion and firmness: *for thus saith the Lord, Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls.*