

UC-NRLF



B 3 379 437

Angels Devils
Shed

REESE LIBRARY

OF THE

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

Received May 1884

Accessions No. 25149 Shelf No.



Angels 700

UNIV

Accession





LETTERS

TO THE

REV. WILLIAM E. CHANNING, D. D.

ON THE EXISTENCE AND AGENCY

OF

FALLEN SPIRITS.

BY CANONICUS.

Recd. Thos. Channing
11

No demonstration can be stronger than this; God hath said so, therefore it is true.—CHILLINGWORTH.



Boston :

T. R. MARVIN, 32, CONGRESS STREET.

SOLD BY CROCKER AND BREWSTER, PEIRCE AND WILLIAMS,
HILLIARD, GRAY, LITTLE, AND WILKINS, BOSTON :

J. P. HAVEN, AND J. LEAVITT, NEW-YORK.

1828.

DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS.....TO WIT :

District Clerk's Office.

BE it remembered, that on the twenty third day of October, A. D. 1828, in the fifty third Year of the Independence of the United States of America, THEOPHILUS R. MARVIN, of the said District, has deposited in this Office the Title of a Book, the Right whereof he claims as Proprietor, in the Words following, *to wit* :

Letters to the Rev. William E. Channing, D. D. on the existence and agency of Fallen Spirits. By Canonicius. No demonstration can be stronger than this ; God hath said so, therefore it is true.—Chillingworth.

In conformity to the Act of the Congress of the United States, entitled " An Act for the encouragement of learning, by securing the copies of maps, charts and books, to the authors and proprietors of such copies, during the times therein mentioned ;" and also to an Act entitled " An Act supplementary to an Act, entitled, An Act for the encouragement of learning, by securing the copies of maps, charts and books to the authors and proprietors of such copies during the times therein mentioned ; and extending the benefits thereof to the arts of designing, engraving and etching historical and other prints."


JNO. W. DAVIS, { *Clerk of the District
of Massachusetts.*

25149

CONTENTS.

LETTER FIRST.	<i>Page.</i>
Introduction. Statement of subject,	5
LETTER SECOND.	
Preparatory Argument,	12
LETTER THIRD.	
Scriptural Argument commenced,	15
LETTER FOURTH.	
Scriptural Argument continued,	24
LETTER FIFTH.	
Scriptural Argument concluded,	49
LETTER SIXTH.	
Recapitulation. Philosophical Argument. Objections considered,	65
LETTER SEVENTH.	
Inferences. Conclusion,	77
NOTE A.	
The Jewish belief in the existence of Satan not "a fiction of Oriental Mythology,"	97
NOTE B.	
Consistent Rationalism denies all angelical existences, .	99
NOTE C.	
English Unitarian views of the temptation, devil, &c. . .	100

NOTE D.	<i>Page.</i>
American Unitarian Canon of Inspired Books,	108
NOTE E.	
The credulity and tendency of Rationalism,	122
NOTE F.	
Priestley. Eichhorn. Calvin. The effect of Liberal sentiments in Switzerland, and of Evangelical senti- ments in Great Britain,	123
NOTE G.	
References to passages of the New Testament, asserting the existence of Evil Spirits,	129
NOTE H.	
Reason—its province and use. Judge Story,	129
NOTE I.	
Are Unitarians Universalists?	134
NOTE J.	
Are Unitarians Christians?	146
NOTE K.	
Books specially deserving attention,	154



LETTER I.

Rev. and Dear Sir,

THE present is a day of free inquiry. Our creed cannot now rest on authority, but on argument. The subject about to be examined, which constitutes one article in "the popular creed," you will, doubtless, think of importance, of great importance, if the view here taken be correct; and even if this view be erroneous, it is surely important to disabuse the public mind of an error so long and so generally prevalent.

But you will ask, "Why are these letters addressed to me?" The question is a fair one, and shall have a frank answer. Your high standing in this community, your acknowledged talents, your various learning, your cultivated taste and extended influence, point you out as the proper person to be addressed, that any misstatement of facts or fallacy of reasoning may at once authorise and invite from your able pen prompt and certain refutation. Another motive, I am free to state, is the influence of your name in arresting attention and inviting inquiry. The simple fact, however, that you have long been known as an intelligent and influential advocate of Unitarianism, would of itself justify the course I have taken. To whom could I so appropriately address a series of Letters, controverting the opinions of Unitarians on an important subject, as to the most influential of the Unitarian clergy? Another reason, however, for this course will soon be

apparent, which, if well grounded, will not only justify, but render imperative the selection of Dr. Channing as the individual to be addressed.

Without further preface, I shall proceed to a consideration of the subject which is now to be discussed. I am about to present a simply scriptural argument *in proof of the existence of a mighty fallen Spirit, called Devil or Satan ; and of his agency and influence in this world.* The subject thus presented is uncommon, and will, no doubt, with many, be unwelcome and unpopular. But you, my dear sir, and the writer, together with his Unitarian and Orthodox readers, will all agree in this, that the uncommonness or unpopularity of the views presented, either singly or combined, will afford no proof, nor presumption even, that they are untrue. The truth or falsity of our religious views must be decided by another standard than popular opinion. "To the law and to the testimony," is our ultimate, and on this subject, our only appeal. The scriptures, fairly interpreted, are the only legitimate source of evidence to which the nature of the subject admits of an appeal. On a subject relating to the invisible world, its existences and influences, the Lord from heaven—the divine teacher, and those illuminated by his Spirit, are the only admissible, because the only competent witnesses. We wish to know what the Lord Jesus, and John, and Peter, and Paul believed and taught ; not what Plato or Cicero imagined, or Farmer or Edwards asserted. Quit the scriptures, and "shadows, clouds, and darkness" envelope at once all our speculations, not only on the immortality of the soul, but on all questions relating to immaterial and spiritual existences. We shall see, however, as we proceed, that reason does teach and can teach nothing contrary to the declarations of inspired wisdom, relative to the beings and influences of the unseen world.

I assume at the outset of this discussion what you, doubtless, will readily grant, that you give, and acknowledge yourself bound to give, implicit credence to what the Bible plainly declares,—declares not in a solitary, isolated, doubtful text, or in a few scattered, uncertain passages, but plainly, repeatedly, explicitly. I shall omit, on the immediate subject of these Letters, all arguments from the Old Testament, not because that was a revelation “adapted to the infancy of our race,” for “all scripture,” an inspired apostle, referring to these very books, says, “was given by inspiration of God,” who surely would not deceive in the *infancy* any more than in the *manhood* of our race, (if such terms have any meaning;) but because the Saviour and his apostles have more fully revealed the fact of diabolical existence and agency, and thus authenticated previous revelations, rendering “assurance doubly sure.”

Before we proceed farther, it will be necessary to prepare the way for the discussion, by a statement of those views, which to the writer appear alike unscriptural and untrue. Whether they are so or not, is the question at issue. Unitarian views on the existence and influence of evil spirits, have recently been more fully developed, I believe, in this country, than heretofore. The following extract from a communication in the *Christian Register* for December 22, 1827, gives us to understand, at least, what Unitarians do not believe on this subject. It is part of a review of Dr. Beecher’s missionary sermon, and is all that relates to this topic. “The sermon departs from the true missionary spirit, in making *erroneous representations of religion*. It asserts, as an undeniable fact revealed in the scriptures, the notion which was grafted upon the purity of the Jewish faith from the fictions of oriental mythology, that the world is under the dominion of a presiding spirit, who divides the empire with the

only God ; and that without his agency it is as impossible to account for the modifications of evil among men, as it would be to account for the origin of the material world, without the existence of an Intelligent Mind. We say nothing of the truth or falsehood of diabolical agency, but we do say, that a man advanced beyond the simplest elements of theology, who asserts this doctrine, as an acknowledged principle of revelation, and of such evident truth, that, without it, 'the Bible is one of the most deceptive books ever written,' displays a carelessness, or a hardihood of assertion, that excites our unaffected amazement, and is utterly inconsistent with the spirit of fairness and good faith, which lies at the foundation of the missionary cause. Did not the preacher know, that theologians inferior to none in extent of learning, deep research, ardent piety, and studious attention to the word of God, have been unable to discover the doctrine there ? How could he then declare, that, if these minds had been successful in their investigations, 'the Bible is one of the most deceptive books ever written.' We know not this gentleman's views of the sacred volume, but, with our views, no temptation could induce us to stake its veracity on the truth of any doctrine which was not, explicitly, revealed ; which men, studious of its contents, have believed it did not contain ; and men, studious of nature have utterly denied."

The style, the talent, the glowing eloquence, no less than the adroitness and the *tact*, to mention no other qualities, of the whole piece, point to the practised hand of a master. If it be not from the pen of the gentleman to whom these letters are addressed, it is just what might have been expected from Dr. Channing. Published in the Register under the circumstances mentioned, it is evidently an expression of Unitarian opinion. If, however, I have misjudged as to its real author, this will not

affect the question at issue between the parties. The piece thus published, no one can doubt, is intended as an expression of Unitarian views. No Unitarian has questioned the soundness of those views. Am I not authorized, through this discussion, to take this communication as a recorded, recognised expression of Unitarian opinion on this subject? Notwithstanding the Ciceronian expression, "we say nothing of the truth or falsehood of the doctrine of diabolical agency," it is very plain that the writer says and intends to say something, and that something is a plain denial of the doctrine. This doctrine he distinctly calls "a fiction of oriental mythology," and traces its history by telling us, that it "was grafted upon the purity of the Jewish faith?"* All we have to do with this quotation now, however, is to fix on the precise meaning of the author. It is evident that *he does not believe in the existence of any invisible, superhuman, evil agent, having influence over himself or others.*

Let me now ask Unitarians generally, do you believe in the actual existence of a mighty fallen spirit, who seduced our first parents from their allegiance to God, and still continues tempting men to sin, and thus plunging them deeper and deeper into misery? I might have divided this question, but I prefer putting it in this shape first; and if you say *No*, as I expect you will, is that answer the result of the theological tenet attached to it, *the doctrine of the fall*? If so, do you believe in *the actual personal existence of the devil and his angels*, abstracted from all questions of influence, past or present? Is not your answer still the same, *No*? I wish to state your views with perfect fairness and precision, so that in my subsequent remarks I may neither do you injustice, nor combat "a man of straw." Unless I am misinform-

* See note A.

ed, and I have taken some pains to learn the truth, Unitarians, as a body, deny not only the actual agency, but the personal existence of the devil and his angels. This, to preserve even the show of consistency, they must do. Surely, if the scriptures teach the existence of mighty fallen spirits, they teach, with no less clearness, their agency in this world, their influence over men. With the writer of the article quoted above, you do not believe in any invisible superhuman evil agent, having influence over yourselves or others. You do not believe in any such agent. You do not perceive or feel any such existence or influence. You do not believe the scriptures teach any such fact; therefore you do not believe the fact. Is not this your state of mind, fairly expressed, so far as negatives can express it?

But the scriptures assert, or at least *seem* to assert, not only evil agency but personality of evil agency, that is, a real devil, an actual Satan. How do you and your teachers get over assertions of this sort *often made* in the word of God? There is, no doubt, some theory, some mode of interpretation on this subject, which satisfies the inquisitive among Unitarians. Many may throw the whole subject by as unworthy of a thought, taking it for granted, that their *no* belief is *sound* belief. Some may consider it one of the "vexatious questions" more easily asked than answered. Others may think these expressions an allegorical mode of asserting something which they cannot define, but consider an "oriental fiction." Still, among *rational*, unshackled inquirers, there is, doubtless, some explication which removes the difficulty that is thought to embarrass the commonly received opinion. The Rev. Mr. Ware in his discourses* calls "Satan, the personified principle of evil." How far Mr. Ware speaks the opinions of American Unitarians on this subject is

* Second edition, p. 118.

left for inference. But as this is the interpretation of the same word, and also of the word devil, throughout the Improved Version, it may fairly be presumed that the approved Unitarian explanation of these words is contained in the expression "principle of evil." If I knew of any other explanation more or less plausible, I would give it. This discussion may not be wholly useless, if it tend to enlighten us as to the opinions held by different parties or individuals on this subject. If any Unitarian shall think that his opinions or those of his friends, are not properly stated, I trust he will find an excuse for the writer in the want of explicitness on this topic in American Unitarian writings. Priestley, Belsham, &c. are not oracles for consultation, or at least their responses are not allowed to be authoritative on this side the Atlantic. And it certainly is unfair to attribute to an opponent, sentiments, which he does not, or we do not know him, to believe. The opinions of the Orthodox on the subject in question, are sufficiently explicit. Unitarianism, so far as it is known to have taken any positive shape, is embodied in the phrase already quoted, "principle of evil." Permit me to ask you, my dear sir, do you not assent to this interpretation of your brother in the ministry, and of Unitarian expositors generally? I also desire every reader of these Letters, before he proceeds farther, to settle in his own mind and for his individual satisfaction, the precise import of the words, Satan, Devil, &c. so often used in the New Testament.

The writer is not ignorant of the difficulties, which either do, or are supposed to attend this subject; nor of the names that may be brought to bolster up a denial of what the scriptures, left to the plain import of language, evidently teach. In the discussion, however, on which we are about to enter, all names and all authority will be thrown aside, except the authority of those names, to

which Unitarians and the Orthodox attribute inspiration. Unitarians will, of course, be the last to reject the grand Protestant principles, *the sufficiency of scripture, and the right of private judgment*. To these scriptures, with what judgment we possess, let us now appeal.

LETTER II.

Rev. and Dear Sir,

I REMARK that the Bible reveals *the existence of good spirits, angelic natures, sent forth to minister to the heirs of salvation*. This position is analagous to the main one I shall take, and will tend to introduce, illustrate, and confirm it. These spirits not only exist, and take an interest, but are actually concerned in the government of this world. For proof of this, I simply ask, who walked with the three children of Israel in the fire? Who is Gabriel, sent to Daniel, to Mary and others? Who is "*Michael, that great Prince that standeth for the people of God*?" Who were the multitude of the heavenly host, attendant on the angel that announced the advent of the Saviour to the shepherds in Bethlehem? Who strengthened Jesus, when he fainted in the garden? Who are the twelve legions of angels, that he might have commanded at any moment? Who were the shining ones, that rolled away the stone from the sepulchre, and there appeared to the disciples and the women? Who told the apostles, that in like manner Jesus should return, as they had seen him taken up into heaven? Who opened the prison doors by night, and brought the apostles forth and

said, "Go, stand and speak in the temple to the people all the words of this life?" Who smote Peter, sleeping between two soldiers, bound with two chains, saying, "Arise up quickly, and the chains fell off from his hands, and the iron gate opened to them of his own accord?"

In these passages a visible, perceptible, angelic agency is asserted. But is such an agency never invisible and imperceptible? Does any one doubt it? Read the sixth chapter of the second book of Kings. The king of Syria had sent horses and chariots, and a great host, to seize Elisha. The servant of the man of God trembled when he saw the city thus encompassed, and said, "alas, my master! how shall we do? And he answered, fear not: *for they that be with us are more than they that be with them.* And Elisha prayed, and said, Lord, I pray thee, open his eyes, that he may see. And the Lord opened the eyes of the young man; and he saw: and behold, the mountain was full of horses and chariots of fire round about Elisha." The imagery, here attributed to the spiritual world, was probably drawn from the visible horses and chariots, which encompassed them. The actual fact, however, of invisible *protectors* and protection, is distinctly asserted. So true is it, that "the angel of the Lord encampeth round about them that fear him, and delivereth them." Should any one suppose the import of these passages doubtful, because the one is figurative and the other poetical, to remove such doubts, only one passage more need be quoted. This is from an argumentative epistle. "Are not the angels all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for those, who shall be heirs of salvation?" This passage is thus rendered by Professor Stuart; "Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to assist those who are to obtain salvation?" But enough. You believe in good angels.* You believe also in gradation

* See note B.

of rank among them, angels and archangels, and in their interposition in the affairs and the government of our world. All this, American Unitarians, unless I greatly err, believe plainly revealed, or at least, have not denied to be plainly revealed. But I ask you, sir, and your Unitarian brethren, if you are conscious of any such guardianship, protection and influence as is positively asserted in the passage last quoted? According to Unitarianism, recently developed, there is no such thing as future eternal punishment. Some incorrigible offenders may, perhaps, be annihilated, but most will be restored to purity and to heaven, either during the course of this life, or by the disciplinary, reforming power of punishment in the life to come. The great mass of human beings during all past ages, and of those now upon the stage, whatever may be their character, must ultimately, according to this theory, be "heirs of salvation." But the "heirs of salvation" "have angels ministering to them," or assisting them in obtaining this unspeakable blessing. Are the great mass of men conscious of such ministration? Will they not pronounce these "angel visits" very "few," and so "far between," that not even one can be recollected? Have the "men, studious of nature," found or believed in such an influence from the invisible world for even the best of our race?

But lest you should be dissatisfied with this view of the subject, let us look at it from another quarter, and with a different light.

Unitarians, while they deny the personality and agency of the Holy Spirit, yet believe, or profess to believe in a divine influence of some kind, expressed by the terms, grace, Holy Spirit, &c. by which men are assisted in forming habits of virtue. But is not this influence imperceptible? Is it not, though experienced, yet *unfelt* by its subject? But does that affect its reality? Certainly not.

Neither does the fact, that the agency of angels in ministering to the salvation of men is imperceptible, affect its reality. Will not all agree, then, that whatever beneficial influence is exerted in behalf of our race, either by the Father of our spirits, or by those unseen messengers that fly to do his will, is exerted in such a way, so exactly according to the principles of our nature and the laws of mind, as to be imperceptible? It does not at all interfere with our own activity or accountableness. The fact of its existence is beyond the province of unassisted reason to discover, and is to be believed, like the facts of a future resurrection and a general judgment, *simply because revealed*.

Let the reflecting reader carry these last remarks along with him in the discussion before us.

LETTER III.

Rev. and Dear Sir,

HAVING thus prepared the way for the discussion, I now assert, and shall endeavor to prove, *that the Bible, plainly and unequivocally reveals the existence of evil spirits, one of whom, called Satan or Devil, being represented as leader of the rest; and reveals also the fact, that they possess and exercise a great and terrible influence over men.*

It has been seen that American Unitarians, generally, believe, or do not deny the existence of good, while they do deny the existence of evil spirits of a loftier order than our race. Does the inquiry suggest itself, why is it that

men readily believe in a heaven, and as readily *disbelieve* a hell,—willingly believe in *good* angels, but *deny* the existence of *bad* ones? What is the explanation of this, but that men love to have it so, and easily believe or disbelieve what they wish? Is not this a general principle of our nature? Is it not strongest, when least perceived? And may it not be operative in the present, as in other questions? Selfishness would feel, and of course would offer no objections to a companionship and brotherhood with Gabriel. But what principle of humanity would recognise an intimate alliance with Satan? It is a logical maxim, quicquid recipitur, recipitur ad modum recipientis, which may be freely rendered, *our belief is shaped and coloured by our desires*. Let us now attempt to lay aside our wishes, and decide on the question before us from arguments addressed to reason, discarding prejudice and all preconceived opinions, and believing the simple testimony of Him, who was, and is the truth, who knew the truth, and has plainly revealed the truth.

Let us now proceed to examine the testimony and the witnesses to be adduced.

The first argument in proof of diabolical existence and agency, is the fact, that *Christ himself was tempted, and put to exquisite suffering by Satan*. Matthew, iv. 1—11. “Then was Jesus led up of the Spirit into the wilderness, to be tempted of the devil. And when he had fasted forty days and forty nights, he was afterward an hungred. And when the tempter came to him, he said, If thou be the Son of God, command that these stones be made bread. But he answered and said, It is written, man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God. Then the devil taketh him up into the holy city, and setteth him on a pinnacle of the temple, and saith unto him, If thou be the Son of God, cast thyself down: for it is written, he shall give his

angels charge concerning thee ; and in their hands they shall bear thee up, lest at any time thou dash thy foot against a stone. Jesus said unto him, It is written again, thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God. Again the devil taketh him up into an exceeding high mountain, and showeth him all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them ; and saith unto him, All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me. Then saith Jesus unto him, Get thee hence, Satan ; for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve. Then the devil leaveth him, and behold, angels came and ministered unto him." Compare Mark, i. 13, Luke, iv. 1—13.

Whatever difficulties, real or imaginary, may attend the subject of "the temptation," the actual existence of a mighty evil spirit is plainly asserted. No American critic has yet ventured to deny, that, when angels are said in this passage to have come and ministered to Christ, personal existence, attributes, and actions, are ascribed to them.* They really approached and served their Lord, whom "all the angels are commanded to worship." Putting other passages of scripture out of the question, as equally in favor of angelic and diabolical existence, what is the evidence from the above quotation in proof of the existence of angels ? It is found in a single verse, and a solitary assertion. Angels came and ministered to him ; the devil came and tempted him. If the passage stood thus, the evidence for angelic and for diabolical existence would be equal. But how stands the evidence now ? Through the whole passage, not only personal names, devil, Satan, the tempter ; personal actions, coming, talking, quoting scripture, reasoning ; but all the ingenuity of artifice which can be imagined as belonging to the

* What, according to Unitarian exposition, can the assertion "angels came and ministered unto him," mean ?

great enemy of mankind, is employed to accomplish his diabolical purpose. Jesus is hungry ; the devil knows it and says, " here now is an opportunity, if you are what you profess to be, to show your power. Make bread of this stone." " Man shall not live by bread alone." " You claim God for a protector. Cast yourself from this pinnacle, and see if his angels will take charge of thee." " Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God." " Here are all the kingdoms and riches and glory of the world. They are mine. Only fall down and worship me, and they shall be thine." " Get thee behind me, Satan. To God only belongs worship." Having thus assailed Christ through the most importunate of sinless appetites, and through the strongest principles of humanity, the love of riches and power and glory, and having been thwarted in each attempt by an " it is written," " it is written," " it is written," the devil leaveth him, and angels came and ministered unto him. Is there not as much evidence in this passage of the existence of Satan, as of good angels ? If the existence and agency of the former must be explained away, on what principle can the existence and agency of the latter be allowed ? I wish you, my dear sir, and every Unitarian reader of these Letters who professes to think for himself, to say whether you are prepared to adopt a principle of interpretation, which not only denies the existence of Satan but of *Gabriel also*. Let him who doubts it, *suppose* for a moment, that there is a mighty evil spirit, whose great desire was to divert Christ from the purpose of his ministry ; and suppose him to have approached Christ with this intent, could words and actions more appropriate and in character, have been selected ? Are there any characters drawn by Shakespeare more exactly " in keeping," than those of Christ and Satan, as drawn by the publican, Matthew ? Reflect on the immensity of interest staked at this moment, when the second Adam

was thus assailed by "the prince of this world," and say if the *very grandeur of the conception* does not substantiate and authorize the common interpretation? But, not to rely on this, does not every mind on first reading this passage, believe the existence of an evil spirit to be *asserted*? Does not the most intelligent mind, reading it for the hundredth or thousandth time, believe such an existence *asserted*, whether he believe the *fact* of such an existence or not? Would not every one believe the *fact*, were it not for certain philosophical or moral difficulties thought to attend the subject? Will these difficulties be removed, and the whole subject cleared up, by turning the concrete into the abstract, "Satan" into "the principle of evil," to accommodate German Neology, and American Unitarianism? to meet the opinions of Professor Semler and Rev. Mr. Ware? Will it not require a stretch of even "rational" credulity to believe, that "the principle of evil" should say, or be represented as saying, "all this power will I give thee, and the glory of them; for that is delivered unto me; and to whomsoever I will, I give it: if thou therefore wilt worship me, all shall be thine"? Was Christ, "full of the Holy Ghost," tempted to fall down before, and to worship the abstract principle of evil? Can any believer in revelation, possessing an iota of reason, believe this? But not to dwell too long on a difficulty which meets us at the outset, and will not be found to lessen as we advance, is not the first part of this argument made out, to wit, *that Christ was tempted by Satan?**

* The intention of the writer is, that while this discussion assumes a popular shape, it shall have an immovable foundation in the soundest criticism. No quotations, however, will be made, except from the common version, for these reasons, first, that every one has access to that in an intelligible shape; and, secondly, that the result of the severest critical examination is an establishing, beyond dispute, of the common text as genuine in all the passages on which any reliance is here placed. No Unitarian critic will attempt to evade the

Let us consider the proof of the other part of the proposition, *that Christ was also put to exquisite suffering by the tempter*. After the devil had departed from him, no other mention is made of any such temptation through his whole life, till near its close, when he makes this remarkable declaration, "Hereafter I will not talk much with you, for the prince of this world cometh, and hath nothing in me." John, xiv. 30. Can any one doubt that by "the prince of this world" Christ meant "Satan," "the devil," "the god of this world," "the prince of the power of the air," "the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience"? Christ was "holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners," "knew no sin," was "without sin;" was he then tempted by "the principle of evil"? Even on the supposition of some Unitarians, that he was a "fallible and peccable man," according to all known principles of human nature, and the well established constitution of the human mind, he had now acquired a fixedness of principle, and elevation of moral character so

force of the following arguments by appealing to "various readings." Some *principle of interpretation* must be hit upon to undermine their foundation, or the question must be given up. I shall hereafter prosecute this investigation, as though no other book were in being except the New Testament in plain English, with, perhaps, a very few exceptions; one of which refers to this first quotation from Matthew. The full strength of argument by which this passage proves the position taken, cannot be perceived by the mere English reader. The word here translated "the tempter," is of peculiar structure and significancy in the original, and may be pronounced *untranslatable*. It is a present participle with the masculine article prefixed. Gerard, in his *Institutes of Biblical Criticism*, treating on "the usage of particles" has this rule, (913) "the article prefixed to a participle present, often makes it to denote a character, an employment, a habit of life or a general state of being; and that, not only absolutely, or relative to the present time, but also with respect to the past or the future." Under this rule he adduces ten illustrations, the first of which is that of the word in question, which he thus translates: "he, whose character, custom, employment it is, to tempt." The same word is translated by Storr in his *Elements of Biblical Theology*, vol. ii. page 20, "he, who is in a habit of seducing to sin." Gerard is of high authority in the Theological School at Cambridge. Storr is from the Codman press at Andover. Both of these writers, particularly Storr, have been considered in Europe and America, as having attained, at



heroic and sublime, as to bid defiance to all those temptations which can be supposed to spring from evil principle. Have you ever reflected on the agony of Christ in the garden, when the sweat fell from him, "as it had been great drops of blood"? Why the earnest entreaty, "let this cup pass from me"? Why this extremity of agony during the whole of the passion? What occasioned it? Socrates died not thus. Washington died not thus. Dr. Payson died not thus. Multitudes, of the tenderest years and of the most delicate sex, have been broken upon the rack or consumed in the flames, and come off conquerors and more than conquerors, rejoicing to suffer affliction, rejoicing to die for the name of the Lord Jesus. Was Christ less innocent, less noble, less capable of endurance? Was there not a struggle with "the powers of darkness"? "with spiritual wickedness in high places"? "Forasmuch, then, as the children were partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same, that through death he might destroy him, who had the power least, to "the simplest elements of theology." Their testimony to the force of language according to Greek usage, coinciding in the present case, gives them an authority with all parties, which it will be difficult for the most tortuous and remorseless criticism to resist or evade. If words can mean any thing definite and certain, "the tempter" in this passage means, according to these critical philologists, "*an agent, whose unceasing occupation it is to tempt to sin.*" Let him who can, evade the force of this, by showing it to be a principle of Greek usage, to predicate abstract existence of the masculine article prefixed to the present participle. I have referred to but two authorities on this subject, though a host might be mentioned of philologists, commentators, and critics, all in unison on this point. But Gerard and Storr, having lately issued from the American press, are accessible to all, and of ample authority. It may be well to state here, once for all, that many pertinent, as well as many more doubtful proof texts, will be wholly omitted. Of the latter, the Lord's prayer affords a well known and striking example. The clause "deliver us from evil" is ambiguous in the original, and may mean, as in the common version, from the evil principle, or from the evil one. The word is in an oblique case, and may be derived from either a neuter, or a masculine noun. No dependence could be placed on such a word, and in the present discussion, there is no necessity for thus misplacing it. Even the univocal passages must be decimated, to bring the subject within proper limits.

of death, that is, the devil." Heb. ii. 14. "Having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a show of them openly, triumphing over them in it," (that is, by his *cross*, his death.) Col. ii. 15. "For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil." 1 John, iii. 8. The preceding passages show how—*by his death*. Is there any other rational interpretation than that just given? Christ was innocent, perfect, was to suffer for a limited and *short* time, and on the third day to rise again. All of this he knew. What so dreadful in this, if barely or chiefly to attest the truth of his mission, and the doctrine of a resurrection and a future life, that he could not meet it "like a man," and rise above the mere physical suffering he would now endure? Rather was not this, as he himself has assured us, the hour of his earthly enemies, and *the power of darkness*? Was he not at this time so "forsaken of his Father," that he suffered all that could be inflicted by him "who has the power of death, that is, the devil;" "whose works he came to destroy," and whose power and dominion at this hour, trembled and were broken? This is an intelligible and rational explanation of this great and momentous subject. This view of the passion of Christ does not exclude, but may very properly include all suffering he may have endured from his clear perception of the evil of sin, and of its tremendous consequences; all suffering of a vicarious nature, with which it pleased the righteous Judge of the moral universe "to bruise Him, by whose stripes we are healed." That he, however, suffered at this moment "hell torments," we do not for a moment believe. Innocence can *never* endure the agony of remorse, or feel the stings of personal guilt, or suffer the burning torture of an accusing conscience. Holiness can never, till the principles of mind and the laws of moral agency are completely subverted, endure

the same kind of suffering with unholiness. The sufferings of Christ sprung from a different source. The passages just quoted, point out this source, it is believed, with great distinctness. Not a gleam of light breaks in upon this subject from any Unitarian hypothesis.

The prince of this world, then, tempted Christ, entering on his ministry, and agonized him, (so to express it,) finishing it. At these two periods we might, *a priori*, expect the enemy of all goodness, if ever permitted to assail the Prince of Peace, to be awake to the dangers of his kingdom, and active to prevent its overthrow. The commencement and the completion of the great work of redemption, were epochs too marked not to call forth all the art and the venom of the powers of darkness. *If Christ, if spotless perfection, could be thus tempted and caused to suffer, what shall we think of those in whose mortal members sin reigns, whose hearts are evil only, and continually ?**

* See note C.

LETTER IV.

Rev. and Dear Sir,

My second argument is, that *Christ himself repeatedly and explicitly taught this doctrine.*

I. He taught it *to the Jews at large, as a people.*

Proof. John, viii. 44—48. “Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do: he was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own; for he is a liar, and the father of it. And because I tell you the truth, ye believe me not. Which of you convinceth me of sin? And if I say the truth, why do ye not believe me? He that is of God, heareth God’s words: ye therefore hear them not, because ye are not of God. Then answered the Jews, and said unto him, say we not well, that thou art a Samaritan and hast a devil?” See the whole chapter. It contains an account of one of the most extended conversations between the Jews and our Saviour, which the Holy Spirit has put on record for our instruction. If we can, by any strength of prejudice or ingenuity of supposition, doubt, after reading it, whether Jesus really meant to assert the fact of diabolical existence and agency, let us for once fancy ourselves wholly divested of our Christian birth and education, feelings, opinions, and prejudices. Let imagination annihilate eighteen centuries, and place us in the midst of this perverse and querulous group. What are the opinions of this multitude whom the Saviour is addressing? They are mostly, if not all, of the sect of the Pharisees. They believe in evil spirits of different orders and influence. They pride themselves on their lineal descent from Abra-

ham. Jesus denies that they are truly the children of Abraham, possessed of like faith, feelings and character. "No. Your real father is one whom you are little disposed to own. Ye are of your father the devil, and his lusts ye will do. Who of you ever knew me utter a falsehood? Have I not always spoken the truth? Do I not speak the truth now? Why then do ye not believe me? He that is of God heareth God's words: ye therefore hear them not, because ye are not of God." The Jews are hard pressed by these accusations and arguments. They must evade them. The edge of truth must be blunted. "Say we not well, thou hast a devil?" "I have not a devil; but I honor my Father, and ye do dishonor me. If any man keep my saying, he shall never taste of death." "Now we know thou hast a devil. Even Abraham is dead. Whom makest thou thyself? None but one influenced by a devil could bring such charges against us, the offspring of Abraham, the chosen people of God; and make such pretensions. Thou hast a devil." It deserves special notice, that when Jesus in the 34th verse states the abstract proposition, "whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin," it excites little notice, no rage. When in the 38th verse he gives them to understand that their father and his were different, they forget God and claim Abraham. But when he distinctly asserts their connexion with the devil, then, to evade the accusation, they throw it back upon him. They do not deny diabolical existence, nor raise any cavils about the mode, or the reasons, or the propriety of this invisible influence. They concede all this, but to exculpate themselves, charge him with being instigated by an unseen evil agent. "Thou hast a devil." Was it not incumbent on him, who in this very conversation called upon them to declare if he had ever uttered an untruth, *not to utter one at this moment*? How could he address them, "I tell you the truth when

I say ye are of your father, the devil," in whose personal existence and influence he knew them to believe, when at the same time he knew he was uttering an untruth ; *knew that there was no devil ; that they could not be influenced by any such evil being ; and that their belief was an "oriental fiction" ?* Should the Saviour now ask "who convinceth me of sin ?" the reply would be easy, *the writer quoted from the Register*. "You say there is a devil. You know better. There is none. I do not believe you, because you do not say the truth." If that writer object to this as harsh, or in any way unfair, let him explain how those Jews *necessarily understood Christ*. It is not enough to say, that they sometimes perverted his meaning, wresting it to a sense which he did not intend. What, in the present instance, was the inevitable import of the Saviour's language ? What meaning *did he intend* to convey to the ears of Jews, with their education, opinions and feelings, followers, as they were, of the Pharisees ? I call upon the Unitarian critics, those best skilled in the science of interpretation as stated by Carpenter and Ernesti, to answer these short simple questions ;* *What did Christ, addressing Jews, followers of the Pharisees, mean, when he said, "ye are of your father, the devil" ? What must such Jews have understood him to mean ? What did they mean when they disclaimed such a parentage, and threw a similar charge back upon him ?* The whole subject is here contained in a nutshell. Either Christ did assert to these Jews the existence and influence of a mighty evil spirit, or we must "go the whole" of the accommodation system, as advanced and de-

* Before any gentleman reply to this argument, I would invite him to read Carpenter's introductory chapter to his work on Unitarianism. The principles of interpretation, stated by this writer, are generally correct, and happily expressed. I will only add, if he and his American coadjutors will abide by these principles, the question, as to the existence and influence of evil spirits, is settled.

fended by Semler, in its broadest and most offensive shape.* Every mind, capable of understanding principles and of applying them logically, will see that there is no middle ground here. But, perhaps, some may think that these Jews might not have been all Pharisees, but part Sadducees. Grant it. What difficulty is removed? The dilemma will then be, he either knowingly confirmed an existing false impression, in case they were Pharisees, or asserted for truth what his hearers rejected as falsehood, if they were Sadducees. In the latter case, what room remains for any supposable species of "accommodation"? Let the impugnors of the doctrine asserted, take which *horn* they please, neither will relieve the Saviour from the charge of teaching *falsely*, if he did not teach the existence and agency of evil spirits. From the passage quoted from John's gospel, and from the preceding remarks, these three inferences are fairly deducible.

1. The Jews did not understand the phrase, "servant of sin," that is, of the evil principle, as a perfect synonyme with "child of the devil." It is evident that there was a personality of meaning attached to the latter phrase, over and above the import of the former.

2. The Saviour assumes the fact of the existence of an evil spirit, who was a liar and a murderer (homicide) from the beginning. This fact the Saviour assumes, asserts and reasserts.

3. The existence of such an agent is not denied, but

* The accommodation system represents "*Christ and his apostles as speaking and teaching in accordance with the erroneous opinions of their hearers, and as not expressing precisely and truly their own opinions.*" See Storri's Theology, vol. i. p. 228. For a full refutation of this fundamental principle of infidel neology, see the treatise on "The Historical Sense," by the same able writer. A new and revised edition of this treatise is much needed at the present moment. The learned and industrious translator would add to our many obligations of gratitude, another of no slight weight, by a new edition of that masterly performance.

assented to, and asserted on their part by the irritated and captious Jews.

But if, according to the "rational" interpretation, the word "devil" mean "principle of evil," it will not be easy to clear the Saviour from uttering, or confirming at least, three distinct untruths. He allowed, in this conversation, two falsehoods to pass uncontradicted, and asserted that which substantiated them. Was such the practice of the true and living teacher? Does any one say, "these were a blind, ignorant multitude. They could not know the truth"? The more need, ~~one~~ would think, that their errors should be *rectified*, not *confirmed*. But the fallacy of such an objection will soon be apparent.

II. Jesus taught the same doctrine *to the Pharisees, as a sect*.

Proof. Matt. xii. 22—29. "Then was brought unto him one possessed with a devil, blind and dumb, and he healed him, insomuch that the blind and dumb both spake and saw. And all the people were amazed, and said, Is not this the son of David? But when the Pharisees heard it, they said, This fellow doth not cast out devils, but by Beelzebub the prince of the devils. And Jesus knew their thoughts, and said unto them, Every kingdom divided against itself, is brought to desolation; and every city or house divided against itself, shall not stand; and if Satan cast out Satan, he is divided against himself; how shall then his kingdom stand? And if I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your children cast them out? therefore they shall be your judges. But if I cast out devils by the Spirit of God, then the kingdom of God is come unto you. Or else, how can one enter into a strong man's house, and spoil his goods, except he first bind the strong man? and then he will spoil his house." Compare Mark, iii. 22—27, Luke, xi. 14—26, also Matthew, ix.

32—34. A man possessed of a devil, blind and dumb, had been restored by Jesus to sight and speech. The multitude, astonished at this miraculous display of power, asked, Is not this the promised son of David, the expected Messiah? The Pharisees, indignant that a carpenter's son should be mistaken by the populace for the king of Israel, answer this question by a most malignant charge against Jesus. "This fellow casts out devils, not by divine power, but by the assistance and co-operation of the prince of the devils." Jesus refutes the charge by this argument. "No one will destroy his own power. But Satan would destroy his own power were he to cast out himself. Therefore it is not by the assistance of Satan that I cast out devils. No. It is a stronger than he that hath come upon him. Here now is the proof of my divine mission. If I, by the Spirit of God, cast out devils, then it is plain that the kingdom of God has come unto you, the reign of the Messiah, the mighty descendant of David, under whom Satan is to be crushed, has commenced." Here the Saviour makes the evidence of his messiahship turn on the fact of the subjection of evil spirits to him. This is the very point, the gist of the argument. Did he know it or not? Did the Pharisees thus understand him or not? Was the argument valid or not? Should any one suppose this was an *ad hominem* argument, let him read the record of this conversation as given by the three evangelists. Is there the remotest hint, the slightest ground in their narratives for such a supposition? Is it not an entire assumption? Does not the Saviour address the Pharisees with most evident sincerity and earnestness? Still more, was it necessary to give *additional confirmation* to their error? This, if it were an error, he did according to Luke, xi. 24—26. He here repeats the same doctrine, in entirely different phraseology. On what other occasion did Christ stake the

truth of his mission on an untruth, "an oriental fiction"? In what other case was he so complaisant to the Pharisees, so tolerant of error and falsehood? In the fifteenth and twenty third chapters of Matthew, the reader will find that Christ openly denounced the Scribes and Pharisees, as hypocrites, as fools, blind leaders of the blind, closing with this terrible denunciation, "Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell?" Was this the class of teachers whose errors Christ confirmed in the hearing of "all the people"?

Should a doubt yet lurk in the mind of any one, whether he might not have designed by this argument merely to silence his cavilling and supercilious opponents, no room will remain for such a doubt when we have considered,

III. That Christ taught the same doctrine *to his disciples in private*.

Proof. In Matt. xiii. 24—30, is recorded the parable of the tares, which was spoken in the hearing of "great multitudes, that were gathered together unto him." In 36—39 verses we have this *interpretation of the parable by Christ himself*. "Then Jesus sent the multitude away, and went into the house; and his disciples came unto him, saying, Declare unto us the parable of the tares of the field. He answered and said unto them, He that soweth the good seed is the son of man; the field is the world; the good seed are the children of the kingdom; but the tares are the children of the wicked one; the enemy, that sowed them, is the devil; the harvest is the end of the world; and the reapers are the angels." I ask in the name of reason, of conscience, and of common sense, if words could have been selected more explicit, to express the same truth in the same compass? Words must fail to express ideas, and human language be given up not only as a medium of revelation, but as a medium of intercourse between

man and man, if the Divine Teacher did not, in this *explanation* of a parable, before uttered with intentional comparative obscurity, assert distinctly the existence of an evil spirit, his influence in this world, and the agency of angels at the last day in separating the good from the bad among men.* An accumulation of similar testimony, after an explanation so distinct, so pointed, so express, were a needless waste of time and paper. The mind, which is in a state to resist or *explain away* the explanation already given, would not believe though one were to rise from the dead. In relation to this very subject the Saviour said, "because I tell you the truth, ye believe me not." Is there no reason to fear that a similar charge would still hold good? *The nature of the truth itself is, often, the very reason why that truth is rejected.* The passage quoted from Matthew presents to every mind, on first reading it, *one meaning, and one meaning only.* It admits of no other. This meaning the Saviour expressed to his confidential friends in their retirement, when they had requested him to explain the parable of the tares. There was no possible room for an *ad hominem* argument here. All occasion for obscurity was removed. The apostles express no remaining difficulty as to the parable. It is all cleared up. Philologically considered, this meaning lies on the surface, and pervades the substance of the passage. Those who have studied the scriptures, simply as a record of human opinion, without considering themselves bound to submit to its decisions, have come by general consent to this conclusion, that "*Jesus did mean to teach the doctrine of diabolical agency.*" But he erred. It was however the error of the times, from which it is not rational to expect that any mind should have been entirely free." Whether Amer-

* The following references would confirm, if additional testimony were needed, the position taken. Matthew, xiii. 18, 19, xvii. 19—21. Mark, iv. 14, 15. Luke, viii. 12, x. 17—21.

iean *rational* inquirers are willing to take this ground, remains to be seen. With us it is *now* a question of philology, *what did the Saviour teach?* That made out, the question is allowed to be at an end. What Jesus taught we acknowledge to be true. Philosophy, extraneous to the scriptures, whether skeptical, dogmatical or critical, knows nothing, and can teach nothing upon the subject. The doctrines of the Bible, in relation to the unseen, spiritual, eternal world, are yet held, in the land of the Pilgrims, to be sound philosophy. The private opinion of the Saviour, as divulged to his chosen companions and friends in their most secret retirement, we have found to coincide with the opinion which he openly advanced to the Jews at large, and to the Pharisees as a sect. He did not teach a Pythagorean, esoteric, Eleusinean system of doctrines, to gull and hoodwink the people, while to the initiated he intrusted the key which unlocked the whole mystery. His opinion was not cloaked in ambiguous generalities. It was distinctly uttered, and definitely understood. *Can this be said of all who claim to be Christian teachers?*

Additional proof as to the Saviour's private opinion is unnecessary. Other *related* truths will receive still further elucidation from a passage in the gospel of John. This is a part of his instructions in that solemn interview, which took place just before he was betrayed into the hands of men. The shepherd was about to be smitten, and the sheep to be scattered. Jesus was aware of his approaching end, of the conflict before him, of the agony he was to endure. Though desirous of avoiding, he was still resigned to meet it. "Not my will but thine be done." If ever he was honest and open in his instructions, one would think, from the account given by the apostle whom he loved, that it was on this occasion Jesus unbosomed all his heart to his sorrowing disciples. "I tell you the

truth ; it is expedient for you that I go away ; for if I go not away, the comforter will not come unto you ; but if I depart, I will send him unto you. And when he is come, he will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment ; of sin, because they believe not on me ; of righteousness, because I go to my Father, and ye see me no more ; of judgment, because the prince of this world is judged." John, xvi. 7—11. What does the Saviour mean when he says the Holy Spirit shall reprove or convince "of judgment, because the prince of this world is judged"? Does he here mean "the principle of evil," or an actual person? If the former, what does he mean when he says, the spirit shall convince "of sin"? Does not a plain understanding, or a profound and erudite understanding perceive, that, when the Saviour asserts that the spirit shall convince of sin, of righteousness and of judgment ; adding, of sin, because they believe not on me ; of righteousness, because I go to the Father ; and of judgment, because the prince of this world is judged ; he meant to assert some distinction, some diversity of truth? But according to "the principle of evil" interpretation, the Saviour is unmeaning, or at least tautological in his declarations. A candid mind, unwarped by theory, cannot help seeing that Jesus taught here, as in a multitude of other cases, the existence of a mighty evil spirit, "the prince of this world," "an archangel ruined." This, he solemnly assures his disciples, is one of the doctrines which the Holy Spirit shall specially make known to men. The following remarks by Hess, are well worth the attention and solemn thought of all, whose minds are not yet callous to evidence, who are not yet compromised to party, who are inquiring for truth, and willing to receive it, coming from whatever quarter and with whatever odium. "In this passage, Jesus is not addressing the illiterate populace, but he is speaking to his own apostles.

3*

Nor is he conversing of unimportant opinions which might yet be tolerated for sometime, but of the future preaching of these teachers of the world. Nor is he speaking of certain modifications which the discourses of the apostles might assume from their own infirmities, or of the erroneous ideas of some of their hearers, but of the contents of their gospel, as derived from the Spirit of God, who should teach the truth, regardless of the circumstance whether it accorded with their former ideas or contradicted them."

A third argument is, *The scriptures assure us that Christ possessed and exerted the power of expelling devils from individuals tormented by them.*

Proof. Matthew, iv. 24. "They brought unto him all sick people that were taken with divers diseases and torments, and those that were possessed with devils, and those that were lunatic, and those that had the palsy; and he healed them." viii. 16. "They brought unto him many that were possessed with devils; and he cast out the spirits with his word, and healed all that were sick." Mark, i. 34. "He healed many that were sick of divers diseases, and cast out many devils; and suffered not the devils to speak, because they knew him." iii. 11. "Unclean spirits, when they saw him, fell down before him, and cried, saying, thou art the Son of God." Is this the same "principle of evil" that, in the account of the temptation, is supposed to have called upon Christ to fall down and worship it? In the preceding quotation, it is intelligent, but speechless; it is here both obeisant and communicative. In each case there is a striking external appearance of personality. The artless historians, or rather this abstract "principle" has a wonderful aptitude, it must be confessed, for keeping up this fabulous verisimilitude. It is done to the life. But to proceed with the evidence. Luke, iv. 40, 41. "Now when the sun

was setting, all that had any sick with divers diseases, brought them unto him ; and he laid his hands on every one of them, and healed them. And devils also came out of many, crying out and saying, Thou art Christ the Son of God. And he, rebuking them, suffered them not to speak ; for they knew that he was Christ." How did disease, or evil principle, which are generally thought modifications of matter or of mind, rather than subjective of intelligence itself, know this great truth, that Christ was the Messiah ? A truth, unknown to the Scribes, and the Pharisees, and the High Priest, and the Sanhedrim, and the wise men, and the rulers, and the mighty men of the age ; a truth, revealed to Simon Barjona, not by flesh and blood, not by any human intelligence or instrumentality, but by the Father, who is in heaven ? Or how should maniacs and lunatics, who had been thus for a "long time," know him to be the Messiah ? The whole ministry of Christ, from his baptism to his crucifixion, is not thought to have exceeded three years. Let the reader examine the recorded cures of demoniacs, and say whether appearances warrant the belief that their insanity was, at the utmost, of only three years' duration. This supposition will throw all these cures into the last year of Christ's ministry, a supposition plainly untrue. Many of them occurred in the early part of his ministry, probably, much the largest number of such cures were effected in the first eighteen months of it. But what shall we say of the young man, whose cure is recorded in Mark, ix. 17—29 ? His father, when asked by Jesus, how long is it ago since this came unto him, replied, *of a child*. This was one of the most violent cases recorded in the gospels, yet of the same general nature with others. "Jesus rebuked the foul spirit, saying unto him, Thou dumb and deaf spirit, I charge thee come out of him, and enter no more into him ; [did Christ secure immunity from subsequent dis-

ease ?] and the spirit cried and rent him sore and came out of him." Does this look like the cessation of merely natural disease ?—Again, did the maniacs *ever* mistake either of the 82 apostles and disciples for the Messiah ? How should madmen always have judged thus correctly ? A large number of passages like those already quoted must be wholly omitted ; as also a multitude of particular cures, such as that of the two men among the tombs, of the daughter of the Syrophenician woman, &c. &c. each of which, if closely examined, would of itself, establish the position taken as beyond the possibility of rational doubt. The forecited passages from Matthew, Mark, and Luke, are however amply sufficient, and at once, short, pertinent, and conclusive. In these passages, the fact, that Christ expelled demons, devils, or evil spirits, is expressed in language so diverse and varied, generic and specific, as to admit of no doubt *what the writers intended to assert*. If the testimony is intelligible, are the witnesses credible ? *The authority of the witnesses*, it is believed, is the only reason why doubts, as to the import of their testimony, were ever expressed. Over similar language in Philo or Josephus, the veriest tyro could not stumble. Were such miracles ascribed to Apollonius of Tyana, and not to Jesus of Nazareth, who would doubt as to their meaning ?*

A fourth argument is, *The scriptures declare that Christ communicated this power of expelling demons to his apostles, and that they repeatedly exerted it*.

Proof. Matthew, x. 1, 8. " And when he had called

* Beausobre, in his Remarks upon the New Testament, says, " some think these, (the demoniacal possessions,) were natural diseases, though the causes were unknown. To this opinion I subscribe. My reason is, that the miracles of our Saviour, who cured them, will appear to be more wonderful (plus grands) on this than on the other supposition. Which is the greater miracle, for intelligent beings to obey a command of Christ, or for him to cure diseases by his simple word ?" Strange as it may seem, Lardner countenances this " rational" mode of interpretation. Any one who wishes

unto him his twelve disciples, he gave them power against unclean spirits, to cast them out, and to heal all manner of sickness and all manner of disease. . . . Heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, raise the dead, cast out devils, freely ye have received, freely give." Compare Mark, iii. 13, 14, vi. 7, 13. Luke, ix. 1. Two remarks suggest themselves on these passages. Does any one suppose that when Christ selected his apostles and sent them forth, commanding them to "cast out devils," he intended to impart to them *merely the power of curing natural diseases, whether of a more or less aggravated nature?* Besides the want of evidence for such a use of language, the awkwardness of such an expression, and the needless repetition of ideas, which that interpretation would force upon the commission, there is another answer to the objection, less apparent at first, but not less conclusive. This extensive commission, "heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, raise the dead and cast out devils," is, according to the three evangelical historians, limited to the twelve apostles. But in Luke, tenth chapter, we read that "the Lord appointed *other seventy also*, and sent them two and two before his face, into every city and place whither he would come. . . . And into whatsoever city ye enter and they receive you, eat such things as are set before you ; *and heal the sick that are therein*, and say unto them, the kingdom of God is come unto you." That is, in other words, "be content with your fare, heal all the diseases you meet with, and preach the reign of the Messiah." "Heal the sick that are therein," is as general, as unfit for a medley of learning, ingenuity, contradiction and absurdity, will find it in Lardner's four sermons on demoniacs. He acknowledges that *the apostles actually believed in demoniacal possessions ; and that Christ knew better, but did not rectify the error.* Dr. Lardner was a learned, and somewhat ingenuous Unitarian. He seems to have believed in the existence of Satan, yet, from his qualified use of language, it is somewhat doubtful what he *really* believed, and what he only said in reference to the prejudices of his hearers and the times.

limited a commission as could have been issued for the purpose of curing simply natural diseases. So these disciples understood it. But it is very plain that they did not think it communicated to them the ability of ejecting evil spirits. For we read in the same chapter, that “the seventy returned with joy, saying Lord, *even the devils are subject unto us* through thy name.” It is evident that these disciples had unexpectedly found themselves in the possession of miraculous powers, greatly beyond the letter of their commission, and rejoiced in the discovery. This certainly would not have been the fact, had they understood this commission originally in the sense now controverted, i. e. *had they understood the commission, “heal the sick that are therein,” to have involved the power of casting out evil spirits.* There could have been no occasion for them to express their *joyful surprise* to Christ, on finding that they possessed *simply the powers they knew to have been delegated to them.* To have done this would have been a tacit impeachment of the veracity, or the power of their Lord. But *additional* and *unsuspected* powers, imparted to them through the name of Christ, afforded a *natural* and a *suitable* occasion for an expression of their joy and their surprise. The two expressions in the apostolical commission, “heal the sick, cast out devils,” are not synonymous, neither does the former involve the latter, the disciples being judges. “To cast out devils,” in their judgment, was something different from “healing the sick” of merely natural diseases. Who would best understand the import of their commission, those disciples or modern critics? rather, Christ himself, or the deniers of demoniacal possessions? Had it not been true, that the power of expelling demons was superadded to that of curing diseases, or had it been true that both these were the same, would it not have been natural, nay, would not common honesty and the interests of truth have required

of Christ, when the disciples thus returned, some explanation of his commission, or some correction of their error? Might it not, under such circumstances, have been most reasonably expected, that he would have said to them something like this, "the joy you express is without proper cause. When I sent you forth to cure diseases, your commission was unlimited. How could you be surprised that diseases of any form or of the most malignant nature should be cured, when that was the intent of my commission?" Instead of this, Jesus *confirms* the fact, asserted by these disciples to have occurred beyond their expectation. He said unto them, "I beheld Satan, as lightning, fall from heaven. Behold, I give unto you power to tread on serpents and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy; and nothing shall by any means hurt you. Notwithstanding, in this rejoice not, *that the spirits are subject unto you*; but rather rejoice, because your names are written in heaven."*

A second remark on this apostolical commission is also deserving of notice. "Heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, raise the dead, cast out devils." Here all admit miraculous

* A remark may here be made that, perhaps, will serve to explain a passage of somewhat doubtful import. The twelve apostles and the seventy disciples were commissioned and sent forth *at different times*. There is no evidence that they all knew each other; or if the apostles knew these disciples, they could not have known them to possess the power of expelling demons, as Jesus at this time alone knew this fact. Hence, when "John saw one casting out devils in the name of Christ and forbade him," this may, for aught that appears, have been one of the seventy. As the commission of both classes extended, at this time, only "to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, and they were forbidden to go into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans," the probability is great, that the apostles would have met with some of the disciples in their various, yet limited peregrinations. When the answer of Christ to John is considered, "forbid him not, for there is no man, which shall do a miracle in my name, that can lightly speak evil of me," this probability rises very near to certainty. In the same way we may also illustrate the forecited argument of Christ to the Pharisees, "if I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your children cast them out?" From this passage Storr infers, that "this power of expelling demons

powers were conferred on the apostles, *independent of the voluntary agency of the subjects affected*. “In healing the sick, cleansing the lepers, raising the dead,” the will of the individual, cured, or cleansed, or restored to life, *need not be consulted*. But how stands it with the last particular, “cast out devils”? If this mean cast out “the evil principle,” was this to be done *without the voluntary agency of the persons themselves*? Is it credible that bad men, *very* bad men, were, in the time of Christ, by an immediate act of divine power, altogether independent of their wish and will and effort, yes, contrary to these, *against their express and earnest entreaty*, cleansed of their evil principles? Is this consistent with Unitarian notions of “moral liberty”? Is it consistent with any man’s common sense? Does not the intelligent Unitarian perceive that in adopting such a mode of interpretation, he slides into what he considers one of the most obnoxious tenets of five-pointed Calvinism,—“irresistible grace”? that he *really* destroys free agency, and makes mere physical machines of these men? And if of these, why not of others? Why not of all?

was possessed by others besides the followers of Christ.” But this is neither a necessary, nor a natural inference. Besides, such an interpretation would destroy the whole force of Christ’s argument. Surely if others possessed the power of expelling demons, independent of Christ, his possessing that power would not prove his messiahship, any more than their possessing it would prove their messiahship. The question, “by whom do your children cast them out?” may very naturally mean, according to the well known latitude allowed to those words, *the apostles*—the *disciples*, who were Jews, and, probably, most of them of the sect of the Pharisees, before called to follow Christ. These apostles and disciples would all with one consent, if questioned as to the origin of their power over Satan, have ascribed it to Christ. The appeal then to these eighty two individuals, “they shall be your judges,” known, as they must have been, in different parts of Judea, and probably to many of his auditors, to the Pharisees among the rest, was peculiarly pertinent and forcible. This view gives to the argument an appositeness and force, hitherto in some degree overlooked, and is also simple, natural, and unencumbered with any difficulty. Whether it is the true interpretation, let the reader judge.

From what has been said under this argument, it follows irresistibly, that "casting out devils," whatever it may mean, does not mean "curing the sick" of any simply natural diseases, nor rooting out "the evil principle." What does it mean? "Casting out devils." Nothing more nor less. On the whole subject of demoniacal possessions, I cannot better consult the instruction of the reader, or the strength of my own argument, than by quoting the following passage from Storr.

"Some of the narratives of the influence of demons are of such a nature, that no reasonable exposition can well be given of them, without admitting the reality of demoniacal agency. Such, for example, is the account of the expulsion of the devils from the two possessed men in the country of the Gergesenes. Jesus could not have addressed those demons and granted them permission to enter into the swine, if he had not really regarded demons as the cause of the disease of these individuals. *Otherwise he would have confirmed an error of his contemporaries, not only with words, but actually by the performance of a miracle.* We must carefully distinguish between the expressions, 'curing a demoniac or one possessed of a devil,' and 'expelling demons, or commanding them to depart.' It might indeed be conceded, that, according to the usage of the language, the expression *demoniac*, signified a person affected by a particular natural disease; and that the writers of the New Testament used it in its common acceptation, although that acceptation of the word originated in an erroneous opinion; just as the word *lunatic* could with propriety be applied to a certain species of diseased persons, because, though it originated in error, it had by usage become the customary name of persons affected by a certain disease; and yet it would by no means follow, that the person who thus uses the word in its ordinary acceptation, must have entertained

the erroneous opinion, that the subjects of lunacy were under the particular influence of the moon. Thus, when the astronomer uses the erroneous phraseology, 'the sun rises, or the sun goes down,' no one will think of charging him with holding that vulgar opinion. But if we suppose, that, when Jesus addressed the demons, and when he commanded them to be silent or to depart, he at the same time believed the disease to be entirely natural, and to have no connexion with demoniacal influence; we could not believe that Jesus merely used a peculiar customary expression, which usage had made proper; *but we must believe that he actually confirmed an erroneous opinion by the language which he used.* In reference to the possession, mentioned Matthew, viii. 28, Hess remarks, 'the fact that these demoniacs had, agreeably to the narrative itself, actually been delivered from their affection (v. 32) before anything happened to the herd of swine, proves that it was not the possessed persons who threw themselves among the swine in a fit of madness, but that it was the devils who had been expelled from these persons.' And it is evident from the history of this event, that its object was to expose to view, (in reference to the defence of himself, which Jesus was compelled to make against the most horrible slanders,) the number, *legion*, and malignity of these demons, and their actual, though involuntary subjection to Jesus; and the utmost publicity was given to this matter by the incident of the swine. Relative to the cures of the demoniacs in general, Hess remarks, 'it cannot be denied, that the sacred historians did actually mean vexatious spirits, which grievously oppressed the bodies and minds of men. Agreeably to their intention, therefore, the numerous examples of the cures of demoniacs acquire a peculiar importance, inasmuch as Jesus appears, not only as their deliverer from bodily evil, but as the conqueror of hostile powers from the in-

visible world.' Paulus, in his Commentary on the New Testament, has maintained that 'the cures of the demoniacs were nothing else than *cures of diseases of the mind*, which were effected *by the opinion in the deranged persons*, that the demons which possessed them could not exist near that man of God, the Messiah; and therefore that they must necessarily flee at his approach.' In reply to this, a Tübingen writer justly remarks, 'it is altogether incredible that in so short a time, and in the population of one small country, a mere opinion should of itself, in so many instances, have effected a permanent cure of mental derangement, a disease generally resulting from some radical disorganization of the body; or that in so many cases it should happen, that just at the precise time when Jesus approached such unfortunate beings, the bodily causes of their derangement should in so many instances have spontaneously vanished, and their minds have been restored by mere chance.'"

Such a belief as that attributed to Paulus in the preceding extract, requires a degree of faith "a thousand times greater" than that held by the Orthodox. Yet he considered himself a *most rational* believer. The mode in which these evil spirits were connected with or affected particular individuals, who can define? The fact of such a connexion and such an influence who can deny? "The phrases in which the demons are spoken of, "being in," and "going out," or "being driven out," are used, the first to denote the influence of the demon on the individual, the latter two to denote the cessation or removal of such influence. Christ possessed and employed the power to destroy this visible influence of the devil, in a visible manner. The like power he gave to his apostles, and they also frequently exerted it." Beyond this, to attempt definition, were to be wise above what is written. If the philosophy of the day would allow us to retain the natural distinction

of *final* and *efficient* cause, the quotation above made would show that on the former of these something might be said.

I cannot enter fully into the subject of demoniacs. My argument does not require it. Yet I cannot say that I am satisfied with any exhibition of this subject, which has fallen under my eye. President Appleton has written more logically, and more to the purpose, than any other writer. Yet Lectures, addressed to Under Graduates, would hardly admit a full statement of the subject. He has, however, stated fairly the pretended arguments of Farmer, Lardner, and Sykes, and annihilated them. His amenity of manner is equalled only by the pungency of his logic. Whoever seeks for truth on this subject, may be greatly aided by President Appleton, whose Lectures are less known and read than they deserve to be.

The word translated *devils*, in the plural number, would be more literally rendered by the word *demons*. The question arises, What did this word mean in Judea in the time of Christ? To settle this has called forth much investigation. President Appleton gives the result of this investigation thus: "The word, *dæmon*, is very general, and corresponds, in a great degree, to the English word, *spirit*. It does not designate the moral character to which it is applied. It is used in relation to the supreme God, by Plato and Isocrates. It was used by certain philosophers, and afterward by some of the Christian Fathers, to signify evil spirits of a rank superior to mankind. It was likewise used, and, I apprehend, very commonly, to signify the souls of dead men. The evangelists did not apply the term either in the first or last of these senses, but in the second. They did not assert that demoniacs were disordered by the supreme Deity, or by the spirits of the dead, but by spirits of a malignant character, and of a rank superior to man. The term is not used, there-

fore, in the New Testament, in a sense unknown among the Greeks." President Appleton has given the sense, in which the evangelists used the word, correctly. It may be doubted, however, whether, in classical use, it had not a still greater latitude of meaning than he has assigned it. He, who wishes to know the *whole truth*, must not depend on the authorities cited by Farmer and Lardner, who had a theory to support, but must look *farther*. He should consult the Commentary of Proclus on the First Alcibiades of Plato, which he will find subjoined to Taylor's translation, and especially the work of J. G. Mayer, published at Tübingen, 1780, entitled, *Historia Diaboli*. His first chapter is full of information. In it he treats, to use his own words, *de existentia Diaboli, dæmonumque, nec ex ratione, nec traditione, apud Chaldæos, Persas, Ægyptios, Græcos ut Pythagoram, Platonem, nec ex Judæorum scriptis, sed ex sola revelatione, demonstrabili; contra Adæmonistas crassiores, Sadducæos subtiliores, speciatim Semlerum Tellerumque*.*

I have already endeavored to show, that the explanation of the cures of demoniacs by the curing of simply natural disease, is wholly insufficient. President Appleton has argued the case of the cures of the demoniacs among the tombs, with irresistible effect on every mind, disposed to take the scriptural account to be what it professes to be. See his twenty-seventh Lecture.

I wish to present a somewhat different view of this case, but tending to the same point. This cure is re-

* Those to whom the words, "fictions of oriental mythology," are in the place of sense and argument, might do well to think, and thinking, to answer, *Quid, quæso, communem illam persuasionem, de Deo bono maloque, quorum neuter ab altero dependeat, apud Chaldæos, Persas, Magos, Ægyptios, Chinenses magis peperit, quæ Manichæismi ante Manetem, omnes terras, ad ortum solis et occasum sitas pervadentis, causa exstitit, quam depravata illa de auctore mali traditio?* Whence the Ophiolatry of Ægypt, India, Scandinavia, and Mexico, except from the influence of the Old Serpent, auctor mali?

corded in Mark, v. 1—20. Matthew, viii. 28—34. Luke, viii. 26—36, passages which the reader is requested to examine carefully.

Lardner states three hypotheses adopted to explain the destruction of the herd of swine. Christ either communicated the disease, (*insanity*,) with which the two men were affected, to the swine; or these men drove them down the hill; or evil spirits were cast out of them, and suffered to enter the swine, by which they were driven into the deep. He rejects the first as unreasonable. He adopts the second, as do *rational* christians generally. The Orthodox adopt the third. Let us examine the rational theory. If the two maniacs drove the swine into the deep, (to say nothing of the difficulty [impossibility?] of the attempt, and not to ask what the keepers were about,) *they either drove them before they were cured, or afterwards*. If they drove them before, while they were yet maniacs, why should the people so earnestly have besought Christ to depart out of their coast for curing afflicted maniacs, and *preventing farther mischief*? Was it common in other cases, when Christ had cured the sick, *to beseech him to be gone*? Would it not have been more rational in this instance to have besought him *to stay*? or were they, one and all, *desirous of a further destruction of their property*? If they drove them *afterwards*, were not the maniacs *more insane after their insanity was cured, than while their madness raged*?

From the narrative of the evangelists, it is evident, that the cure, in some degree, preceded the destruction of the swine. There is no hint nor shadow of a hint that the men were themselves the cause of this destruction; still less, if less be possible, that they were this cause after they were restored to "their right mind." This supposition is not only gratuitous and without evidence, but against the whole mass of evidence. Yet Lardner says,

"when he had imagined the thought of gratifying the evil spirits by which he imagined himself to be possessed, with the destruction of the swine, he would without much difficulty drive them off the precipice. [Would two madmen from the Insane Hospital drive two thousand swine off Central Wharf in the presence of "their keepers," "without much difficulty?" Were swine less *contrary* in Judea than in Massachusetts?] If some few of them were put in motion, the whole herd would follow. Nor is it unlikely that the other person, his companion in affliction, joined his assistance; for St. Matthew speaks of two. They invested the herd [this partakes rather of an *Irish* than an Oriental idiom,] on each side and thus drove them before them." Lardner's Works, vol. i, p. 474. All this is *rational*, *very rational*. No one more highly respects the amiable character and extensive acquisitions of Lardner, than the writer. But I must protest against absurdity of explanation even though offered by Lardner.*

The question between the Orthodox and the Rationalists is not *whether these persons were diseased?* It is admit-

* When Peter speaks of "*the angels* who were cast down to hell," the editors of the Improved Version explain the assertion in a note thus, "the spies, who were sent to explore the land of Canaan." Sir William Drummond thinks that Moses in giving an account of the twelve sons of Jacob meant to describe the twelve signs of the Zodiac. Mr. Mitford, the historian of Greece, outstrips Mr. Belsham even in the race of liberality. He not only rejects "the introduction of the gospel of Matthew" and "the proem of John's gospel," and the common interpretation of demoniacs, for all which the English Unitarian Reviewers greatly commend him, but "he justifies Caiaphas, in pronouncing sentence upon Jesus, absolves Pontius Pilate, and concludes that the sacrifice, predestined by Almighty Providence, was accomplished—if not without crime, yet, the signal treachery of one man excepted, without any that we seem warranted to impute." He also justifies the Roman government for persecuting the early christians. Pity it is! that Mr. Mitford cannot antedate his existence by a retro-metempsychosis in the personage of Trajan. He could easily answer the inquiries of a too tender-hearted Pliny in one sentence, "*Christianos illos jugulate.*" Are the improved editors, or Sir W. Drummond, or Mr. Mitford, *most* rational? Will it be believed that Mr. Mitford escapes with almost no Unitarian censure? That he is even hailed as an enlightened advocate of Unitarianism?

ted on all hands that they were afflicted with a dreadful disease. The question is, what was *the nature* of this disease? Was it *a physical derangement only, or the result of possession by evil spirits?* This distinction should be kept in mind, to detect the fallacies of Lardner and Farmer. When Jesus says of the woman, who had been sick eighteen years, "Satan bound her," does it follow that Satan did *not* bind her, because she had been sick eighteen years? Yet this is the species of logic adopted by those celebrated authors. In view of such scriptural statements, as have been exhibited under this and the preceding argument, the Rationalists, to produce conviction in reasoning minds, must adduce some argument more weighty than a *petitio principii*. It should also be remembered, that what in some passages is attributed to evil spirits in general, is, in other places, attributed to Satan in particular; just as the defeats of Burgoyne and Cornwallis were the defeats of King George; and what was done by those Generals was done by their Sovereign, according to the received maxim, *quod facit per alium facit per se*. The scriptures represent Satan as the leader of the fallen hosts. These things kept in mind, the whole subject will be plain.



LETTER V.

Rev. and Dear Sir,

A fifth argument is, *That Christ himself taught concerning evil spirits a continuity of agency, influence and connexion, intelligible only on the supposition of personal existence.*

In the passage from the eighth chapter of John, before quoted, the devil is called by Christ "a murderer," literally a homicide, or in still plainer English, though of precisely the same import, a man-killer. To what incident recorded in scripture can this refer, except to that which "brought death into the world and all our wo"? With what terrible emphasis of truth is it applicable here? Is it necessary to quote other passages of scripture to show that our first parents were tempted to sin by the wiles of Satan? But having tempted men to transgression, is Satan content to resign all further influence over them? Luke, xiii. 16. "Ought not this woman, being a daughter of Abraham, whom Satan hath bound, lo, these eighteen years, be loosed from this bond on the Sabbath day?" xxii. 31. "And the Lord said, Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat." Here various, ceaseless, continued activity is ascribed to something, which looks very like an agent; which, if it have not a personal existence, is of a unique, indescribable, inconceivable character. Was it "disease" of any name or nature, or "the principle of evil" more or less inveterate, or "Sammæl the angel of death," in the popular Jewish mythology, "that desired to have Peter, to sift him as wheat"? Matthew, xxv. 41. "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels." Here the Lord Jesus Christ distinctly asserts, that, at the judgment day,

the impenitent shall be sentenced to an everlasting residence with something. With what? With "evil principle" or "disease" in the abstract? With madness? With epilepsy? With a Jewish mythus? With —? With —? or "with the devil and his angels?" Supply the preceding blanks with whatever explanation or supposition you please, fanciful or philosophical, (which is only another word for ultra-fanciful,) learned or unlearned, will it meet the innumerable and pressing difficulties of the case? Will *any* supposition meet these, *except that of the personal existence of the devil and his angels?* In stating this argument, I have purposely limited it to the *very words of Christ while on earth*, a few of which only have been quoted. The apostles would afford abundant confirmation of it. Considering the early and deadly influence of Satan over Adam, his continued agency in afflicting our race, his seducements in leading men into sin, and the destiny that Christ declares to await the finally impenitent in connexion with fallen angels, we are constrained to pronounce "the Bible one of the most deceptive books ever written" if "Satan" do not mean an agent, and not an attribute; a person and not a quality. This will appear still plainer when we consider,

The sixth argument, *That Christ personally taught the existence of a mighty evil spirit, who occupies a usurped dominion in this world.*

Proof. John, xii. 31. "Now is the judgment of this world; now shall the prince of this world be cast out." xvi. 11. "Of judgment, because the prince of this world is judged." xiv. 30. "Hereafter I will not talk much with you, for the prince of this world cometh and hath nothing in me."

What possible explanation can be assigned to these passages, consistent with a denial of diabolical agency? Can believers in the native original purity, or, what may

more properly be called, the moral equipollence of our race, suppose "the principle of evil" intended here? If so, another corner stone of the Unitarian fabric, if not subverted, receives a severe shock. Can those, who suppose every child now born into the world, as free from every taint and predisposition to sin as Adam fresh from the hand of his Maker, or as the child Jesus when "the magi fell down and worshipped him," believe that "the evil principle" is "the prince of this world?" Has not Dr. Ware proved *to the satisfaction of Unitarians* that simplicity, innocence, virtue, purity, veracity, honesty, love of kindred, and of country, philanthropy, &c. are as natural as the opposite qualities, and far more general? Not only are two truths spoken to one lie, but ten debts are paid to one not paid. Is not man holy and good, or at least as holy and good, as he is unholy and bad? "Of a mixed character?" The good preponderant? Why then should "the principle of evil" be exalted to this bad eminence,—have this monopoly assigned to it, while the principle of *goodness* is forgotten or slighted? Is there not something rather askew here? The different parts of the Unitarian edifice do not tally, or if they do, they require a joiner of greater skill than has yet appeared to put them together, to suit the tenons to the mortises. Is it not a curious fact that different Unitarian interpretations of the words devil, Satan, &c. interpretations of the first authority and most general prevalence, applied to different passages tend at one time strongly to one point of "hateful" Calvinism, *irresistible grace*, and at another time, to another equally hated doctrine of the same "gloomy system," *original entire depravity*? Whence is this? Is this tendency of the Unitarian mode of interpretation stated unfairly? Is not the expression "tend strongly," rather below than above the truth?

But suppose we adopt either of the other *liberal* expla-

nations. Is "disease" so much more prevalent than health, that it deserves to be called "the prince of this world"? "Would you go to a hospital to learn the health of the community?" Had Christ dealt in Grecian, rather than in Jewish mythology, would not his cheerful and complacent spirit have exalted Hygeia to this eminence? Instead of this, can the really enlightened Unitarian believe that he would have given the sceptre to Sammæl or Pluto, the grim king of death? Are such conceptions consistent with his notions of the character of the messenger of glad tidings? Either of the three hypotheses is hemmed in with insuperable difficulties. The attempt to stand *stock still* and say nothing, is the only tenable (because unassailable) position the Unitarian can take. This, however, hardly falls in with the assumed character of those who are leading the age in "the march of mind," *looks bad*, and is scarcely compatible with the *genius loci* of Boston, which has ever been reputed alike inquisitive, intelligent and communicative. These pioneers through the great wilderness of theological science must feel themselves *the forlorn hope* of human illumination. Is any Unitarian satisfied that in the passages quoted "the prince of this world" means "the principle of evil," or "disease," or any merely popular Jewish mythological fancy about the angel of death? It is readily conceded that Sammæl, like Belial or Apollyon, might be another popular name for Satan. But to call this a mere mythus, would be simply *an assumption of the whole subject in debate*. In what sense was disease "judged" or "cast out" by the death of Christ? Was it "the principle of evil" that "came" to Christ, "having nothing in him," and yet so afflicted him as to prevent Christ from "talking much with his disciples"? If this was the season when "the powers of darkness" assailed Christ, as has been already shown, all this is plain and intelligible.

But what can the proof texts quoted under this argument mean, on any Unitarian hypothesis ever yet proposed?

My seventh argument is, *That Christ taught the same doctrine after his ascension to heaven.*

Proof. Acts, xxvi. 16—18. "I have appeared unto thee (Paul) for this purpose, to make thee a minister and a witness both of these things, which thou hast seen, and of those things in the which I will appear unto thee; delivering thee from the people, and from the Gentiles, unto whom now I send thee, to open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, *and from the power of Satan unto God.*" This passage, by itself, affords the same evidence of the existence of Satan as a personal agent, that it affords of the existence of God, as a personal agent. Any interpretation that would turn the word "Satan," into the abstract principle of evil, would turn the word "God," into the abstract principle of goodness. This would drive us to the incomprehensible pantheism, under the less intelligible name, transcendental idealism, of Fichte. In this passage, darkness and light are abstracts and opposites; Satan and God are concretes and opposites. I ask the writer of the article quoted from the Register, I ask the theological students and professors at Cambridge, I ask you, my dear sir, and the Unitarian clergy of Boston and New England, I ask all Unitarians of this land and of every land, *did Christ, in commissioning the great apostle of the gentiles, confirm, from the throne of his glory, an oriental fiction?*

In order to give no offence to the most fastidious critic, the quotations on which the principal reliance has thus far been placed, have been taken, almost exclusively, from the evangelists: still more—from the apostolical gospels of Matthew and John: still more—from those parts of their gospels, which Unitarians allow to have been written by these apostles. There is no dispute as to

the genuineness of the readings. What still adds weight to this selection is, that these quotations are, for the most part, *in the very words of Christ himself*.

The prejudices of those, whose professed reverence for the instructions and doctrines of Christ himself is so great, that they reject a quotation from Paul or Peter as of quite inferior authority, have thus far been consulted in their fullest extent. After this accommodation of ourselves to the views of Unitarians, it is but fair, in adducing further arguments, to take the liberty which the views of the Orthodox on this subject permit. Believing the epistles to be of equal authority with the gospels, and a more systematical revelation and fuller defence of the Christian system, the Orthodox receive whatever they contain, supplemental or explanatory of this system, as springing from the same authoritative origin, *the inspiration of the Spirit of Truth*. They believe the apostle Paul to have spoken *the truth*, when he said to the Galatian churches, "I certify you, brethren, that the gospel which was preached of me, is not after man; for I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, *but by the revelation of Jesus Christ*." They believe, that the epistles of Paul contain the instructions and doctrines of Christ as really as though they heard them from his own lips. What the apostles believed and taught, who did not write gospels, but wrote epistles to individuals, to particular churches, or to the church at large, they think deserves the same attentive deference, that is paid to the four evangelists; especially, believing as they do, that it was not the *unassisted apostles* who spoke and wrote, but the Spirit of their Father, who communicated divine truth through them. If this be a prejudice, yet, having the sanctity of age and the authority of the church universal in all ages, the writer must be excused, if, without further deference to the critical skill of Dr. Priestley, who thinks

the apostles, especially Paul, reasoned inconclusively, or to the conscientious freedom of Mr. Belsham, who does not hold himself bound to believe because they believed, he is unwilling to forego so early, so deep-seated and wide-spread a prejudice, but chooses to summon these witnesses to give their testimony on the subject under consideration. Whether inspired or not, all will allow that the apostles were *quite as likely* to understand the truths they were to teach, and which they actually did teach through a series of years, as any Socinian writers, from the Fratres Poloni to the Editors of the Improved Version. Whether we can understand what they taught, we shall soon have occasion to decide. If our belief must rest on the dictum of any man, the writer is willing to express the strong prepossession, reasonable or *unreasonable*, that one distinct declaration of Paul, would outweigh the most elaborate criticism of Cappe; and that ten verses from Jude, would overturn ten chapters from Lindsey, or even from the estimable and intelligent Lardner. In other words, if I could ascertain the opinion of an apostle, who listened to the instructions, which fell from the lips of Jesus while on earth, or received his instructions from him after his ascension to glory, *that opinion in regard to the spiritual, eternal world, I would prefer to all the speculations of all the schools.* If in this opinion, *all the apostles coincided*, I should consider it just as credible and as certain, as though the voice of the Eternal were to proclaim its truth from the whirlwind or the lightning. No black cloud over the face of day, no tempest of fire and smoke, no thundering in the heavens above, nor shaking of the earth beneath, could add to the certainty of the truth, however they might to the vividness of the impression. If individual and, still more, united apostolical opinion, in reference to the spiritual world, is not of *unquestionable authority*, not only must

the epistles be given up, but the gospels also, and all revelation, and the *possibility* of revelation. In this case, I must become an absolute skeptic, "I must doubt of every thing; yes, of these doubts themselves." I am thrown into a state of more perplexing doubt than Socrates himself. I cannot even *hope* that a divine teacher shall ever come. What that class of Unitarians expect to gain, who, while they profess most sincerely to believe in Christianity as a revealed system of divine truth, give but a partial, forced, unwilling acceptance to the epistles, is more than any of them have yet distinctly informed us.—It would seem, from a recent article in the *Christian Examiner*, that American Unitarianism is about to undergo an unwonted and unexpected transformation.* Paul is apparently about to become a favorite, at least till the epistle to the Hebrews is *uncanoned*. Whether he will retain his hold on Unitarian affections *after that*, considering his "inconclusive reasoning" and the things in him "hard to be understood, which the *unlearned* and *unstable* wrest to their own destruction, *as they do also the other scriptures*," can scarcely be thought problematical. I beg the writer of the article just alluded to, seriously to consider the quotations, which will shortly be made from Paul, from the unquestioned writings of the great apostle of the Gentiles. Paul is not an allegorist. He does not indulge in "allegorical," "mystical," or "merely imaginary senses" of quotations from the Old Testament, or of arguments addressed to Roman, Corinthian, or Ephesian Christians. "We must recollect that the words of Christ were reported from memory by the evangelists, and not always with perfect accuracy." "The evangelists, differing as they do occasionally as to the sense and bearing of these words," and "being all allegorists," "it would not have been strange, if unconsciously and through inadvertence

* See note D.

they had given an allegorical turn, by a slight change of expression, to words, which were used by our Saviour himself only by way of application." Perhaps Matthew and John, with the very best intentions, were not, after all, faithful reporters of what Christ said in regard to the existence and agency of Satan. The medium of communication may have tinged the instructions of Christ with a superadded allegorical sense, which they did not possess when first uttered. But this cannot be said of Paul. He is plain and explicit, indulging in no allegorical, rejecting all mystical, imaginary interpretations and applications. He never allows himself in liberal "accommodation" to suit his doctrine to his hearers. If he at times reasons *ad hominem*, the context and occasion plainly point this out. Let it be remembered that this is the "latest fashion" of Unitarian belief.

When Paul and the other apostles were sent forth to "turn men from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God," what did they understand their commission to mean?

Omitting the Acts and the Apocalypse, we will limit our quotations to the epistles, and here too we can only make a selection, omitting many passages equally as pertinent and strong as those to be quoted.

Romans, xvi. 20. "The God of peace shall bruise Satan under your feet shortly." 1 Cor. v. 5. "I have judged to deliver such an one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus." vii. 5. "Come together again, that Satan tempt you not for your incontinency." 2 Cor. ii. 11. "Lest Satan should get an advantage of us, for we are not ignorant of his devices." What does the word "Satan" in these passages mean? "Principle of evil?" "Disease?" "Mythus?" A leading Unitarian writer, of great learning and ability, has recently told us, that "ac-

cording to a Jewish conception, Sammæl, the angel of death, was identified with Satan." Satan, if I understand the writer, was only another name in the popular Jewish mythology, for the angel of death. But then there was in reality no such being as the angel of death. The word was used in "a merely imaginary sense." I ask that writer to examine his assertion, these remarks and the above passages, and, in view of the whole, to decide what the word "Satan," *used by Paul*, means. What in a special manner does it mean in these passages? 2 Cor. xii. 7. "Lest I should be exalted above measure through the abundance of the revelations, there was given to me a thorn in the flesh, the messenger of Satan, to buffet me." Did Christ strengthen "the principle of evil" in the chiefest apostle?

1 Thess. ii. 18. "Wherefore we would have come unto you, even I Paul, once and again, but Satan hindered us." *Was Paul hindered from visiting the Thessalonian Christians by the Jewish conception about the imaginary angel of death?* or if it mean that he was hindered by sickness, how will that explanation suit 1 Tim. v. 14, 15? "Give none occasion to the adversary to speak reproachfully; for some are already turned aside after Satan." Is it any occasion of speaking reproachfully of Christians, that they "suffer those ills which flesh is heir to"? Did not the importance of the subject and the strength of opposing prejudices demand that varied and multiplied illustrations should be given, and the fallacy and absurdity of the Unitarian theories be shown, I should fear exhausting the patience of the reader by any further quotations, after so full and so unequivocal an exhibition of this apostle's meaning. But as Paul is just now likely to be listened to with special deference, it may be well to give him a still farther hearing.

2 Cor. iv. 3, 4. "If our Gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost, in whom *the god of this world* hath blinded the minds of them that believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them."

Do you doubt who "the God of this world" is? See Eph. ii. 1, 2. "And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins; wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience." The phrase, "the prince of the power of the air," according to the well known idiom of the New Testament, evidently means the powerful invisible prince, which the synonymous parallelism, "the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience," still farther explains and limits. All this exactly coincides with the declarations of Christ before quoted, that the prince of this world is judged, is cast out, &c.

One passage more from Paul, and only one. Eph. vi. 10—12. "Finally, my brethren, be strong in the Lord and in the power of his might. Put on the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil. For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places." See the whole of this most striking passage. It is so full a representation of our invisible spiritual enemies, and of the mode of meeting and vanquishing them, that those, who may be in doubt as to the truth on this subject, and yet willing to believe what the word of God declares, are earnestly requested to read it, study it, meditate upon it, compare it with the preceding declarations of Christ, and of this apostle, and see if it must not refer to actual spiritual existences, and not to abstract impersonalities. Compare it with

Col. i. 13, and ii. 15. See how by the cross, i. e. his death, Christ triumphed over his enemies and the enemies of the human family, spoiling principalities and powers, delivering true Christians from the power of darkness. Let every one examine this subject without prejudice, dispassionately, ready to give up preconceived opinions, if unsound, and say, will any Unitarian theory meet the apparent intensity of apostolic meaning?

In reference to the quotation from Eph. vi. 10--12, the following remarks by Storr deserve special attention. "St. Paul, who had dared to overturn the magical system of the Ephesians, regarded the doctrine of evil spirits as not at all inconsistent with the dignity of that very Christianity, which had discarded superstition. And he did not hesitate to interweave this doctrine with his epistle to the Ephesians themselves, although in this same epistle he inveighs against the superstition of the Essenes, with which the Ephesians were in danger of being tinctured. Had not Paul believed the doctrine of wicked angels, the epistle to the Ephesians would surely have been the last place in which he would have spoken so impressively and circumstantially concerning their temptations, as he in this very epistle was contending against the Essenes, who had manifested a veneration for good angels and a terror of wicked ones altogether extreme."

On any Unitarian hypothesis, which has yet been advanced, darkness, thick darkness, and only thick darkness rests upon this subject. The plainest language must be wrested and "turned aside from its obvious meaning," or the defenders of that system would, long since, have either, *quoad hoc*, embraced Orthodoxy, or renounced revelation. This is strong language, but see, in confirmation and illustration of the remark, another passage from a plain, literal, *un-figurative* apostle. James, ii. 19. "Thou believest there is one God; thou doest well. The devils

also believe and tremble." What was the object of James in his epistle, especially in this assertion? Was it not to show that *faith alone* in accountable beings, i. e. *mere belief* without right affections and actions, could not justify? In the passage just quoted, he allows that belief in the existence of God is "well" enough in itself, but this alone can never justify and save. How does he prove this? Thus. *Even the devils believe and, what is more, tremble*, and thereby show *the sincerity* of their belief. What, to Unitarian conception, can this mean? Does a mythus or madness believe and tremble? Does "the evil principle" believe and tremble? Of rational accountable beings, this may be said, but of what else can it be? Either of the *liberal* explanations applied to the word "devils," in this connexion, makes the apostle's reasoning, instead of an argument, a mass of unintelligible nonsense. If language *can* express the conception, is not actual personal existence attributed to evil spirits here?

In an unornamented argumentative discussion, can "belief and trembling" be predicated of disease or of the abstract principle of evil under the personal name of "devils," while the *only pertinent use of the word*, while the *whole drift of the argument*, requires that it be taken in *its personal sense*? In the compass of language, inspired or uninspired, oriental or occidental, prosaic or poetical, can there be found a catachresis so harsh and craggy, as Unitarian interpreters would here thrust upon one of the simplest and most matter-of-fact writers in the New Testament? The expression itself, the context, the object of the writer, the general character of the epistle and of the apostle, are all for a simple natural meaning, which a child could not help understanding *right*; yet an unwillingness to believe an unpalatable fact, together with the prejudice of system, introduce and defend a figure

that, at once, bids defiance to all laws of language and rules of logic. If such be "rational" interpretation, what is irrational? Let him, who believes the Bible to contain a revelation from heaven, and the epistle of James to be a part of that revelation, read the passage already quoted from that epistle, *read it in its connexion*, and then, in the presence of his maker and his judge, lay his hand upon his breast and say whether the passage does not seem to him to teach the actual existence of evil spirits, of "devils that believe and tremble." Is it irrational to interpret scripture, not only according to its literal and obvious meaning, but according to its *only consistent meaning*?

The opinion of the apostle John, on this subject, has been already exhibited from his gospel. His first epistle abundantly confirms that opinion, as may be seen by quotations in note C.

In order to elicit the opinions of Peter and Jude, the second chapter of the second epistle of the former, may be compared with the epistle of the latter. These two passages are very similar, and designed to teach the same lesson. Let us examine them with some particularity. They both assert the fact that as there had been false prophets among the Israelites of old, so "false teachers," had already, even in the apostolic age, "crept in unawares" to the Christian church, "privily bringing in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them." It would be foreign to our purpose to inquire who these teachers were. The assertion "that they denied the Lord that bought them," sufficiently indicates the cast and stamp of their theology. The apostles, seeing the danger to which the Christian church was thus early exposed, "gave all diligence in writing to those sanctified by God, the Father, and preserved in Jesus Christ," "exhorting them to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints." They assure them at the same

time, that, though "many should follow the pernicious ways of these false teachers, so that the way of truth should be evil spoken of, yet their judgment lingered not, and their damnation did not slumber." In this case, both the teachers and the taught, "following pernicious ways," the apostles most plainly declare should speedily be involved in one common ruin, "bringing upon themselves swift destruction." Peter, well acquainted with the human heart and its readiness to deny or doubt the plainest and most unequivocal assertions of divine vengeance, immediately adduces other recorded examples of the terrible wrath of Almighty God against sinners, to show the certainty of the threatened punishment against these false teachers. "For if God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment; and spared not the old world, but saved Noah, the eighth person, a preacher of righteousness bringing in the flood upon the world of the ungodly; and turning the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah into ashes, condemned them with an overthrow, making them an ensample unto those that after should live ungodly; delivered just Lot, vexed with the filthy conversation of the wicked.....the Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptation, and to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished." How much of this is literal? Was a whole "world of the ungodly" destroyed by a flood, or a figure? Was Noah saved literally or figuratively? Were those that "dwelt in the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah burnt to ashes," and thus made "an ensample to those that should live ungodly," by figure or in fact? Was there such a man as Lot, whom God delivered from this conflagration? Or is this a personification? Were "the angels that sinned," real angels, who transgressed the divine laws, or the evil principle, or a mythus, or disease? Were

these angels, or this principle, disease, or mythus, "cast down to hell, and there delivered into chains of darkness to be reserved unto judgment"? What principle of interpretation, sanctioned by usage, common sense or consistency, could thus jump at once from the simple, self-evident meaning of language, to so harsh, crabbed, unmeaning and incredible an explanation as the self-styled rational theory forces upon this passage? Does not the expression "angels that sinned," in this connexion presuppose their existence in a sinless state? When was "the principle of evil" in this sinless state? How did "the principle of evil" sin? Can any thing but voluntary agents be said to sin? Is the principle of evil a voluntary agent? Or rather a multitude of such agents, "angels that sinned"? According to Jude, these angels "kept not their first estate." What was *the first estate* of the principle of evil? They left their own habitation. What was the original habitation of this principle? Innumerable questions like these might be asked on the different passages, which relate to this subject, that will admit of no conceivable answer, consistent with the Unitarian hypothesis; no answer, which would not carry absurdity on the face of it. Even a "rational" believer would hardly venture to predicate sin of *disease*, or of a mythological Jewish fancy. This would startle Dathe, who thinks Satan, in the book of Job, a good angel, though rather a rigid censor of morals; or even Brennecke, who believed that Christ remained twenty-seven years on earth after his resurrection.*

* See Note E. I regret to notice that Mr. Noyes, in his spirited, faithful and elegant translation of the Book of Job, rather countenances this absurd dream of Eichhorn, Dathe, &c. To mention such an hypothesis is to refute it.

LETTER VI.

Rev. and Dear Sir,

The sum of the argument is this. Christ himself was tempted and put to exquisite suffering by Satan. He also repeatedly, and explicitly taught the doctrine of personal diabolical existence. He taught this to the Jews as a people, to the Pharisees as a sect, and to his own disciples in private. Christ possessed and exerted the power of expelling devils from individuals tormented by them. This power he imparted to the twelve apostles and seventy disciples, which they also frequently exercised. Christ taught, concerning evil spirits, a continuity of agency, influence, and connexion, intelligible only on the supposition of personal existence. Christ distinctly represents a mighty evil spirit as occupying a usurped dominion in this world. After his ascension to heaven he confirmed the same truth. The apostles Matthew, John, Paul, James, Peter, and Jude, together with the disciples Mark and Luke, understood their commission to mean that men were literally to be turned "from the power of Satan unto God."

Hitherto the argument has been *simply scriptural*. The principles of interpretation applied, have been those of *common sense*; just those principles which are in daily use when we decide on the meaning of language. Before closing the argument, I wish to present to the truly philosophical inquirer one train of thought, differing in a degree from those already suggested, though it has been hinted at, and would be perceived by a reader of the class now particularly addressed.

What is the evidence on which the Copernican theory rests, and by which it has supplanted all others? Simply this, *all known facts tally exactly with this the-*

ory. No one hypothesis, from Ptolemy to Des Cartes, will meet and explain all known astronomical facts, except the theory of Copernicus, as proved by Newton, and illustrated by La Place. His theory is verified, because it meets and explains all the facts of the case; while the other theories are proved to be false, because neither of them will do this. Let us apply these principles of the inductive philosophy, to the subject under consideration. We must bear in mind that the Bible is to the truly religious philosopher, what the external universe is to the natural philosopher, *a great store-house of facts*. The Orthodox theory of a personal meaning attached to the words "devil and his angels," meets and explains all the passages in which these and similar terms are employed; i. e. *exactly tallies with all the facts revealed on this subject*. No other theory, nor combination of theories, will thus meet and harmonize these facts. No theory has been advanced, or (I will venture to add) *can* be advanced, that shall, at the same time, deny a personal meaning to those personal words, and afford a consistent meaning in its stead. Which theory ought, then, to be called (I do not now say *scriptural merely*, but) Baconian, philosophical, rational? All know which assumes to itself the latter title. But which is and ought to be considered the *truly rational theory*, that which meets and explains all the facts, or that which in one point or another, is constantly running into some egregious, palpable absurdity? Is the Copernican or the Ptolemaic, the Orthodox or the Unitarian theory, the true one? I invite the discriminating, the cultivated, the truly philosophical minds among the Unitarians, to examine this argument, to subject it to the most rigid scrutiny.

Will any one, as a dernier resort, deny that the Orthodox theory does thus tally with the facts? Then let me ask, Is there *one liberal theory*, which tallies with them? With

which of the theories do most of the facts readily harmonize? Apply any one Unitarian theory, or *the whole of them*, and the one universally received theory of the Orthodox, and say which seems most exactly accordant with the repeated scriptural declarations of personal diabolical existence. Borrow illustrations as to Jewish opinions in the time of Christ, from Josephus and Philo, from the Rabbies, from Buxtorf and Lightfoot,—to which interpretation will their testimony and the historical illustrations afforded by them, give support? Allow then, for the sake of argument, that both theories are embarrassed with some difficulties; is it not rational, is it not indicative of true philosophy, to embrace that *which is least embarrassed*? But I deny that there is any difficulty in the Orthodox theory, *as a revealed matter of fact*. The question here is not how or why, these facts exist? but simply and only *what facts are revealed*? The subject is perfectly analagous to the doctrine of a general resurrection. The fact of such a resurrection is plainly revealed. Who can tell *how* this will take place, and answer all the questions that skeptical ingenuity, aided by chemical philosophy, can propose? Could Paul have done this? Since the severe blow given the Aristotelian logic by the Lord Chancellor, truly philosophical minds have been content to renounce the essence, the mode, and the reason of things as the primary, if not as the ultimate, objects of inquiry, and confine themselves to simple facts. It is this modesty of inquiry within legitimate bounds, that has produced the splendid results of modern science. Had Dr. Priestley and other “rational” inquirers only been as reasonable in their religious, as in their philosophical investigations, they would have saved themselves, their readers, and their opponents, a deal of trouble.* The time will come, and is near at hand, when men will see that the same principles which guide their

* See note F.

inquiries into the works of God, must also guide their inquiries into the word of God. Then will the character, the perfections and the will of the Eternal, now faintly shadowed forth to corrupted human hearts from the former, beam out with resistless and glorious effulgence from the volume of his Son.

To return to the argument already offered, I repeat that the Orthodox theory harmonizes all the facts revealed on this subject, while no one Unitarian theory, nor *combination of theories*, will do this, but, on the contrary, they constantly involve evident and acknowledged absurdities. Which is true, *the self-consistent or the self-contradictory theory*? The attempt to remove the personal meaning of these passages, and leave any consistent sense remaining, would be as idle, to use the beautiful illustration of another, "as the attempt to separate the veins from a slab of variegated marble, without destroying the stone."

The argument is closed. What shall we say to it? Will you believe Christ and his apostles, or plunge into all the uncertainty and skepticism exhaled from the fogs and mists of Germany? Will you assume the air of learning, and talk of mythus, and poetical fable, and philosophical romance, and eastern drapery, and "oriental mythology," and tell of unenlightened Jewish peasants, and the progress of mind, and "pure reason," and go through the whole cycle of learned nonsense, *to avoid a plain and often repeated truth of God's word*?

Here let me ask, can the fact of the existence of evil spirits be *disproved*? Are there any passages of scripture, which so clearly assert the non-existence of evil spirits, as to nullify or render doubtful the import of those already quoted and commented upon? Are there any which even hint such a denial?

Let it be distinctly understood, that the fact, often asserted in scripture and confirmed by reason and con-

science, *that men's sins are their own, and that they are accountable for them*, does not in the least affect the subject in dispute. They are thus accountable, whether these sins spring entirely and solely from an evil heart, or whether they are induced to commit them by an additional influence of wicked men or wicked angels, by visible or invisible enticers. No violence or force is offered to their moral nature in either case. They act of their own choice, freely, voluntarily, and are, of course, moral agents, or in other words, *are responsible for their conduct*. A man is not held *innocent* because his wife tempts him with the prospect of gain, to commit murder. Judas is not thought blameless because the priests and rulers tempted him "with thirty pieces of silver" to betray his master. Is his innocence established because "Satan put it into his heart"? A disposition to cherish or to comply with the suggestion of Satan was evil, and in this Judas sinned. A disposition to comply with the offer of the priests was evil, and in this also Judas sinned. All this is perfectly consistent with the declaration of St. James, that "every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed." This is the only passage from the New Testament which I now recollect to have seen adduced, with which to oppose the multitude of passages quoted in these Letters; a passage, which if it prove that Judas could not have been tempted by Satan, proves also that he could not have been tempted by the priests with the thirty pieces of silver.

Again. Let it be remembered that the fact, *that God overrules all the beings, and controls all the events of the universe*, does not touch the question. The universal providential government of God, extends to "the vast and the minute," to the evil and to the good, to his enemies no less than to his friends. When Jehovah declares, by the prophet Isaiah, "I form the light and create dark-

ness ; I make peace and create evil ; I the Lord do all these things ;” or when he asks by the prophet Amos, “ shall there be evil in the city, and the Lord hath not done it ? ” is it rational to infer that there is no other intelligent being in the universe, who can sin and tempt others to sin ? If these passages disprove the existence of Satan, they disprove at the same time *the existence of evil men*. The fact is, however, that they have only a remote and indirect bearing upon the subject ; no other relation than what may spring out of the much agitated question as to the existence, origin, and end of moral evil. Yet these are the strongest objections I have anywhere met with against the repeated and univocal declarations of sacred writ ; objections totally without weight, unless they disprove that men are sinners. It is only the weakest of weak causes that thus renounces the explicit declarations of Christ, made and repeated under every variety of circumstance on earth, and even confirmed from heaven, for a metaphysical disputation as to the origin of evil. Is it not the boast of Unitarians, (no matter whether well or ill founded,) that they draw their instructions, their system of doctrines, duties, &c. from what Christ personally taught during his ministry ? Is it not, professedly, on this account that they pay a higher deference to the gospels than to the other portions of the New Testament ?

On this Unitarian assumption, (granting what they have hitherto repeatedly affirmed, to be true,) *that the instructions of Christ were not only more intelligible than those of the prophets, but also more than those of the apostles*, I have in the preceding Letters built my argument. My object has been in the first place to discover *what Christ taught during his personal ministry*. Will any Unitarian shrink from this inquiry ? Will he prefer what can, at most, be but a doubtful expression of Isaiah, to the certain

and intelligible assertion of Christ? One might, with equal propriety, reason with a pendulum, as with such pretenders to logic; never at rest in one place, but first in one extreme, then in the other. I do not allow that there is the least contrariety between what Christ taught personally, and what he taught by the prophets before, and by the apostles after him. The only apostolical passage adduced against the personal existence of Satan, is that from James, which is perfectly consistent with all the passages on which any reliance has been placed, and the quotations from Isaiah and Amos are wholly irrelevant. Is there, then, any reason for explaining away and disbelieving the many reiterated declarations of scripture, which at the first blush, and after the most thorough examination, evidently state the fact of diabolical existence and agency? If this were an error, why did not Christ explode it? *Why need he have confirmed it?* Is not a single "thus saith the Lord," worth a thousand fancies, reasonings, and hypotheses of the most learned theologians? What do we know of the unseen, eternal, spiritual world, except what the Bible reveals? What can the Bible reveal, *what can God himself possibly reveal*, in regard to that unknown world, whither we are rapidly tending, if, after admitting the Bible to contain his revealed will, we subject his declarations to our purblind reason in this cradle and shell of our existence? Does not the short-sightedness of reason prevent our looking "a step beyond the grave?" Cannot Omnipotence, that created millions of worlds, and spread them out through infinite space, have also peopled them with myriads of intelligences? Must all these be dwarfed to the puny dimensions of earth-born man? Is there not truth, as well as poetry in the declaration,

"Think not, though men were none,
That heaven would want spectators, God want praise."

Among the millions of spirits "that walk the earth

unseen," why may not some be evil?*" Will Unitarian notions of *moral liberty* present any obstacle to the belief, that some of them may have perverted their high powers, and apostatized from their allegiance to the Lord of the Universe? If good angels are "ministering spirits sent forth to encamp about the righteous," why may not evil spirits seduce the ungodly to greater ungodliness? What is there mysterious, unscriptural, irrational, or anti-analogical in the fact, that intelligences of a higher power, official or intellectual, real or relative, should be disposed to draw those of lesser capacity into sin? Were Jeroboam and Lord Byron scrupulously conscientious on this point? Is it not a most extensive principle, that "misery loves company?" Does not the very nature and essence of sin consist in malevolence? just as, on the other hand, holiness is benevolence, God is love? Learned men may speculate what they will on the nature of sin, as consisting in the transgression of law published or imprinted on the original constitution of the soul, they do not reach the *full* truth of the case till they understand, that sin, of its own proper nature, exhibited, simply in and by itself, is unmixed, defecated malevolence, hostility to all good, inclination to all evil. Such it is in hell. Such it is among the fallen spirits of the unseen world. If such spirits exist, the simple question is, *have they any influence over men?* Who can answer this question? Can reason un-

* If the existence of Satan and of evil spirits be an oriental fiction, is not the existence of good spirits such a fiction also? What firmer foundation would a *thorough* rationalist want for his anti-angelical creed, than the following lines from Hesiod?

"Aerial spirits, by great Jove designed
To be on earth the guardians of mankind;
Invisible to mortal eyes they go,
And mark our actions, good or bad, below:
Th' immortal spies with watchful care preside,
And thrice ten thousand round their charges glide.
They can reward with glory or with gold,
Such power divine permission bids them hold."

Works and days. B. i. v. 120.

enlightened by revelation? Can experience, however general? Their answer might be ambiguous, and would certainly be unauthoritative. The only indisputable answer must come from one who knew the truth, would state the truth, and *whose testimony, we know by sufficient evidence, is true*. Such an answer we have heard from the lips of Jesus Christ, and heard it confirmed by all his apostles whose written testimony has come down to us. There is no room for a subsequent question as to *the how* in this matter. The current philosophy would teach us there is no *how* in the universe, at least no *intelligible, explicable how*. Actual facts, we are assured, antecedent, coincident, or subsequent, are the only *hows* of philosophical investigation or rational belief.

If, however, you will not believe a fact till you understand how it is, *how is your soul united to your body?* Are you not constrained to reply, as all others have been before you, "I do not know"? Disbelieve the fact then. *Your soul is not united to your body; or you have no soul; or you have no body*. If ignorance of the mode in which a fact exists is to disprove the fact, each and all of these conclusions may be legitimately drawn from man's ignorance of the mode in which spirit and matter are connected in himself.

Do you deny the existence, presence, and influence of evil spirits, because you cannot perceive and comprehend them? Can you perceive or comprehend the existence, presence, and influence of an all-pervading, ever-present, infinite Spirit, "in whom you live and move and have your being"? Must you not say with Job, "Behold, I go forward, but he is not there; backward, but I cannot perceive him; on the left hand, where he doth work, but I cannot behold him; he hideth himself on the right hand, that I cannot see him"? Follow out your principles. You cannot perceive by any internal sense, by any perspicaci-

ty of intellect, a present, incomprehensible, impalpable Spirit. He cannot exist. *You are an atheist.* You shrink with horror from this conclusion. It is the legitimate, *the inevitable* result of your principles of reasoning. But if one Spirit may be present to our souls, yes, must be ever present or we sink into annihilation, and yet we are unconscious of this sustaining, ever-active energy, why may not other spirits be present, either constantly or occasionally, and we be unconscious of their presence? Does God know the creatures of his power? their nature, their capacities, dispositions, efforts and tendencies? If so, shall the Omniscient be credited when he speaks, or be subjected to the skepticism of an insect, that, but as yesterday, saw the sun, and to-morrow shall see it no more? *Shall we believe God or not?* Shall we follow the bewildering light, the ignis fatuus, which Hume or Eichhorn may hold out to allure us, or HIM, who is the way, THE TRUTH, and the life?

There is, then, in short, no *reason*, no argument, no analogy, no plausibility, for which to give up the plain, repeated, intelligible declarations of eternal truth on this subject?*

Before proceeding to some practical remarks, which either spring from, or are intimately connected with the subject discussed, I wish to say, that the testimony of the Lord Jesus, and of his apostles, is the only ground taken or desired for belief on this question. What their repeated, explicit, and united testimony is, has been seen. All other authority has been rejected. The Council of Trent and the Augsburg Confession, the Synod of Dort and the Racovian Catechism, the Thirty Nine Articles and the Assembly's Confession of Faith, Rome and Canterbury, Andover and Cambridge, the churches of Boston, whether creedless or "trust deed"-ed, have been thrown

* See note G.

aside to give place to this one question, *What saith the scripture ?**

Whoever shall honor the writer with the notice of a reply or review, or attempt to instruct an inquiring and intelligent community on the subject here discussed, will permit him to suggest, that a simply scriptural discussion is what the course here pursued and the exigencies of the times require. An answer, to deserve the name, *must consist of a refutation of the arguments here advanced by a critical examination and satisfactory explanation of the texts here quoted.* Let the remark, often quoted, “retorquere non est respondere,” not be forgotten. “A virtual answer” may “differ widely” from an actual answer, and has sometimes been thought a softer name for “evasion.” Having taken my stand on the great Protestant principle, a principle often acknowledged and appealed to by Unitarians, to wit, *the entire sufficiency of the scriptures as the only rule of faith and practice,* I shall not willingly and of my own accord be drawn into any other discussion. If, however, contrary to the wishes indulged and here expressed, any gentleman shall think that important information may be obtained or illustration thrown upon the subject by an examination of eastern mythology, or by a comparison of the philosophical tenets of minds widely separated in time and place, or by an etymological view of such words as Abaddon, Baalzebub, Diabolos, Satan, &c. or by an extended comparison of the classical and scriptural use of demon, daimonion, &c. or by an examination of patristical opinions, or by a collation of the opinions of all ages and all countries, early and late, remote, savage, and civilized, the writer hereby expresses his entire readiness, should Providence permit, to enter on such an investigation, after a reply of the character above described shall have been given.

* See note H.

I cannot here hint at even the heads of argument that might be pursued, should the scriptural ground be thought insufficient, each of which might be auxiliary to the truth. Still the writer repeats, that such a course of investigation he does not wish to pursue, not because he has the slightest doubt as to the result, but from the wish to restrict the discussion within its appropriate limits. The scriptures are a *common arbiter*, and to their decision, fairly made out, each party, as yet, allows itself bound to submit. When we make reason, unenlightened by revelation, the umpire, we enter on a wide interminable field of fancy, vagary and folly, which different minds may explore, and, culling what suits, and rejecting what opposes their conflicting theories, they may make out by apparent learning and wily ingenuity, a plausible defence of any system, however futile or preposterous. To those best acquainted with the history of controversies, these remarks will appear most pertinent and forcible. I repeat again, that the proper arbiter is that, whose decision is final and authoritative, *the Bible*. To this the discussion has in these Letters been confined, and to this, so far as the writer is voluntarily concerned, it will continue to be confined.

I have one request to make of the reader of these Letters, viz. that he will consider *why* the terms "principle of evil," and "disease," have been so frequently repeated. These are the main theories of those professing to believe the scriptures, and yet denying the personal existence of the great adversary of souls, and of evil spirits.

LETTER VII.

Rev. and Dear Sir,

Reflecting on the arguments presented in these Letters, each of which proves the position taken, some remarks suggest themselves of solemn import.

One is, *That while men doubt or resolutely deny the agency of Satan, they may at that very moment be giving strong evidence that his malignant influence is greatest upon them.*

The writer's powers of exaggeration fail, who describes the Orthodox belief as "a notion that the world is under the dominion of a presiding spirit, who divides the empire with the only God." The prince of this world is not content with a divided allegiance or sovereignty. He is a thorough usurper. He, *whose right it is to reign*, the Creator and Preserver, the Redeemer and Sanctifier of man, is cast out from the heart, while Satan meets with no resistance to his ill-gotten authority from man himself. Man does not, by nature, even know that he is thus enslaved. When the declaration is made, he denies it; his feelings rise in anger at the imputation. Examine, examine *well* the feelings that rise in your bosom at this declaration; you must be turned "from the power of Satan unto God." He that is of God heareth God's words. The declaration of Baxter is naked, but momentous truth, that "the soul of every man is by nature Satan's garrison; all is at peace in such a man till Christ comes, and gives it terrible alarms of judgment and hell, batters it with the ordnance of his threats and terrors, forces it to yield to his mere mercy, and take him for the governor; then doth he cast out Satan, overcome him, take from him all his armour wherein he trusted, and divideth his spoils; and then doth

he make a firm and lasting peace." Have you ever reflected that you have an invisible active enemy, whose assaults can be resisted only by repentance for sin, by faith in the divine promises, by prayer for heavenly strength and light, by the word of God, by a holy life, by the hope of salvation through Jesus Christ? Clad in this panoply of heaven, the Christian soldier may go forth to his spiritual conflicts, fearless of assaults and confident of victory, and while engaged in the heat of battle, he may send forth shouts, jubilant of praise to his great Captain, who fought, *conquered as he fell*, rose, reigns, and shall forever reign.

Another remark is, *That Satan has few more successful servants, (though they know it not, and mean not so,) than those professed teachers of Christianity, who either openly deny his existence, or, by never asserting it, let it slip out of the minds of their hearers.*

The amiable and estimable qualities, the varied learning and beneficent dispositions of such teachers, may make them revered and loved and honored in any community. But if there prowl about a terrible adversary, "as a roaring lion," thirsting for blood, seeking with a sleepless activity "whom he may devour," and they disbelieve and deny it, and, watchmen and shepherds of the flock as they are reputed, they cry "all's well," "peace, peace," when imminent danger threatens, and "there is no peace," but "sudden destruction cometh," *are they not the greatest enemies of those committed to their trust?* It is, indeed, a most ungrateful task to bring forward, either directly or by implication, such a charge against a highly respectable portion of the community. Sensibility would gladly keep silence. *But, if the argument, herein pursued, be valid*, I trust to the intelligent candor of the gentlemen implicated to say, whether the charge is not well founded, and whether duty does not demand that it be

made. I take my stand on the declarations of the New Testament. If these have been interpreted correctly, all must allow that the charge is *too true*; and surely we should not shrink from publishing the truth Christ preached, whoever may feel themselves condemned by it. If this interpretation be erroneous, let these gentlemen, who certainly are competent, show it, and I will as readily acknowledge my error and make all concessions, by them and the public deemed proper, as I now bring forward this charge. It will be seen, on a moment's reflection, that the imputation which may by some be thought personal and invidious, is the necessary inference from the Orthodox view of this contested subject. *Truth, truth, not men, should be sought and honored.* Determined opposition to the opinions, by us deemed false and dangerous, of those about us, may certainly consist with the kindest feelings towards those who entertain those opinions. No one would more readily pay the tribute of merited respect to the integrity, the exemplary manners, the kindly social virtues, the literary and general intelligence of the Unitarian clergy of New England, than the writer. Eulogium I shall not write. Truth I will not conceal, but with the modicum of ability I possess, will distinctly state, "without fear or favor or hope of reward."

I call upon those, who are standing as beacon lights to direct immortal voyagers over "that vast ocean they must sail so soon," to beware, lest they put the coruscations of their fancy in the place of that light which has burst upon our world from the throne of God. Vain are all brilliancy of imagination, kindliness of affection, and nobleness of nature, vain are all intellectual attainments, all cultivation of taste and refinement of feeling, which exist independently of the great change, the second creation in Christ Jesus to good works, that divine regeneration by the Spirit of God, by which holiness is wrought into the un-

dying soul, and “without which no man shall see the Lord.” All else is but bran, chaff, husks. The chisel may have unveiled the majestic form; the pencil may have caused the *all but* living group to start from the canvass; the orator by the energy or the pathos of his eloquence may have “ruled the wilderness of free minds with unbounded authority;” the poet, catching inspiration from the fervid glow of his own intense and creative spirit, may have sent forth strains of unearthly sound, and more than earthly might, by which he outlives kings and conquerors and empires; yet upon the walls of this glorious fabric, erected to honor and perpetuate the triumphs of human genius, a man’s hand may be seen writing, *thou art weighed in the balances and art found wanting*. Knees, that trembled when rising to address a British or an American senate, may never have knelt in humble reverence to the King of kings. The noble heart, that scorned an ignoble deed, may never have felt one throb of penitence for sin, or one pulsation of gratitude for redeeming love; no, *may have scorned the service of Him*, that, born in a manger, was crucified with thieves. Artists and poets and orators and statesmen there have been, that have given too fearful evidence that they knew not God, and obeyed not the gospel of his Son; whose great engrossing object of pursuit has been, not, to render thanks to the giver of life and talent and opportunity of personal improvement; not, to adore the perfections of Infinite Eternal Excellence; not, to admire “the unsearchable riches of Christ,” which arrest the inquiries, and pass the comprehension of the heavenly host; *no, none of this; but to perpetuate their own fame*, when they themselves shall have quit the earth, and have been called into the presence of their Maker and their Judge. Is not the hand of the Great Deceiver in this, thus to hold out an illusive shadow before these gifted intellects, which they pur-

sue with such an intensity of eagerness, and which vanishes when grasped, while the bread of heaven, of which if a man eat he shall never hunger, offered freely by a divine hand, without money and without price, is rejected as loathsome and nauseous? Well might Burke pathetically exclaim, "what shadows we are, and what shadows we pursue!" If all this may be true, as it certainly is, it need excite no great additional wonder, that others of the same race, temperament, and character, should pass their lives within the precincts of the catholic or protestant church, all unconscious of their alienation from God, their subjection to Satan, and of the necessity of a mighty influence from on high to be sought in a divinely appointed way, to create them anew in Christ Jesus.

A profession adopted at first, perhaps, to please friends, perhaps for what may be thought its learned leisure, or for its acknowledged respectability, with but little thought of the immense, unspeakable responsibility of having the care, the direction, and, in a great degree, the formation of immortal souls for an endless destiny beyond the grave; a profession, thus adopted, becomes ere long a business merely, not unfrequently, a drudgery. The scriptures are studied, either to support a system, or to find materials for a sermon, an essay, or a dispute. It is to be feared that this is the fact with numbers of every religious denomination. Biblical critics have too often been any thing but Bible Christians. The man of God, *thoroughly furnished*, should combine both characters. Can there be any wonder that teachers of an intelligent and naturally amiable character, but ignorant of their own alienation from God, and of the necessity of regeneration by the Spirit of God, should also be ignorant of that enemy by whose devices as "an angel of light," it is greatly to be feared, they are ensnared? Well did a heathen say the precept, "know thyself," descended from heaven. True

self-knowledge is of heavenly origin. Let Orthodox clergymen, whether Baptist or Episcopalian, Methodist, Presbyterian or Congregational, take heed to themselves, that they love the Saviour, while they preach the truth as it is in Jesus. While other reputed teachers deny the empire and the agency of Satan, the prince of this world, let them never shun to declare the whole counsel of God on this, as on every other subject. Is there not among the Orthodox clergy and societies at the present moment, a false delicacy on this subject? This ancient and active enemy of man smiles in his wrath, when, in compliance with a sickliness of taste, or through fear of offence, those that should be bold for the truth shrink from declaring it. If the bosom of Satan is ever the seat of one happy emotion, it is, *when those, set to warn men of his devices, deny his existence; his joy is complete, when his agency is ridiculed.*

Another remark is, *That this doctrine does not stand alone, but is indissolubly connected with the other great truths of the Orthodox system.*

If this world is under the usurped dominion of a great fallen spirit, the enemy alike of God and man, the doctrine of man's original entire depravity will cease to be an incredible enigma. And if Satan "rules in the hearts of the children of disobedience," deceiving and "leading astray the whole world," the necessity of the interposition of the Son of God "to destroy the works of the devil," will become apparent. Hence also the necessity of the Divine Spirit, "to create men anew in Christ Jesus." Man's alienation from God, and aversion to his sovereign character and holy government, will no longer be denied as a doctrine of revelation. "The carnal mind" will be seen "to be enmity against God." Now, without a stock of Rabbinical learning, the Saviour's declaration will be very plain, "except a man be born again, he cannot see the king-

dom of God." And the impenitent, it will also be seen, "must go away into everlasting punishment." These and other associated doctrines stand or fall together. On the simple fact, then, whether Christ, speaking to the Jews of Satan, the devil, the prince of this world, &c., meant what these words plainly express, and what the Jews understood them to mean, may be considered as depending the truth of the great cardinal doctrines of Orthodoxy, viz. man's original apostacy, continued and entire depravity, redemption by the Son of God, regeneration by the Holy Spirit, a heaven of blessedness for penitent, obedient believers, and an eternal hell for the finally impenitent.

Here I willingly state, that this remark is one which has been borne in mind from the commencement of this discussion. I have wished Unitarians and Universalists, (who, with different names, are essentially one,*) who solemnly profess to receive the Bible, as the only, the sufficient, and *the obligatory* rule of their faith and practice, to shift the position from which they have been accustomed to look at Orthodoxy, and to view the subject in another light and from another quarter. The passages of scripture, which the Orthodox quote to prove the divinity of Christ, original sin, atonement, &c., have been so often produced, and so often considered by those now grown old in this controversy, that it were idle to expect, by them, to awaken a new train of thought in minds thus barricaded by prejudice. These passages are now classed as spurious, of doubtful authority, ambiguous, mistranslated, not to the point, &c. &c., so that the critic and the pretender to a critical acquaintance with the scriptures, is armed, or imagines himself armed cap-a-pie, ready to ward off any blow, or parry any thrust, from that quarter. Perhaps by varying the point of attack, an assailable spot may be

* See Note I.

found that will lead at once to the enemy's fortress. Spurious, doubtful, ambiguous, mistranslated, pointless texts, have given place, English Unitarians being judges, to those which are genuine, of indisputable authority, "found in the oldest manuscripts," of univocal meaning, correctly translated, and perfectly to the point.

Even now, it will be perceived by a subsequent note, the most prominent leaders of the Unitarian party are openly and fearlessly publishing opinions in regard to parts of the Bible, which have heretofore been kept back, or only let out drop by drop, with a cautious (shall I add, *time-serving*?) timidity, that proves these leaders to have been heretofore fearful, that the people were not quite prepared for a naked plunge into the stream of pure, *rational* truth. These leaders would now seem nearly, if not *quite*, ready to quit the inspired authority of the sacred volume for — what? Who of themselves can tell? We could point them to a land where learning has had its most illustrious votaries; where inquiry on religious topics has been free as air; where "rational" Christianity has "had full sweep," experiencing but slight opposition from gloomy, calvinistic, puritanical, pharisaical strictness; where every received truth has been subjected to the most rigid test, to the most fearless scrutiny; where all possible disjunctions and alliances, permutations and combinations of opinion have had their day, been tried, condemned, and passed off to forgetfulness. But the sun of truth, which rose upon the world at Luther's bidding, obscured for a time, has again burst forth, promising to shine brighter and brighter unto the perfect day. Are Unitarians here, prepared for German experiments and German neology?

"I would that I could pierce the ears, as with a trumpet-call, of those who stand" in the pulpits, and preside over the first and the cherished Institution, of our Pilgrim

Fathers. "I would awaken them from their slumber to the fearful responsibility they incur" by withholding, disguising, or misrepresenting that system of divine truth, which their fathers would have poured out their life's-blood to its last drop, rather than have renounced or concealed. "I would implore them to look to it, lest, when poor and wretched man, with the whole head sick, and the whole heart faint, asks them for medicine, they give him a poison; lest they should administer a cup of trembling for the waters of salvation; and, as *the children* cry for bread, they should give them a stone."

Guardians of our youth, instructors of our manhood, guides of our immortal spirits, remember in whose places you stand, and *whose children* cry to you for the bread of life. Our Fathers, whatever faults or foibles may have clung to them, were distinct, full, and fearless in the avowal of their religious opinions. Those opinions they fondly cherished, distinctly expressed, and boldly defended, yes, with the faggot and the sword before them. Hither they came, not *to conceal*, but that, unmolested, they might enjoy those opinions, and teach their children the fear of the Lord, *and the distinct truths of his revealed will*. They taught their children something more than Mahomet, or Lord Herbert, or even Moses taught; they taught some doctrines besides the facts (questioned by none called Christian, or even Mahometan) that there is one God and a future life, and that Jesus is a divinely appointed instructor. They openly and fully taught what they understood and believed Christ revealed in regard to his own person, character, offices and object; in regard to the spirituality, perpetuity, and *sanctions* of the divine law; in regard to a future judgment and the final destiny of man; in regard *to the ground of man's justification*, and the conditions he must fulfil in order to divine acceptance and final approbation. On these subjects of mo-

mentous interest, there was no necessity of questioning, and cross-questioning, and almost putting them to the torture, to discover their opinions. They felt it to be their duty, their high honor, their ennobling privilege, *to let their light shine*. They did not believe all opinions either innocent, or equally valuable. They believed that truth was light, and that error was darkness. They believed Unitarianism to be dangerous error, and Orthodoxy to be saving truth. True, too true it is, where first this light was kindled, now is portentous darkness. But the fire from the altar of God, brought hither by sacred hands, has not gone out. It has been kindled up on other candlesticks, and is now bursting forth on the right hand and on the left, the joy of "the saints" and the terror of those that know not God.

If our Fathers' creed were erroneous, rectify it. Do not believe, merely because they believed. Such a faith none would more heartily have deplored than the Cottons, and Nortons, and Wilsons of New England's earlier days. Scholars they were, that would yield to few or none of their successors. In acuteness of intellect, classical attainment, and logical precision, the Norton, who, two centuries past, enlightened New England by his learning, and enlivened it with his piety, need not shrink from a comparison with him, who now darkens it with learned doubts and logical inaccuracy. A faith, springing from examination and from a love of the truth, was what those men, who first occupied Boston pulpits, possessed; and prayed and labored that others, their successors, might evermore possess. Whether "their understandings were so debased, their moral sentiments so brutified," whether they possessed "sense or spirit, or knowledge of right and wrong, enough" to distinguish between "a Calvinistic God and the Prince of Hell," let their children decide.

Still we are not called upon to believe, *merely because*

our Puritan Fathers believed. Far higher is the obligation of our faith. The ever living Jehovah, our maker and our judge, and not our departed ancestors, has laid us under obligations, which we cannot shake off, *to know and believe the truth.* If the Bible be a fable, we are under obligation to the God who gave us reason, to reject it. If Orthodoxy be a wrong interpretation of that sacred volume, let those who know this interpretation to be wrong, reject *this interpretation*; but let them give in its stead *the right interpretation, fully, distinctly.* Professing to believe the Bible to contain a revelation from heaven, can you so impugn the character of its author, as to suppose he has given us an enigmatical book to tantalize us? *Tell us, then, fearlessly and fully, what you believe and why you believe it; what you disbelieve and why you disbelieve it.* Be at least as frank as Dr. Priestley and Mr. Belsham, “the most illustrious advocates of English Unitarianism.” Do not fear the reproach of a name. If Universalism be true, glory in the term Universalist. Singularity is not a reproach, it may be an honor; it is not a fault, it may be a virtue. Galileo and Columbus were once ridiculed for their opinions. Who ridicules them now? The Huguenots, Methodists, and Puritans, by the excellence and sanctity of their lives, have rendered honorable, epithets not so intended.* Liberal Christians surely, will not shrink from the honorable task of enlightening a benighted community. Even if you are to perish in the attempt, *fear not.* Whose fall would be more glorious than that of the martyr of truth? Whose reward more certain? Cranmer and Latimer and Ridley, those

* I venture to predict that, before this century closes, “the mummies” of Geneva will be a more honorable distinction throughout Europe, than the strange misnomer, which the Venerable Company wish to attach to themselves, *Evangeliques Reformes.* It is characteristic of Unitarianism, in all latitudes, to be exceedingly solicitous of “a good name.” This, like fame, followed, is lost; deserved, but disregarded, is secured.

worthies of the English Church, did not shrink from a chariot of flame to bear them home to glory.

If Unitarianism be, as its advocates aver, a serene and lofty eminence, on which the human mind, liberated from error, "redeemed, regenerated and disenthralled," walks abroad in the image of its Maker, in the conscious dignity of an immortal and purified intelligence,

Despicere unde queat alios, passimque videre
Errantes,

with outstretched hand and suppliant voice, we earnestly entreat admission to this light, to be elevated to this summit. We think the optic nerve of our moral eye can bear any truth, which is of so pure and perfect a nature. We desire to put an instant termination to our pupilage, to be held under Calvinistic bondage no longer. Our minority we wish ended at once. We will assume "the manly gown" forthwith, if it can thus be afforded from the Unitarian wardrobe. Surely Unitarians will not imprison or keep back for their individual benefit, *any part or portion* of so inestimable a trust, held, not for themselves, but for the race. "Freely ye have received, freely give," is a plain directory in circumstances by them considered so peculiar and favorable. Henceforth we look for the distinct utterance of *the whole truth*, for it is well known, not only to the bench and the bar, but to minds of any reflection, that *a part* of the truth is often *an untruth*.

Before closing these Letters, I have some important and practical questions to propose, which I trust you, my dear sir, and the readers generally, will not think out of place or inopportune. Do you really believe that Christ and his apostles taught Unitarianism? If so, which of the many theories, embraced under that most comprehensive name, did they teach? Is Christ "a fallible and peccable man," or higher than the highest archangel, the instrumental



creator of these heavens and this earth, the governor of the moral universe, subordinate only to the Eternal, himself *almost divine*? Or does he occupy an intermediate place between these vast extremes? Did Christ, as Logos, exist "with the Father before the world was"? Was he supernaturally begotten of the Virgin Mary, or is this "a fiction of oriental mythology"?* Had Christ, in any view of his character, a proper personal pre-existence before he was born at Bethlehem? If he had, is Christ merely a man? If he had not, how was he "with the Father before the world was"? How was he "the root of David"? How "did God create the worlds by him"? What did Christ and the apostles teach as to man's native character? What is regeneration? What is the everlasting state of the finally impenitent? Or, in other words, what is the condition of those impenitent at the day of judgment? Is there *an endless hell* for those on the left hand, *as surely*, as there is an endless heaven for those on the right? Will those who go away into everlasting punishment "with the devil and his angels," return to purity and to blessedness?—These questions, though often proposed, cannot be too often considered by those, who will ere long, and may shortly, be summoned hence to return no more, but to hear from the lips of their Judge the welcome invitation "come, ye blessed," or the irreversible doom, "depart, ye cursed."

I assume, in the following questions, as an indisputable fact, that to reason from moral effects to moral causes, is a legitimate mode of ratiocination. I know full well that it is sometimes a delicate process, and requires a skilful hand. This is not the place to enter into a consideration of the qualifications, distinctions and limitations requisite

* May we be permitted to ask the Unitarian biblical critics, what part of the introduction of Matthew and Luke's gospels they receive, and what part they reject?

to the proper understanding of this whole subject. Nor is it at all necessary. Broad, palpable, blazing distinctions often force a reluctant acknowledgment from unwilling prejudice itself. A man, having the sense of sight, with his eyes open, unbandaged, unobstructed, cannot easily mistake the brightness of uneclipsed noonday for the darkness of midnight.

I ask, then, has Unitarianism in any shape, within the last three hundred years, either broken off from the Roman Catholic church, or christianized a before unchristian people? Has not Unitarianism invariably come in *after* reformation—after Orthodoxy? *Has it, for that period, taken the lead in any one great movement for the reformation of the world?* But is it so, that real, primitive, purified Christianity, the Christianity of Paul and Peter, is so backward and diffident, that it only comes in as a sedative to prevent an over-zealous activity in the friends of man? a sort of make-weight in the moral scales? or, in other words, follows in the rear of an “exclusive,” hot-headed, intolerant Orthodoxy?

Are these things so? Is the religion of Christ *in its purity*, of secondary and subsidiary power only in revolutionising the world, and purifying, and elevating, and sanctifying it? It was not so of old. Either Christianity has lost its primitive energies, or Unitarianism is not Christianity. But the salt of heaven has not lost its savour. *Declensions in Orthodox Churches are no new thing, from the Seven Churches of Asia, to the Genevan and the Boston Churches.* Christianity in its purity, is mighty. Weak in numbers, wealth, and intellect, upheld only by those accounted “the filth and the off-scouring of all things,” it is still irresistible in power, for by *prayer and faith*, it takes hold on the arm of Omnipotence, and the world feels its influence. It conceives, attempts, accomplishes, great things. When did Unitarian-

ism *originate* Bible, Tract, Education, Missionary, Sabbath school, Bethel, or Prison Discipline Societies? All these originated in England and America among "the saints," as they are deridingly called in the former country, and here too by a preacher of some note, and, what is more, they are so called *in the Bible*. Now if "the saints of the Most High God," might naturally be supposed to take a *leading* interest in building up the moral kingdom of God, it is only a question of fact, as to whom those saints are, *who lead in the benevolent Christian efforts of the day*? Bible societies, however they may have originated, unite now all among us who profess to believe the scriptures to be from God. But look at missionary societies. All the principal denominations, holding the head Christ Jesus, the Lord of glory, crucified for sinful man, have established and are extending their missions. Not only Orthodox Congregationalists and Presbyterians, but the Baptists, Methodists, Episcopalians, all are active to make known a Saviour's dying love, and to extend his kingdom. What have all the preaching, and writing, and discussion of Unitarians amounted to on this subject, in Boston? Is there a single Unitarian clergyman found ready to go to Calcutta, with its numerous Christian population and civilized society? Is there one that will quit his home and his fire-side, to lend a helping hand to the great oriental philosopher, Rammohun Roy, in his attempt to destroy paganism, and introduce pure Christianity? Are Unitarian ministers in such demand at home, that not one can be spared? Is there no call for Orthodox clergymen from the north and the south, from the east and the west? Are Unitarians ignorant of the first principle of Orthodox benevolence, "there is that scattereth, and yet increaseth; and there is that withholdeth more than is meet, but it tendeth to poverty"? Who will go to New Holland, to Borneo, to Ava? Who will take up his shivering

abode among the Greenlanders? Who will brave the burning sun of the tropics, and the scorching sands of Africa? Who will cast from him the recollections of civilized life, for the cabin of the Hottentot; the charms of elegant society, and the attractions of literature and cultivated taste, for the wigwam of the Osage or the Choctaw? Who will give up the security of Boston, for a dungeon in Ava or in Beyroot? If missionaries are to go to such places, thus putting in jeopardy their lives, not knowing what things shall befall them, apprehensive of bonds and imprisonment, yet not counting their lives dear to them, so that they may win Christ and be found in him, so that his name may be preached to every creature, they must be sought at Andover and not at Cambridge; among the Moravians, the Baptists, the Methodists, or Evangelical Churchmen, but never, NO, NEVER, among Unitarians. Will you explain this in connexion with the parting command of Christ? Surely the Unitarians of the United States, if not as numerous, are at least as able to support missionaries as the Moravians. What cultivated *rational* divine ever sold himself into slavery, that he might have the opportunity of preaching Christ to his fellow man, as some Wesleyan Methodists have done in the West Indies? These are the men "who count all things but loss," for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus their Lord. Which now is the true original gospel, published by Christ and his apostles, that which originates and sustains such efforts, or that which looks coldly on, finds fault if there happen to be something either faulty or thought to be so, attempts to do something itself, but is paralysed in its first step, and, with all its boasted wealth, and numbers, and talent, and disinterested generosity, in Europe and Asia and America combined, can only support one missionary on heathen ground, and he, an indi-

vidual at first sent forth by the Orthodox themselves? The first Unitarian missionary remains yet to be sent out.*

Pause now, in view of this matter-of-fact mode of inquiry as to the original, heaven-published gospel. Unitarianism, in none of its protean shapes, still less in its Socinian or Humanitarian form, ever went forth to civilize and christianize the heathen. In books and theory, they may speculate what they will about the simplicity of their faith, and the efficiency of truth in the Unitarian form, but *facts, facts*, are wanted to substantiate theory, and verify assertion. The Orthodox faith is here based on the surest philosophy, supported by indisputable facts, a species of irrefragable argument. Let the islands of the Pacific, as described by Cook and by intelligent impartial voyagers now, bear testimony to this. Unitarians may imagine and propose the most scientific mission, with all the apparatus of Greenwich, if they please; they may have the telescope of Herschel and a solar microscope; they may add to these the alembics, deflagrators, and retorts of Davy; and what will it all amount to? *The Gospel of Christ is foolishness to man, yet it is mighty through God.* Here is the Unitarian error. They overlook the agent, who gives efficiency to means, and blesses, not the wisdom of words, but the words of heavenly wisdom. "Not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit saith the Lord." Witness Brainerd, with his Bible only, preaching, through an ignorant Indian interpreter, to the savages, and say, would the National Institute, with all their philosophical apparatus, have brought these stoics of the woods to weep and cry out "*what shall we do to be saved?*" Those who, unlike "the English traveller," wish to philosophize *deeply*, as to the cause of the revi-

* If, according to a recent Unitarian publication, "the apostle Paul" was "a Unitarian," he remains to this day not only without an equal, but without a *successor*.

vals of religion in America, would find here matter for solemn thought. Was it Brainerd, or the Spirit of God attending Brainerd's ministrations, that humbled the haughty savage, and caused the fearless lords of the creation to weep for their sins, and to cry to the Lamb of God to wash away their sins, and save their souls? Let *rational* Christianity answer this.

But, perhaps, you will tell me, Unitarians have now their *missionary* society. True, they have, and their tract society also. And what think you they will accomplish? Is it man or God, that will convert the world? If God is to do this great work, man is no doubt to be the instrument. How then is man to effect it? Preaching, the press, education will do much. But is not the *secret* of missionary effort and success to be found *in a spirit of prayer?* *Throughout the world*, on the first Monday of every month those that worship Christ and sing hymns to him, "Quasi Deo," *unite* to pray to him, the Lord of the harvest, that he would send forth more laborers into his vineyard, and gather in speedily an abundant harvest. Is there any such thing in existence, or was it ever conceived by any of the party, to establish a Unitarian monthly concert of prayer? If God be a hearer of prayer and "will be inquired of" as to the spiritual blessings he bestows, and Unitarianism be of a more elevated, purer and more spiritual nature than the Evangelical faith, is it not strange beyond the bounds of ordinary strangeness, that the one class are thus *united*, persevering, importunate in prayer, while the other class think or act as though they thought a passing Sabbath day's remembrance quite sufficient?

This ungodly world, my dear sir, is not to be brought back *to allegiance to God* by smooth periods, nor gentle names, nor soft, endearing epithets, nor by professions of an enlarged (but indiscriminating) charity. The time has come when the Spirit of God is lifting up a standard here,

on the spot early trod by the Pilgrims, watered by their tears, hallowed by their prayers, and still "sacred to their memory." Abroad, the vials of God's wrath would seem about to be emptied on nominal and anti-christian powers. The false prophet trembles on his throne; Babylon is shaken; a mighty angel is flying through the heavens, preaching the gospel to all people, "the kingdoms of this world are about to become the kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ." What has Unitarianism to do with these great events? It has had nothing to do with them, it will have nothing to do with them. It will itself soon pass away, and leave not a wreck, not a memento, behind.

The wheel of the divine government is rolling forward the divine purposes. The simple question for each one to consider is, will you lend your feeble aid in impelling it forward, or oppose its progress, and be crushed beneath its weight? *Unitarianism is not the faith once delivered to the saints.* Its foundation is rotten. There is a stone, a tried stone, rejected of old *by the builders*, which will afford a sure foundation. Fly to that before it be too late. Based on the rock of ages, you may resemble Knox, "who feared not the face of clay;" with Luther you may go forth to any duty, "though the devils be as thick as the tiles upon the houses;" "*fearing God, you need have no other fear.*"

NOTES.

NOTE A. Page 9.

When, or by whom, this scion was inserted into the Jewish stock, the writer does not say. If he can fix the age and the author of the book of Job, and the country he inhabited, he will have taken one and the first step, which is always the most difficult, towards the determination. If, with one class of critics, we assign this book to Moses, or with another class, we date it still farther back in the patriarchal age, in either case it is the oldest record of human opinion; and, adopted into the Jewish canon and sanctioned by Christ and his apostles, stands forth *as the first revealed expression of divine truth*. Its date is thus, from six hundred to a thousand years anterior to the period assigned to Homer by *any* of the classical critics. But diabolical existence and agency are asserted and reiterated, not in the poetical, but in the historical parts of this book. Was it then "carelessness or hardihood" that asserted as an undeniable fact, that "this notion was grafted on the purity of the Jewish faith from the fictions of oriental mythology"? "Did not the gentleman know, that theologians, inferior to none in exact learning, deep research, ardent piety, and studious attention to the word of God," have discovered, in this first remaining production of the human mind, and *original revelation of divine truth*, a clear and distinct recognition of diabolical agency? Have they not traced this notion up to the very fountain of truth, to the light of heaven, to the inspiration of the Almighty? Did he not know that they have seen this notion, not merely engrafted into the purity of the Jewish, but ingrained and interwoven with the whole system of the Christian, faith? How then could he assume, with such roundness of period, and fearlessness of consequence, (shall I add, *disregard of fact*?) that this notion, presented to human contemplation in the first written record extant, and under the authoritative sanction of inspiration, was "a fiction of oriental mythology"? in other words, a dream, a fancy, an untruth? Need we be at a loss to know "*this* gentleman's views of the sacred vol-

ume"? All acknowledge the writer of the book of Job to have been a genius of the loftiest order, a sun of surpassing brilliancy, before which the lights, greater and less, of Grecian and Roman glory, fade away into dimness, or totally disappear. Why, then, are we constrained to imagine him, so meagre in imagination, so jejune in invention, so derelict of inspiration, that in order to produce this book, he had recourse to fabulous legends, and unreal phantasies? Where is the evidence of the existence, and what was the character of these fictions? Is there any Idumæan history, any Assyrian roll, any Arabian chronicle extant, from which to hazard a conjecture on these points? Neither Egypt nor Babylon affords a hieroglyphick, or character, by which to pierce the darkness that broods over those remote ages. Be it known, that the first period of authentic profane history commences at least seven hundred years subsequent to the latest date assigned, with any considerable degree of probability, to the author of this book. Is Herodotus to give evidence in this case? What did he know, or could he know, upon the subject? Would you admit Tacitus and Suetonius to be credible historians in regard to the belief and the practices of even contemporary Jews? What then could a Grecian historian, removed a thousand miles in space, and a thousand years in time, know of that remote age and distant country? Evidently, nothing. Suppose we could summon Sanchoniathon and Manetho, Berosus and Abydenus, the Ossians of history, and put them to the question, what could they testify? Nothing, nothing at all. Are we then to quit "the sure word of prophecy," wherein "holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," for the supposititious imaginings of a *soi-disant* rational Christianity? Is "pure reason," on a subject *wholly and forever beyond its unassisted grasp*, of paramount authority to recorded fact and *inspired decision*?

Following out the assumptions of the reviewer, we shall soon find ourselves compelled to adopt the rationalism of Röhr, Wegscheider, and their school; and if we pretend to receive the scriptures, it will be as a collection of oriental fictions, an assemblage of traditionary tenets and mythological fancies, by the aid of which, so far as they correspond with *enlightened reason*, we may elaborate a system of "divine truth." "Theologians, inferior to none in various and exact learning, deep research, studious attention to the word of God, and" (would it not be uncharitable not to add?) "ardent piety," have been unable to discover any thing more than such tenets and such fancies in the volume of inspiration. The sons of the Pilgrims are not yet so bereft of reason as to renounce revelation, and take in its place, they

know not what, dignified, though it be, with the name of "rational Christianity."

Before this writer again decides with such oracular authority, it may serve to refresh his memory and shape his periods, to review his chronological tables. He might consult Niebuhr to learn what authority is attributed by the learned to the first five centuries of Roman history. How much in Grecian history, previous to the first Olympiad, is *not fabulous*? Eusebius, in his Chronicon, shows, according to the chronology of the heathen historians just mentioned, whose works, some fragments excepted, have long since perished, and also of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and Diodorus Siculus, *that Moses lived prior to the worship of Jupiter*, to the birth of Latona, of Bacchus, Apollo, and most of the heathen deities, to the flood of Deucalion, to the fall of Phæton; and *centuries prior to the first poets, philosophers, and historians of Greece*. The first Olympiad was instituted in honor of Jupiter, B. C. 776. Moses was eighty years of age when he led the children of Israel out of Egypt, B. C. about 1500.

NOTE B. Page 13.

The writer is not ignorant that "rational christianity," carried out to its legitimate results, (that is, *pure rationalism*,) has denied the existence of good as well as of bad angels. Nor does he see how a man can *pretend* to reason upon the subject and deny that the existence of the latter class is revealed, and yet believe in the existence of the former. *Consistent "rational"* criticism must sweep away both classes together, and it were idle to deny it. This has been the result, where liberal minds have been unlaced from creeds, unfettered by authority, and at liberty to speak out their undisguised sentiments, *fearless of offending popular opinion*. "Theologians, inferior to none in" extent of information and compass of research, profoundly versed in the original languages of the scriptures and the kindred dialects, and loaded with stores of classical and oriental learning, men "studious of nature" in her permanent and her ever-varying forms, have blotted out, with unsparing hand, every vestige of angelic existence from the sacred page. This is *consistent inconsistency*, an honor, to which the American supporters of a kindred system cannot *yet* lay claim. Should the descent of opinion, however, be as rapid for the next ten years as during the ten years past, (not to speak of an *accelerated velocity*,) it may be questioned whether "the lowest

depth" of German rationalism will be more than a step to "the deeper still" of American rational Christianity. A new illustration, it is to be feared, is about to be given to the adage, *corruptio optimi pessima*. If this be thought severe, let the reader remember that in 1815, the views of the atonement given by Butler, in his *Analogy*, were said by Dr. Channing, to be as generally received by the Unitarian clergy as any others; and that ten years afterwards, "a central gallows" is erected, by which to hold up those views to scorn and detestation. A descent, equally rapid, cannot be paralleled in Germany, from 1750 to the present moment. With Dr. Priestley, this divine, accomplished and eloquent though he be, may well say, "I do not know where my creed will be fixed." The remark of the satirist, *nemo repente fuit turpissimus*, can apply only to manners, not to sentiments.

NOTE C. Page 23.

What American Unitarian interpreters suppose the three evangelists to mean by their narratives of "the temptation," remains to be seen. They are of age, and can speak for themselves. It is not probable that any of them are *yet ready, openly*, to take the ground of Professor Schleiermacher, a name, though unknown here, of great learning, and of great authority throughout Prussia and all Germany. He thinks "the most natural explanation of the temptation is, that it is a parable, delivered by Christ to his disciples, which might easily have been misunderstood historically, and yet as easily, notwithstanding this misconstruction, pass through a great number of hands." Putting this into intelligible English, it reads thus, *the disciples, each and all, misunderstood Christ, and have perpetuated their misconception in a volume said to be inspired*. In this "most natural" opinion, we see the reverence felt for the scriptures by this learned and *most rational* member of the German Lutheran Church. "He avails himself," as another distinguished German writer has said in his reply to Rose, "of the Established Ecclesiastical System, as, in some way or other, the envelope of his philosophical system."

All this may be disclaimed by *American rational inquirers*, as irrelevant. But how can we know what is considered *rational in Boston*, if the advocates of rational inquiry here, will maintain an astringent silence on such topics, but by learning what is thought rational by Unitarians, where the lips are unclosed, and communication of opinion is free and unrestrained? Whence is it, that in a monarchy, and with an established religion, the principal writers are

frank, undisguised, and fearless in the expression of their belief and of their disbelief, and of their reasons, while, in this Republic, with no religious establishment to fetter thought, or the utterance of thought, this birthplace and home of free opinion and free expression, the opinions of a large class of professedly religious teachers should be known *only as they are wormed out*? How loud a panegyric does Unitarian silence undesignedly pronounce upon the character and the influence of our Puritan Fathers?

The wild speculations of continental dreamers the Christian Disciple and the Christian Examiner have often reprobated. There is allowed to be no blood-relationship, no fellow-feeling between the professors of Göttingen and of Cambridge; while those of Andover are cordial fellow-laborers with those of Tübingen, and, recently, with those of Berlin. Insular writers, however, the good sound common-sense writers of England, are not thus recklessly thrown to the winds. True, the headlong Priestley, the daring Belsham, and even the Improved Version, embodying as it does, the results of Unitarian learning and the inventions of "rational" ingenuity, are rather ungratefully regarded as questionable coadjutors, *just yet*. But what shall we say of Cappe, the most learned and the most critical of all the English Unitarians, not excepting Wakefield, and far the most cautious? What shall we say of the Monthly Repository, the accredited organ of Unitarianism in Great Britain, especially of its first volumes, when the writers were desirous of "putting the best foot foremost"? Unitarians in this vicinity have recently expressed the desire of *drawing closer the bonds* between them and their brethren over the waters. By looking into the Christian Register, it will be seen, that the Monthly Repository is the Magazine from which most of its foreign articles are taken. Is it not fair to presume that Unitarians here adopt the same belief in regard to Satan, Diabolos, &c. as their English brethren, and, moreover, *adopt the same mode of interpreting these words in the scriptures*? The English critics, with their characteristic bluntness, speak out what they believe, or disbelieve, with considerable fulness and precision. It can hardly admit of a doubt that their more wily younger brethren, will, ere long, be constrained, either from self-respect, or a compliance with the reiterated call of public opinion, to take the same course.

The following quotations may serve to take off the bandage, already somewhat loosened, from Unitarian eyes, which their leaders of their own accord are quite unwilling to remove.

Cappe, in his critical notes on the temptation, is quite lean in his explanation, and evidently feels himself embarrassed. This is appa-

rent, both from his remarks there, and when the same subject recurs in his Life of Christ, which, on this period, is for the most part, a repetition of what he had said in his Notes. He gives us the most approved "rational" interpretation thus. "The case with the writer here, or with some one before him who first told the story or recorded it, seems to have been this, to wit; he was about to relate such things concerning Jesus, as to the precipitate, and to any who were not well disposed towards him, might appear to be a blemish on his character, and not to consist well with the appellation, *Holy One of God*. To preclude such disparaging conceptions concerning the character of Jesus; to prevent any such effect of doubts and difficulties, the growth of his own mind, the result of impressions made on him by his present circumstances, and which tended, as it might seem, towards apostacy and unfaithfulness; the evangelist, going to relate them, does not choose to represent them in plain naked language, as the spontaneous produce of his thoughts, but rather as the suggestions of another. He avails himself of an idiom much in use among the Jews, figuratively ascribing to a being of evil character, any thing in the person and circumstances of any man that either was, or that tended to what was deemed, either naturally or morally evil."

Cappe, in this explanation, has adopted a mode of expression somewhat analogous to that which he attributes to the evangelists. He was afraid to speak out, and yet he was unwilling to withhold, his opinion. In plain English, Cappe means that Christ had "doubts and difficulties, the growth of his own mind" solely, misgivings as to the work on which he had entered, which tended to apostacy and unfaithfulness. These the evangelist knew would not, "to the precipitate," consist well with the character of the *Holy One of God*. They must in some way be concealed or palliated, or so expressed, as to remove the offence that would be felt by those not well disposed towards him. The evangelist was unwilling to express the plain truth in naked language, that these doubts and difficulties were the spontaneous produce of Christ's own thoughts, and so he avails himself of the Jewish idiom of charging upon Satan, what wholly belongs to Christ himself; of charging upon the imaginary, fictitious Satan, the doubts and difficulties of the *Holy One of God*!

I will make only a remark or two, in passing, on such an explanation. If I mistake not, it has always been pointed out as a peculiar, prominent, and most distinguishing feature in the evangelists, that they told, and were disposed to tell, the whole, simple, undisguised, naked truth, for, and *against*, their master, and themselves, unsuspecting

of criticism, and fearless of consequences. They drew no characters. They pronounced no eulogiums. They told the truth, and left it to make its own way, under the God of truth, believing, or at least acting as though they believed, that "unadorned, it was adorned the most." Where else shall we look for any fears on the part of the disciples, that the character of "their Lord and their God" would suffer from the plain statement of what he said, or did, or *thought*? If Cappe's view be the true one, we must hereafter give up the *artless, truth-telling* character of the evangelists, and believe them artful and truth-concealing, if not Jesuitical.

But again. "This was an idiom much in use." What was this idiom? Why, a general national belief in the actual existence of the devil and his angels. On consulting Cappe's references for this idiom, it will be found that he has referred to passages which prove this national belief. Suppose I should deny that Boston means a literal city; *it is only an American idiomatic expression, much in use for the general idea of residence*, and in proof of the assertion, should refer to New York, Philadelphia, Washington, &c.; would my logical and critical abilities be trumpeted forth as of the highest order? Yet this is precisely the reasoning of Cappe, who must be acknowledged by all, as among the most intelligent, critical, and cautious, not to say *wily*, of Unitarian writers. It is the *system*, and not the *man*, which is answerable for these absurdities. Let him have truth on his side, and he would be irresistible. As it is, to those but partially read in biblical criticism, and who are predisposed to follow a learned leader in rejecting Orthodoxy, I know few Unitarian writers more able "to make the worse appear the better reason."

I am about to extract some passages from the *Monthly Repository*, which will not only give us English Unitarian belief (or disbelief?) on this subject, but also, which is of great importance, *the principles of interpretation* by which they arrive at their conclusion. The essay, from which these extracts are taken, was continued through three numbers of that Magazine, for 1809. The writer begins by saying, that the word *diabolos*, translated devil, occurs thirty-eight times in the New Testament, and proceeds to consider these cases in detail. He does not advert to those passages in which the word Satan, tempter, wicked or evil one, god of this world, prince of this world, &c. &c. are used. These are left unnoticed. However, he had enough to do with the thirty-eight passages. In some of these, it is admitted on all hands, this word is properly translated, slanderer, in the common version. Let us see how he treats those translated devil.

Math. xiii. 39. This is the *explanation* of the parable quoted in the

fourth letter under the third head of the second argument. "In this connexion, it may justly be doubted whether Jesus means positively to assert the existence of the devil, and his ascendancy over the human mind. *It is far more probable that he uses the phrase in conformity to the prevailing notions of his countrymen.* From a parable, nothing can be inferred but the doctrine or instruction which it is intended to inculcate; the circumstances are to be overlooked, and every thing which is collateral is to be considered only as the ornament of the allegory." The writer does not once advert to the fact that this is *not* a parable, but *the interpretation* of a parable, given by Christ himself, not to his countrymen at large, but to his own bosom friends in their retirement. It would seem that a Unitarian writer, is under an almost physical, a sort of "absque remedio" inability to state a difficulty fairly, to meet an argument logically, or to translate correctly.

To proceed with this writer. "John viii. 44. 'Ye are of your father the devil,' &c. Such is the influence of association and of long established habits of thinking, that it will not be easy to suggest any interpretation of this passage different from the common one, which will not appear to many very harsh and unsupported." *True.* Reader, how do you think he gets over or *round* this difficulty? Tax your invention to the utmost, and you will be disappointed at last. This writer is not one of those, gruelled with a small or a sizeable difficulty. He thinks it most natural to suppose that Cain was the murderer, who abode not in the truth, referred to by Christ in this place. But should any of his readers have some "doubts and difficulties," as to this allusion, he has still another bridge over which he can retreat. In that case, he says, "Jesus need only be supposed to refer to the commonly received opinion of the origin of evil designs and wicked practices." Any farther explanatory notice one would think a work of supererogation. However, he follows up these two rather startling propositions by a third, which is not far out of its proper place in capping such a climax. "*In the language of his reproaches and of his accusations against those who were seeking his life, we are not to look for his authorized instructions upon a subject incidentally introduced*" !!! Incidentally introduced! Expressly introduced by himself, without any call or extraordinary occasion for it on the part of the Jews.—Such is the reverence of English Unitarians for what they allow to be the *very declarations of Christ himself.* No wonder after this, that the apostles should be treated quite cavalierly. "Acts xiii. 10. 'O full of all subtilty and all mischief, thou child

of the devil, thou enemy of all righteousness,' &c. Paul was a man of strong feelings and strong passions, and no doubt was greatly irritated and provoked by the conduct of Elymas. It seems there was just occasion for this resentment, for it is recorded that Elymas was struck blind by the instrumentality of Paul; *but no argument for the existence and agency of the devil can be founded on the indignant language of the apostle.*" Certainly not! If the language "of reproach and accusation" employed by Christ only confirmed his hearers in a long received error, what else could be expected from an "indignant" apostle? It matters not that, in the ninth verse, Paul is said to have been "full of the Holy Ghost;" a circumstance thought too unimportant by this writer to deserve even a passing notice. The devil, who goes about as a roaring lion, is, according to this writer, none other than Nero.

We now come to a passage, to which, and this writer's remarks upon it, I do most earnestly invite the serious, inquiring, reflecting reader to give special attention. "1 John, iii. 8. 'He that committeth sin, is of the devil; for the devil sinneth from the beginning. For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil.' Unquestionably the devil is here spoken of as the author of sin; and as a being who himself sinned; in reference to which the apostle again says, verse 10, 'in this the children of God are manifest, and the children of the devil; whosoever doeth not righteousness is not of God.'" This writer allows, that in the 12th verse, the same allusion is made, "not as Cain, who was of that wicked one and slew his brother." Even a *rational* understanding could not help seeing that "the wicked one," of whom Cain was, differed from this very Cain himself, who is said to be the devil in the eighth of John. "It may however be questioned," [what cannot be questioned by a sturdy, heartless skeptic?] "whether the apostle means to support the truth of this opinion, or only adopts it as the common and prevailing one." Again. "This may be only in allusion to the philosophy of that dark age, when the Jews incorporated the mythology of the heathens with the pure doctrines of revelation. They on whom the Sun of Righteousness has arisen," [what does this mean in the Unitarian vocabulary?] "have learnt that God is the Creator and Maker of all, that all men are his offspring, and that it is only in a figurative sense that the vicious are the children of the wicked one, i. e. of the devil, or the being who is supposed to sustain that character, the author of every thing which is evil." How they have learnt this last fact, he does not inform us. Christ and his apostles "unquestionably" taught a directly opposite doctrine. I

am not aware that any chemical analysis, or any geological stratum, or any botanical classification, or any phrenological nomenclature, or any of the results of comparative anatomy, or any of the wonders developed and demonstrated in the *Mèchanique Cèleste*, fasten upon Christ and his apostles the charge of teaching falsely, or of incompetence or unwillingness, at the hazard of their lives, to teach the truth. Till something in the *shape of evidence* is produced, I trust it will not be thought indicative of either weakness or prejudice, to believe Christ, "that for this end was he born, and to this end came he into the world, *to bear witness unto the truth.*"

But this writer is yet to give the finishing touch to his picture of revelation. "The only passage in Jude is one of very doubtful authority. *I do not mean that it is wanting in any of the copies now extant;*" [after this, I hope we shall hear no more from the Unitarian press about Griesbach: of what use are his labors? The lower criticism is gone;] "but of doubtful authority, that an inspired apostle, or one who had a competent knowledge of the history of the Old Testament, and of the dispensation of the gospel, should introduce such a fabulous legend as that, which is the subject of the 9th verse, how that Michael, &c. If any one can build his faith in the existence of such a being, on such a contemptible story as this, I would leave him in quiet possession of his opinion; for there is little room to hope that reason will have much influence, where absurdity has obtained such an absolute dominion." Let it not be forgotten that English and American Unitarians solemnly profess to receive the epistle of Jude as a part of the inspired Word of God.

Let it be remembered that the preceding extracts have been taken from the accredited organ of English Unitarianism, evidently written by one able to make the best of his subject. It is no common mind, which can give such uncommon *twists* to scripture. These were written twenty years ago. Unitarianism is a precipitous declivity; down, down, down to a bottomless abyss. But few prints of returning feet are to be traced in an upward pathway. What Marshal Ney said to Napoleon, "revolutions never go backward," is equally true in the religious and in the political world. A distinguished Unitarian writer thinks, that if forty years more are allowed his system, it may be proved as true *by its works*, as Calvinism. I will only ask, if fifteen years have brought the greater part of the Unitarian clergy of New England, from Worcesterians or Semi-Arians to Humanitarians, how long it will take the latter to become infidels in speculation? *Mark this*, I do not charge any one with *designing* to become

infidel. But I recollect who said, “ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of.” *I know what have been the results with minds similarly circumstanced.* Moral causes and moral effects are as indissolubly conjoined as any in the physical world. Mr. Belsham, ungratefully neglected by his American brethren, shall have a hearing. “In the New Testament the word *devil* is sometimes used to personify the principle of evil, and sometimes the idolatrous and persecuting power; and the want of attention to this figurative mode of expression, has misled many readers who were ignorant of the Hebrew and Oriental phraseology, and has induced them to believe the real existence of an evil spirit.” Month. Rep. p. 305, 1807. Mr. Belsham is a man of thought, of *greater capacity* of thinking, I verily believe, than any American co-worker in the same cause, and not inferior in learning, and far, very far *beyond them all* in open frankness of expression. He is an honest man. In the passage just quoted, it will be seen that he coincides with Cappe, with the anonymous representative of English Unitarianism, and with the Rev. Mr. Ware.

I have not thought it necessary to remark, in the Letters, on the alleged use of the word *devil*, in the New Testament, as a personification of the idolatrous and persecuting power. I know not that any New-England Unitarian holds that opinion. Let the reader, however, apply either of Mr. Belsham’s personifications to this one passage, “the devils believe and tremble,” in its connexion in the epistle of James. Mr. Belsham is not ignorant of the power of words, nor what a mist hard names can conjure up before ignorant imaginations. He understands the “philosophy of mind” too well, to let slip the opportunity of verbal influence. We could tell him of some, who, after years of study in the Hebrew idiom and habitudes of thought, and after an acquaintance, not altogether slight, with the Syriac and Chaldaic and Arabic languages and learning, still “believed the real existence of an evil spirit.” In his own land, he might find in Professor Lee, “the admirable Crichton” of the age, such an one; he need not go far from his own door to meet John Pye Smith, the first dissenting clerical scholar of Great Britain, whose chastened taste, and various learning, and unassuming yet active piety, present one of the most finished models for youthful contemplation.

One other quotation from the Monthly Repository, shall close this Note. A writer therein thinks the sufferings of Christ in the garden, resulted from the exquisite susceptibilities of his physical frame. Besides, “he had a most severe and distressing bodily disorder” at

this time. He was seized "with a violent nervous affection." Hence his distress. I suspect this will be *news* to the most enlightened American rationalist.

NOTE D. *Page 56.*

As the Unitarians have recently broken ground on a subject, where it has long been known, often predicted, and as often denied, that they must ultimately come, it may not be "travelling too far beyond the record," to meet them at the outset in a note appended to this discussion. The subject referred to will be found, *in the end*, to be nothing less than *a denial of the inspiration of the whole sacred volume*. In the Christian Examiner for January and February, 1828, is the continuation of a learned and elaborate essay on the author of the epistle to the Hebrews. The writer of this essay has come out, with a degree of boldness, and a distinctness of expression, hitherto unusual in his school. For this the community will thank him. No religious teacher, least of all an instructor of religious teachers, should hold opinions which he would not freely state, and, when called upon respectfully, defend with what of argument and ability he may possess. *For his own religious opinions, individually, he is alone responsible to his God and his Redeemer.* But when he assumes the office of a public teacher in any community, his situation changes. He is then *in duty bound* to let that community know, fully and frankly, what his opinions are. The writer referred to is, both by report and by internal evidence, a distinguished individual in the Unitarian ranks. When on common ground, he writes with a beauty and a force that are truly admirable. Two pages from the pen of Johnson can scarcely be selected, superior in discrimination and felicity of expression, to those which precede the discussion in this number of the Examiner. In this essay, though something, I doubt not, is still undisclosed, something new, *in this country*, has been advanced. The fact, that Unitarians reject the epistle to the Hebrews as uncanonical, is not now for the first time known, though it is for the first time distinctly *made known* in the accredited organ of American Unitarianism.* *The epistle to the Hebrews must be got*

* I shall not stop to inquire why so absurd, illogical, mystical, unintelligible a book has been *so long* allowed by intelligent Unitarians to pass for *genuine*, believing it, as they must have done, to be *spurious*.

rid of at all events. Such a feeling seems to have actuated this writer, from the beginning to the end of his communication. *He does not state, nor give even a passing notice to the arguments, historical, critical, and irresistible, of Professor Stuart.* I will not suffer myself to state in *appropriate* terms what he *has* done, lest some of my readers should think that such words ill become the advocate of truth. I will only say to the intelligent reader, who is willing to know the truth, “read, compare and consider the Introduction to this epistle by Prof. Stuart and this essay, which purports to be a review of this Introduction.”

The rejection of this epistle, however, will ultimately be found an immaterial and unimportant part of the developements made in this essay. As this writer has not noticed Prof. Stuart's arguments, he will not complain, (at least he *need not*,) that I do not here notice the first number of his essay, but confine my remarks to his second. His argument, in his own words, is this, “*St Paul and the writer to the Hebrews differ widely from each other in their prevailing mode of interpreting the Jewish scriptures, in the use which they make, in reasoning, of passages from those scriptures, and in their style of reasoning generally.*” p. 38. To those who are not disposed to submit the dictum of any man, however learned, but rather to examine every argument however plausible, something may be suggested, which will not only call in question the validity of this argument, but may also start the inquiry, whether, if not under, at least *in connexion with it*, something more is not meant than meets the eye. This argument may first be refuted as above stated, and then stated in the altered form the writer has contrived to give it in the course of his remarks, and which he well knows it must take or not be “worth a straw.”

This writer being judge, “all the evangelists are allegorists.”* He will not deny that Christ himself indulged in the allegorical or mystical interpretation and application of the Old Testament, *if his conversations and remarks are reported correctly by these evangelists.* Peter, in his addresses to the Jews, adopts this mode of reasoning. Thus far Paul is untouched. But the following concession is by the essayist himself. “Allegorical interpretations of the Old Testament, *similar to those on which the reasoning in the epistle to the Hebrews is founded*, occur, likewise, in the gospels and in the Acts of the

* This writer shall have the privilege of *defining his own terms.* We hope he and his brethren will be *as courteous* in return. “Allegorical,” “mystical,” “merely imaginary,” are synonymous. “An allegorical meaning is *any* supposed mystical meaning, answering in some sort to the true meaning of a passage, whether that passage be literal or figurative.” p. 40.

apostles. They are found in a speech of St. Paul, as it is given by St. Luke, in the thirteenth chapter of the Acts." p. 53. This was a speech addressed to "the men of Israel," i. e. to the Hebrews. Grant now, what this writer labors through ten pages to prove, that Paul in his other epistles addressed to *Gentiles*, never allegorizes. What becomes of his argument? Surely when the evangelists, and Christ according to these evangelists, and Peter and Paul in addressing the Hebrews, *all use interpretations of the Old Testament similar to those on which the reasoning in the epistle to the Hebrews is founded*, this writer might have spared both his learning and his labor to prove that Paul, in addressing these very Hebrews, would not still adopt the same mode of reasoning. To show that he allegorized to Gentiles *but little*, would only show that there was little occasion for it; or to show that he did not allegorize *at all*, would not at all touch the point. What should we think of the biblical critic's logic, who should attempt to prove that the speech recorded in the thirteenth chapter of the Acts, could not have been delivered by the same orator, who, on Mars Hill reasoned with the Stoicks and the Epicureans "out of their own poets," and should give as his reason, that in the first speech the orator reasoned with the Hebrews according to their own principles, and "out of their own scriptures"? Yet this is precisely the absurdity of this writer, learned as he is, and discriminating as he can be, when the least flaw is to be detected in an opponent's argument.

In principles of reasoning, and methods of quoting scripture or poetry, the orator at Athens "*differs as widely*" from the orator at Antioch, as the writer of the epistles to the Thessalonians, differs from the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews. Was Paul at Antioch a different orator from Paul at Athens? Would not this essayist have done but impartial justice to have recollected an avowed maxim of the apostle, that in things not criminal, he "became all things to all men," "*to the Jews as a Jew*"? I will here quote a remark from an author, who, *this writer* will admit, understood what he said. "His reasoning, [the apostle Paul's,] which, at first view might seem unsatisfactory, will in many cases appear striking and forcible, when we have a correct notion of the opinions and sentiments of those for whom it was designed." p. 69. This remark is equally true and valuable. Let the essayist review his quotations from Lightfoot, &c. and let him decide *from his own authorities*, whether the epistle to the Hebrews was not the place of all places for that mode of interpretation, which he himself allows to have been common and popular among that people.

Let those at Cambridge, accustomed *jurare in verba magistri*, examine well before they take assertions to be proof, or *assumptions* to be *arguments*. For the benefit of those, who imagine themselves enjoying the pure light of unsullied truth, I will quote another remark from this essayist, and contrast it with one or two from a different quarter. "Among his cotemporaries, he [the writer to the Hebrews] was probably distinguished for his intellectual powers. But his reasoning cannot be regarded *as of any force* by an intelligent reader of the present day. It is difficult so far to accommodate our minds to the conceptions and principles of the author and his cotemporaries, as to perceive how it was adapted to produce any effect at the time it was written." p. 40 Again. "The force of St. Paul's reasoning, and the weakness of the reasoning of the writer to the Hebrews, will be most clearly perceived by him, who best understands their writings." p. 70. It seems, then, according to the dictum of this essayist, that "an intelligent reader" must at once detect "the weakness of the reasoning" exhibited in the epistle to the Hebrews, and, contrasting it with the usual strength of Paul's, must reject the claims of that apostle to its authorship. This is *assertion*, depending for its credibility on the character of its asserter. What he presents in the shape of argument, has been met by argument. His assertions, put forth so confidently, may be *fairly met* by counter assertions of names quite as learned and quite as willing to look at *both sides* as himself. Storr, in his *Theology*, vol. i. p. 120, says, that "Berger, in his Dissertation entitled, 'The Epistle to the Hebrews a Homily,' finds so great a similarity between the epistle to the Hebrews and Paul's discourse, Acts, xiii. 16—41, that he believes this discourse might be regarded as an extract from that epistle, or vice versa, that epistle as a commentary on this discourse." Storr was himself something of a dialectitian, and paid as close attention to the epistles of Paul and that to the Hebrews, *probably*, as this essayist, and, perhaps, as any man now living. Need I say what was the result with this "intelligent reader"? This essayist, probably, does not consider Prof. Stuart an "intelligent reader," and does not number him among those who "best understand their writings," i. e. of Paul and the writer to the Hebrews. But as, in this community, he will probably be *singular* in his opinion, the following remark from Prof. Stuart, may, by some, be thought of equal weight with that of the essayist. "My own conviction, (if I may be permitted to express it,) is as clear in respect to this point, as from its nature I could expect it to be. I began the examination of the subject unbiassed, if I was ever unbiassed in the examination of any question ;

and the evidence before me has led me to such a result ;" viz, that Paul was the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews. How can the essayist wonder that Berger, and Storr, and Stuart, should believe that the reasoning of the writer to the Hebrews had the *exact force of Paul's reasoning*, when he himself tells us, that interpretations of the Old Testament, similar to those on which the reasoning in the epistle to the Hebrews is founded, exist in Paul's speech to those Hebrews? Is it a wonder that Paul is consistent with himself?

I do not expect by these remarks, to shake one prejudice in the mind of a settled, thorough-going, Unitarian. But will the young, ingenuous, inquiring minds, who boast that their opinions must rest on reason, take the self-contradictory dogmas of any man in lieu of evidence? I ask all reflecting, intelligent, candid minds, Has not the argument, as stated in the words of the gentleman himself, been refuted? Just recollect that he himself assures us, *that Paul allegorizes in his recorded speech addressed to the Hebrews*; that his epistle to the Hebrews is an epistle to the Hebrews, with whom, according to his own showing, *the allegorical mode of interpretation was in general favour and use*; and the essayist's forty pages are null and void.

I come now to considerations of greater moment. I will here state the argument in the form it must take, and which this writer knows full well it must take, or go for nothing. *Paul never allegorizes. The writer to the Hebrews does allegorize. Therefore he is not Paul.* Again. *He who employs the allegorical mode of interpretation is unworthy of credit. This writer employs this mode of interpretation. Therefore he is unworthy of credit. Wherefore this writer is not Paul, and, be he who he may, is unworthy of credit.*

Should the essayist object to the syllogism by which an allegorist is proved unworthy of credit, I would thank him for the arguments by which he would disprove it. Though the gentleman has given his argument *in words as before quoted*, he has contrived in its progress, to present it in the form which I have just stated. He is too intelligent a man, and too skilful a logician, not to see, with Paul's speech before him, that the argument, as stated by himself, is at least *exceedingly unsatisfactory*, and to the Orthodox will be wholly nugatory. How he disposes of Paul's speech, we shall soon see.

That the writer strongly desired and covertly designed to present the argument as just stated, the following extracts, I think, will show. "We have thus gone through those passages of St. Paul, which we believe would be selected by a writer, whose object it was to show

that he had given a mystical sense to words of the Old Testament. *None of them, when properly understood, seem to afford any foundation* for the opinion.* But supposing it to have been proved that they do not, more has been proved than is necessary to the present argument. In order to establish a wide difference between St. Paul and the writer to the Hebrews, it would be sufficient to show, that the mind of the apostle, during that period of his life when he wrote his epistles, was *but little* affected by the prevalent errors of his age, respecting the interpretation of the Old Testament." p. 68. Again. "It is a most striking proof of the intellectual power of this apostle, that he so far, *or entirely*, disengaged himself from the errors of the learned of his nation, respecting the interpretation of the Old Testament." p. 69. The words, "or entirely," were not used by this writer without thought, or the perception of their bearing. He thinks this a circumstance hitherto overlooked, in estimating the intellectual stature of this apostle. He is right. By Unitarians it has been overlooked; we are glad it has at length been discovered. Again, p. 69. "He has nowhere in his epistles attempted to accommodate to Jesus any of the allegorical expositions by which so many passages were made by the Jews to refer in a mystical sense, to their expected Messiah;" *a fortiori*, we must argue, that he *nowhere* accommodates those Jewish allegorical expositions to any other subject. *None* of the passages in his other epistles, wherein he has been supposed to adopt the allegorical mode of interpretation, seem to afford *any* ground for such an opinion. The apostle *entirely disengaged* himself from this error of the learned of his nation. He *nowhere* attempts to accommodate any of the allegorical meanings, attributed by the Jews to the Old Testament, to Christ (or to any other person or subject.) The inference is irresistible. *Paul never allegorizes.* In other words, Paul never uses that mode of reasoning adopted by the writer to the Hebrews, wherefore he is not that writer. This is the drift of the essayist's explanations and argument. Still the speech, recorded in the Acts as having been delivered by Paul at Antioch in Pisidia, when invited to address the "men of Israel" by "the rulers of the synagogue," wherein, according to this writer, Paul indulges in "allegorical interpretations of the Old Testament, *similar to those on which the reasoning in the epistle to the Hebrews is founded,*" remains to be disposed of. How does he meet this difficulty? HE DOES NOT MEET IT. He does not *attempt* to meet it openly. He tries to shun it. It is only by hints, and a cautious mode of stating his argument, that we can conjecture how he *could* evade a concession so destructive to his

whole argument, as that just quoted. This writer understands perfectly the force of language, and if he adopt a peculiarity of expression, it is not without reason. "Allegorical interpretations are found in the speech of St. Paul, *as it is given by St. Luke*, in the thirteenth chapter of the Acts. This speech was delivered a considerable time" [how long is a considerable time?] "before the composition of the earliest of his epistles, which was, probably, (?) that to the Galatians."* Those words, "as it is given by St. Luke," are very innocent and very true in themselves. Whether they have a *hidden* meaning, the author has not *told* us. In the absence of positive, we must cast about for circumstantial evidence, which, though often inconclusive, is sometimes irresistible. The same Luke, who wrote the Acts, it must be remembered, is one of the evangelists, "all of whom are allegorists." If "they unconsciously and through inadvertence may have given an allegorical interpretation to the words of Christ, which as uttered by him, were used only by way of application," as this writer avers, Paul surely could not expect to fare better than his master. It might very naturally be expected, that "by a slight change of expression," Paul's words, "used by way of application," would receive from the pen of the allegorizing historian "an allegorical turn." This will appear still more probable, when we recollect that *no passage* in the epistles of St. Paul seems to afford *any foundation* for the opinion, that he ever used the allegorical interpretation, that he had not "*entirely disengaged himself* from this error of the learned of his nation."

The inference from all this is, the moral certainty that "the speech, as it is given by St. Luke," is not the speech *as it was delivered by St. Paul*. Should, however, any "doubts or difficulties" remain after this logical demonstration, the reader must further consider, that "this speech was delivered a considerable time before the composition of his earliest epistles."† This is plainly the writer's resort

* If this writer will permit, I would suggest another probability, at least equally as great as his. I would say that the apostle Paul, after addressing the "men of Israel" at Antioch, his heart glowing with affection to "his kinsmen according to the flesh," expanded into this circular epistle the doctrine he had just been teaching in the synagogue. This was "a considerable time" before he wrote his epistle to the Galatians. Some years after this, "the mind of the apostle might have been *but little* affected by the errors of his age." Would not such a supposition avert the *disagreeable* necessity of rejecting this epistle, and even allow this writer's argument to be of *some* weight? For the *real* probability in this case, see Prof. Stuart's Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews.

† Whether this writer "is able so far to accommodate his mind to the conceptions and principles" of this orator and his auditors, "as to perceive how it was adapted to produce the intended or any effect at the time it was delivered," he has not informed us. Before he decides ultimately and forever to reject the epistle to the Hebrews, *on such ground as that above stated*, might it not be well for him to

to rid himself from any difficulty arising out of this early speech, *as it is given by St. Luke*. Whether a *really inspired argument* ever becomes superannuated, I am not aware that the omnivorous Germans have discussed. These facts combined,—that Luke may not, and *most probably* has not, correctly reported the speech of Paul, and the very natural fact that Paul, growing wiser as he grew older, outgrew his own early prejudices, *if he had any on this subject*, and the certain fact, that in the epistles, written “a considerable time,” even the earliest of them, after this speech, the apostle appears to have entirely disengaged himself from this common error of the most learned of his countrymen,—will leave the argument, as I have stated it, *and as this essayist has contrived to present it*, valid and irresistible.


“Look before you leap,” is a plain maxim, of some age and much wisdom. Let us see where such reasoning would carry us. This writer being judge, “all the evangelists are allegorists.” But allegorists are unworthy of credit. Therefore the evangelists are unworthy of credit. Something of a step this, *to begin with*. The allegorizing evangelist, John, wrote three epistles and the apocalypse, wherefore these are unworthy of credit. Luke, in addition to the gospel, wrote the Acts, wherefore this is unworthy of credit. After this, one would think that Paul need apprehend no more danger from the speech, “as it is given by St. Luke.” But to proceed. The inspiration and authority of the gospel by Mark, have universally been deduced from the sanction given this book by Peter. Peter, then, having sanctioned the allegorical gospel of Mark, (to say nothing of his own speeches *as given by St. Luke*,) must be involved in the same condemnation with this allegorist; wherefore his two epistles are unworthy of credit. What has just been said of Mark and Peter, applies also, in the same way, though with still greater force and certainty, to Luke and Paul. The gospel, and the Acts of the apostles, written by this allegorist having been sanctioned by this apostle, the latter falls into the same condemnation with the former; wherefore the epistles of Paul are unworthy of credit. Q. E. D. Truly this is an expeditious mode of despatching business. The Unitarian canon of inspired books, will consist, then, of the epistles of James and Jude. But these, it is well

reconsider the apostle's speech, from the thirty-first verse to the end? In this inspired argument, the apostle “adopts the same principle of reasoning, employed in the epistle to the Hebrews.” “A considerable time” after it was delivered, even “as it is given by St. Luke,” it came before the mind of the apostle, who not only inconsiderately failed to correct the errors of his reporter, but actually restamped upon it the seal of his inspired authority. This consideration I seriously suggest to the attentive thought of this learned and ingenious essayist, whose system, and not his intellect, is answerable for these unavoidable absurdities.

known, were not among the universally received books in the primitive Christian church.* To reject the epistle of Jude, considering the obscurity, not to mention "the fabulous legend, the contemptible story, found in the most ancient manuscripts," cannot be considered presumptuous, but rather a proof of earnest desire not to receive for the Word of God, the mere word of man. Much the same may be said of the epistle of James, which even Luther, in the very infancy of biblical criticism, thought of doubtful authority; *a fortiori*, liberal interpreters must reject it. A doubtful book cannot be received as undoubtedly inspired. This is "clearing the wreck" quite effectually. Whitfield is said to have told his hearers that, were they permitted to tear out, one by one, a leaf from the Bible, such as they individually disliked, they would leave him "only the covers." Whether the biblical critics in our ancient University, early dedicated to "Christ and the Church," are not in a fair way to leave us *only the covers*, let the *intelligent reader* decide. The appeal is here made to those capable of discrimination, who can distinguish between logic and rhetoric, between argument and assumption, who can trace the connexion, if it exist, between premises and conclusion, whether, *allowing the evangelists to be allegorists*, according to the concession of the essayist, *and his argument, as he has contrived to present it, to be valid*, the conclusion is not irresistible, that all the New Testament, excepting the epistles of James and Jude, *is unworthy of credit, as of divine inspiration, and of infallible authority?* "The intelligent reader" will bear in mind, that this question does not relate simply to the honest endeavors of the evangelists and apostles to tell the truth, "to the best of their knowledge," but *to their inspired, infallible authority*. How the epistles of James and Jude could be proved inspired after the rejection of the rest of the New Testament, and whether the dispute about them would be "worth the candle," I shall not stop to inquire.

The great importance of this subject warrants an extended and varied illustration. The essayist thinks the epistle to the Galatians, the first epistle written by Paul. p. 53. His reasons for this opinion he has

*To prevent misapprehension on the part of *any*, it may be stated, that of the twenty-seven books, which now compose the New Testament, twenty were received by all the early Christian churches with unanimous consent from the apostolic age. These are called *universally received books*. The remaining seven, were *generally* received by the churches, but not, at first, universally. About the first class, there was no doubt on the part of any. About the second, there was very little, resulting generally from circumstances easily understood. The latter class consists of the epistles to the Hebrews, of James, second of Peter, second and third of John, Jude, and the Revelation. As the attack has recently been commenced on the first named of this latter class, it may safely be presumed that is this but the opening of the campaign, a war of extermination having been resolved upon. At all events, when war begins, who can tell *when and where* it will end?



not stated. Among these he would probably put this, *the manner of reasoning employed in this epistle bears a greater resemblance to that of the speech in the Acts, than that employed in his other epistles*. Paul was a young man when that speech was delivered, in which he uses the allegorical mode of interpretation and reasoning. This epistle shows that he still cast a lingering look back to the favorite mode of argumentation, employed by the most learned of his countrymen. Though he had not as yet divested himself of every prejudice, he does not suffer his argument to be marred by it. After this, he manifests no trace of this error of his countrymen, as is apparent from his other epistles, in which "he nowhere attempts to accommodate to Jesus, any of the allegorical expositions, by which so many passages were made by the Jews to refer, in a mystical sense, to their expected Messiah." p. 69. The essayist would argue, and with *apparent* logic, this epistle, more nearly resembling the allegorical argument, as given by St. Luke, than any other of Paul's epistles, though written "a considerable time" after that speech, was probably written before the other epistles. The whole force of this argument (the strongest I can imagine to support the essayist's extraordinary position) rests on the assumed state of the apostle's mind at different periods, as either disposed or not disposed to use the allegorical mode of reasoning from and appealing to the Old Testament. The *apparent* weight of this argument, which is all it possesses, may be soon made to *disappear*.

Dr. Carpenter, no mean critic for a *Unitarian*, and the Unitarians and Orthodox generally, think it probable that the first epistle to the Thessalonians was the first epistle written by Paul, about A. D. 52. I assume the position, that the concurrent opinion of the great body of the Unitarian and Orthodox critics is quite as probable, as the opinion of this essayist, learned as he is. They generally think this epistle to the Thessalonians was written, at least five, and perhaps ten or even fifteen years before that to the Galatian churches. But in this epistle to the Thessalonians, *as all allow*, Paul does not employ the allegorical mode of reasoning; he does not quote nor even refer to the Old Testament. He was at least five and, perhaps, fifteen years ("a considerable time," *this!*) younger, than when he addressed the Galatian churches. How should this happen, that, in the epistle generally believed to have been the first he wrote, there is no trace of an allegorizing spirit, when in his epistles to the Galatians and others, written a considerable time later, there are many passages, which, the essayist allows, "seem to require some explana-

tion"? Is it not possible that his opinion and argument are alike without foundation? With the Orthodox, the explanation is easy and satisfactory. The Thessalonians were chiefly converts from paganism; few, perhaps none of them, knew any thing of the Old Testament. The allegorical interpretation would have been wholly out of place in an epistle to such converts, and the occasion did not so much call for argument as exhortation. The epistle to the Galatian churches, was occasioned by Judaizing teachers, who had crept in, corrupting the truth. In these churches there seems to have been a mixture of Jews and Gentiles, the latter, probably, much the most numerous. This epistle was addressed to just such persons. Is there any thing wonderful *in this*, that an inspired and divinely-guided apostle, whether in the earlier or in the latter part of his ministry, should adapt his speeches, letters, and arguments, to the character, condition, and capacity of those addressed? That in addressing an Athenian audience on the Areopagus, he should appeal to a Grecian poet, in confirmation of his own sentiments, while Isaiah and David are left unnoticed? That in addressing the "men of Israel" in their own synagogue at Antioch, he should appeal to the scriptures which were there read every Sabbath day, and with which he had been familiar from childhood? That he should appeal to these scriptures in the very manner in which his auditors were wont to appeal to them? That in addressing the Thessalonians, he should write to them "as without the law"; while, in addressing the Hebrews, he should write to them as those who had been under the law, and knew all its rites, its ceremonies, and its observances? That he, who at one time could claim his right by avowing, "I am a Roman," should also at another, addressing "his kinsmen according to the flesh," prove that he was "an Hebrew of the Hebrews"? If an author is not to be confined to one class of topics, and one mode of illustration, *if he may adapt his mode of reasoning to the persons and the circumstances of the persons addressed*, then the wide difference, on which the essayist reposes his argument, is a dream of his own imagination, and nothing else. For it is generally believed, that this difference is *most wide* between his speech as recorded in the Acts, and the first epistle he ever wrote; and the argument, if it prove any thing, (I beg the reader to mark this,) will prove, *either that he did not write the first epistle to the Thessalonians, or did not deliver the speech recorded in the thirteenth of Acts*. The essayist can take his choice, which he seems already to have done by implication, and necessary inference, *rejecting the latter*. Unless I greatly err, the unprejudiced reader will believe that he delivered the

one, and wrote the other, and that the essayist's elaborate argument is straw-built, and tumbles not so much through its weight, as its weakness; not so much through the strength of its assailant, as the insufficiency of its foundation, and the feebleness of its defence.*

In that state of things to which the essayist's argument would bring us, to whom, to what, can we go, "having the words of eternal life"? To this question, another writer in the same Examiner has, by rather a noticeable coincidence, unwittingly supplied an answer. I look upon this essayist and this reviewer, (whom I thus name for distinction sake,) as having given us the strength and the *set* of the Unitarian current, far more fully and unequivocally, than has before been done, and more so than they *individually intended*. But opinion, like murder, *will out*. In the review of Dick's Christian Philosopher, there is much truth, beautifully expressed, happily illustrated, and forcibly applied. There are also expressions symptomatic of a disquiet spirit, of a heart ill at ease, as yet all unconscious of the heights and the depths, the length and the breadth of the unsearchable riches in Christ Jesus, which break upon the soul that receives and *loves* the Saviour as participent of our nature, and "God manifest in the flesh," at once "the root and the offspring of David," a descendant of Abraham as to his humanity, and "God over all, blessed forever."

Nature, without revelation, has always been considered "a sealed book." But according to the argument of the essayist, just examined, we have little or no revelation, or at all events, we *must be in great doubt as to what this revelation is*. I do not wish to overcharge this statement. Is it not the truth, and is it any thing more than the truth, that a Unitarian, who adopts the opinions and the reasoning of the essayist, *must be in great doubt as to what revelation is*? In this state of darkness, into which one Unitarian writer leads and leaves us, another takes us. He says, page 24 of the same Examiner, "we often need something more direct, and immediate, and palpable, than the feelings and sentiments, which we have derived from written knowledge, which, however sublime and glorious in itself, has been conveyed to us, through the fallible medium of written languages and translations of languages." Let not this writer

* In replying to the argument of the essayist, and showing its fallacy, I have not thought it necessary to call in question his assertions relative to the allegorical use of the Old Testament, &c. by the writer to the Hebrews. Granting all that he assumes on this subject, his argument is still entirely without weight. The reader, desirous of understanding the manner in which passages are quoted from the Old Testament by the writers of the New Testament, will find much valuable information in the Commentary by Prof. Stuart, especially in the last Excursus. Consult also a Lecture delivered and published by Dr. Woods on this subject. See also *The Spirit of the Pilgrims*, Vol. I. No. 9. p. 478.

think that any objection is raised against the study of the works of God, while a solemn protest is entered against such a view of the Word of God. Chalmers would have written thus, when abroad on his botanical excursions, or engaged in his laboratory, for the first ten years of his ministry. During the last fifteen years, he has not forgotten his previous acquisitions, nor overlooked the obligations of science to Christianity, while he has found the Bible to be "a storehouse of unworked materials," from which to bring out, for the *certain* instruction of man, and the glory of God, "things new and old." Dwight, and Payson, men of no ordinary grade, in whom taste and learning and piety were happily blended, would have given their right hand to the flame, ere a sentence like that should have dropped from their pen. What? Has it come to this? For the instruction of our ignorance, for the strengthening of our faith, for the consolation of our sorrows, for the support of our spirits when hovering over the unfathomable abyss, whence none return, are we to quit the written word of God, the everlasting gospel of his Son, which shall not fail though heaven and earth pass away, and take in its stead the hieroglyphics of nature, which the wisest and the best of heathen sages pronounced indecipherable? No wonder this reviewer should elsewhere add, "there are hours, we suspect, in the life of every man, in which it seems to him as if the foundations of truth and faith were breaking up around him, and his hopes were to be confounded and defeated.* These are indeed sad and gloomy hours, when all that we have believed, and all that we have hoped, seems fading away in dim and distant uncertainty. Yet he must be either a very firm and enlightened, or else a very thoughtless man, who does not sometimes experience feelings like these." p. 19.

"What can we reason but from what we know?"

If such be Unitarianism, that *it unsettles the canon of sacred books, and shakes the foundations of faith, and truth, and hope*, as it would seem from the concurring testimony of the essayist and the reviewer, truly may the poor and ignorant, aye, and the wise and the wealthy, and the great of the world too, say, "O my soul, come not thou into their secret; unto their assembly, mine honor, be not thou united!"

In concluding this note, I will only add, that whatever may be thought of the essayist's argument, of the analysis here given of it,

* It is necessary to state a distinction of great importance, which the Reviewer has not noticed. The truly pious man may, and often does tremble, lest, a promise being left, he should fail, through his own fault, of attaining to the heavenly rest. But *the foundations of truth and faith remain unshaken*, against which the gates of hell shall not prevail.

or of the reviewer's assertions, this is plain, *the epistle to the Hebrews is no longer to be received by the Unitarians as a part of the inspired Word of God*. It has been pronounced, *ex cathedra*, uncanonical, unintelligible, absurd. No Unitarian has yet whispered a surmise that the argument, so called, of the essayist, is not conclusive and satisfactory. The Orthodox, be it known, are not prepared to renounce this "foundation of truth and hope"; they do not feel that it has been shaken; knowing the ground on which it rests, they *have no fears that it ever will be*. But, we may be permitted to ask, will Unitarian clergymen continue to read this apocryphal Bel-and-Dragon epistle from their pulpits, and in their families, without informing their hearers distinctly, that it is not properly a part of the Word of God, is not of inspired authority, and is read only as the Shepherd of Hermas might be, or any other merely human production? After such an explanation, it might be read *honestly*. *Can it be without it?* Do Unitarians read 1 John, v. 7? If they do, are they not *careful* to tell their people that "it is an interpolation," though something may be said in its behalf? Is it not required of them, if they would sustain a character for consistent honesty, to inform their hearers that the whole epistle to the Hebrews is of no more authority than this much disputed verse, since the Corypheus of the Unitarian chorus has informed a select literary audience *that nothing can be said* in favor of the Pauline origin or canonical authority of this epistle?

Why, it may be asked *in sober earnestness*, should not this epistle give 'place to Robinson Crusoe, "the reasoning of which" can "be regarded as of great force by an intelligent reader of the present day"? "It is, moreover," not "difficult so far to accommodate our minds to the conceptions and principles of the writer, as to perceive how it was adapted to produce great effect at the time it was written;" all of which is denied by the essayist in regard to this mystical, illogical misplaced epistle. Surely Unitarians, coinciding in the views of this writer, must allow that Robinson Crusoe or Gulliver's Travels have a better right, have a stronger and more rational claim, to be read from the pulpit, *being written on rational principles and for intelligible purposes*, than this incomprehensible jargon, so long and ignorantly revered as an inspired epistle to the Hebrews. In the next "Improved Version" shall this epistle have a place? Will not Mr. Paley exclude it from his text according to Griesbach? No matter for opposition from the ignorant, and the bigoted, and the irrational. Truth, *truth* will finally prevail. Let this be the course with those, who profess to hold in their hands the torch of science, and to gaze

with undazzled, eagle eye, on the Sun of Truth. Let not the modern Reformers, emulous of perfecting the work of Luther, shrink from the task.

We have now an entering wedge by which we may hope to obtain Unitarian notions of the inspiration and authority of the several books of the New Testament. Though, according to the argument of the learned essayist, the epistles of James and Jude compose the Unitarian canon, it may be doubted whether the latter of these will not be the very book first to follow the fate of that to the Hebrews. The reverence of English Unitarians for the epistle of Jude has been already seen. The Christian Examiner will not yield to the Monthly Repository in intelligence, and will not long continue more "illiberal," or less "rational." It may be questioned whether any further benefit is to be obtained by the longer concealment of Unitarian views. Unitarians must feel that the time has come, when strength of argument and not ingenuity of artifice must decide *where is truth and what is error*. This reflecting community requires reasons, and not prejudices; arguments, and not assertions; proofs, and not assumptions of the points to be proved. It may be said, then, with propriety to *all* parties, 'bring forth your strong arguments *plainly, fairly, and forcibly*. If Unitarianism be true, let Unitarianism prevail; if Orthodoxy be true, let Orthodoxy prevail; or if any intermediate system be true, let that prevail.' In the mean time, it need only be said, that Orthodoxy, like Revelation, does not fear examination of any kind. It invites, it has endured, and it can endure, the severest test. It only asks that men will *examine it*, will do it justice without prejudice, without partiality, and without favour.

Fiat veritas, ruat cælum.

NOTE E. Page 64.

The first step to become a "rational" believer would seem to be, *to renounce reason*; after that, one can reason himself into the belief of any thing however absurd, and out of the belief of any truth however certain. The freethinkers of England, the atheists of France, and the philosophizing divines of Germany, would afford abundant evidence of this. Whether cis-atlantic rationalism has altered its character by changing its place, those who are competent

can decide. The philosophers of Germany are waiting, it is said, with an anxiety unusual to that meditative race, for a full development of Schelling's philosophical system. In this vicinity, a somewhat similar anxiety is felt by many, to know what course "rational" opinion is ultimately to take. The young divines are placed in a predicament, which they must, at times, feel to be awkward. To go back, they cannot; "*facilis descensus averni; sed revocare,*" &c: to stand still is impossible, amid the increasing light of an improving age; to go forward is perilous. Many eyes are upon them. Hitherto the wind has been what the sailors call *baffling*; whether, hereafter, we are to have "steady gales," setting from "the frozen zone of Christianity," on the icebergs of avowed rationalism or open infidelity, it were premature to say. Time will show.

NOTE F. Page 67.

PRIESTLEY, EICHHORN, CALVIN.

The celebrated Cuvier pronounced the eulogy on Dr. Priestley before the National Institute. The following estimate of his character is accurate, and, considering the person who made it, and the audience before which it was delivered, wonderfully so. "In fact, his history will exhibit, if I may so speak, two men of distinct and almost opposite character. The first, a circumspect philosopher, he examines those objects alone which come within the limits of experience; employs only a strict and cautious mode of reasoning; fosters in his mind no prejudice, no love of system; seeks truth alone, whatever it may be, and seldom fails to discover truth, and to establish it in the most solid and lucid manner. The other, a daring theologian, rashly pries into the greatest mysteries; contemns the faith of ages; rejects the most revered authorities; commences disputant with preconceived ideas, *which he endeavors to extend rather than to examine, and to support which, he falls into the most contradictory hypotheses.*" The whole character is drawn in the same discriminating manner. Had it been Dr. Chalmers, instead of Cuvier, who gave this view of Dr. Priestley's character and efforts, it would have been branded as Calvinistic bigotry. As it is, we believe the admirers of Dr. Priestley are quite willing to forget the impartial estimate of the

French philosopher. The whole eulogy exhibits evidence that while Cuvier admired the talents, he understood the character of Priestley.

The following account of the life, labors, and death of a man not less distinguished, will be interesting to many readers. It is mostly from the Foreign Review and Continental Miscellany. *J. G. Eichhorn* was born 1752, in the principality of Hohenzollern Oehringen. His theory, as to the origin of the gospels, and the controversies springing out of it, it would be out of place to detail. His various and immense learning, and indefatigable labors, may be judged of by a partial enumeration of his works. History of Literature from the beginning to the latest times, 11 vols. General History of Cultivation and Literature of Modern Europe, 2 vols. History of Eloquence in the Modern Languages, 3 vols. History of the three last Centuries, 6 vols. General Library of Biblical Literature, 10 vols. Repertory of Biblical and Oriental Literature, 18 vols. Introduction to the Old Testament, 5 vols. ; and Introduction to the New Testament, 5 vols. The last two volumes of this Introduction were finished but a short time before his death. Besides these works, which he either wrote or edited, he also translated the Hebrew Prophets. In a proem prefixed to this translation, he ranks Isaiah, Jeremiah, &c. with Orpheus, Pythagoras, and other heathen *vates*. He died June 25, 1827, at Göttingen, where he had resided thirty-nine years as a Professor. "From the gradual decline of his strength, he felt the approach of death with the most imperturbable tranquillity ; and he remarked in the last hour to his friend, the anatomist Languenbeck, and the celebrated Professor Blumenbach, as a point of physiological curiosity, how he felt by degrees the vital spirit withdrawing from the different parts of the body, and only a quarter of an hour before he breathed his last, he distinctly stated that life was becoming extinct in the *spina dorsi*." If Eichhorn did not survive his reputation, he lived long enough to see that it would be any thing but *reputable*, with a generation not far distant.

When a Unitarian writer wishes to blunt an argument, or an orator desires to awaken a prejudice, there is a standing illustration always ready, with which

"To point his moral and adorn his tale,"

Calvin burnt Servetus. How it will follow from this, that Socinus was born without any taint of original corruption ; or that Davidies was not in the right to withhold worship from a being whom he deemed a creature merely, the gentleman, who visited Geneva and "reported progress" of *rational* Christianity among those, who sit in Calvin's

seat, did not inform the Unitarian Association. The following character of that champion of the reformation deserves attention.

“Let Calvin’s unimpeachable integrity ; his exalted sanctity ; his firm stand for truth ; the salutary and wide-spread influence of his personal labors, and his admirable writings ; let these be fairly estimated, and we shall hear rather less, than we have of late been accustomed to hear, ignorantly re-echoed, *of the one deep blot on an else spotless name.* The dreadful punishment inflicted on Servetus was in compliance with the notions of the time ; but a man like Calvin, we admit, should have been superior to the errors of his age. It was defended by a mistaken application of scripture authority, but Calvin should have better known the character of his sanction. His act was in the stern spirit of the law, while his creed and his christian experience should have referred him to a more merciful dispensation. But let it not be forgotten, that he had no personal end to serve ; that if there ever lived an individual above all imputation of priestcraft and hypocrisy, Calvin was the man ; and that, although an act of unrelenting severity was perpetrated, it was not done in wantonness of cruelty, nor in the lust of power, but in erroneous deference to principles and prescriptions, which even in our own times and in enlightened countries, retain a strong grasp on the prejudices of men.”

The conduct of Calvin in regard to Servetus, admits of no justification, and *scarcely* of apology. But why Unitarians should bestow all their sympathies upon Servetus, and “remember to forget” Davidies, venting all their antipathies upon Calvin to the entire exclusion of Socinus and his friend Blandrata, is somewhat mysterious, if their object be, in so often producing this illustration, to express their *hatred of persecution*, and their love of liberal principles and free inquiry. *To awaken prejudice is not to infix principle.* Unitarian orators seem well aware of the fact, that most people reason with their ears. At least their arguments are built on this “auricular confession.” If Unitarianism, whether in its larger or more limited sense, be true, it must *be proved so* by some better argument than “Calvin burnt Servetus.” It is unworthy the taste of Dr. Channing and the learning of Mr. Palfrey, to harangue in this style of bar-room declamation.

If Unitarians mean to insinuate that those, who are now called Calvinists in this country, are desirous of imitating the conduct of Calvin in this instance, without stopping to notice the enlarged “liberality” of the insinuation, may we be permitted to ask whether Dr. Prince,

or Dr. Bolles, or Mr. Emerson, is answerable for the scenes exhibited on "Gallows Hill," a century ago? Are Judge Story and Mr. Saltonstall disposed to hang witches? By what exuberance of liberality, we desire to know, are the Andover Professors held accountable for the reprehensible conduct of Calvin, three centuries ago? May we be permitted "to call for information," and request any intelligent gentleman to inform us what special purpose they expect to accomplish by this frequent rhetorical flourish? In the mean time we take the liberty of adding the following facts. Toulmin, no friend of Calvin and no enemy to Socinus, in his Life of the latter, speaking of Cranmer, Luther, Calvin, and Socinus, says, "they all erred in regard to Toleration," "it should, however, rather be ascribed to the times than the men, that they favored in one respect or another, intolerance or persecution." Let those who *possess*, as well as profess, liberality of sentiment, meditate upon this remark of the biographer of Socinus, and say, whether it is perfectly fair and just to the memory of the Genevan Reformer, without any reference to his merits, his attainments, or his efforts, thus to hold him up to perpetual scorn, while the circumstances of the age, and the feelings and conduct of his contemporaries, are *studiously concealed*? When the character of Socinus is drawn, is that trait of it, explained and modified by Toulmin, its leading, prominent feature? In what Unitarian imagination is not Calvin painted as only the gloomy, iron-hearted, relentless persecutor? Why, we ask again, and desire every Unitarian writer and declaimer before penning another sentence, or rounding another period, to answer the question, *why is not Davidies entitled to as much commiseration in Boston, as Servetus*? The plain truth is, that both Calvin and Socinus deserve reprehension. "Call *no man* master, for one is your master, even Christ." Imitate Paul *only so far* as he imitated Christ. Neither Abraham, nor David, nor Peter, nor Calvin, is the exemplar of Christian perfection. Yet what Unitarian would hazard his reputation for liberality by dwelling *only, or chiefly*, on the *faults* of the three names first mentioned? Why not treat Calvin with the same impartial justice as others, who either through remaining imperfections of nature, or the prescriptions of prejudice, fell into similar or equal faults? Really liberal men, of every denomination, need only have this subject presented in its proper light, to silence all the *slang* about "Calvin burnt Servetus." I would not have dwelt so long upon a topic, in itself so unimportant, but that the frequent recurrence to it in Unitarian sermons, periodicals, pamphlets, speeches, &c., has made it necessary, both in justice to the illustrious reformer, and to those who are now called Calvinists.

Thus far I have merely acted on the defensive, and exposed the hollowness of the Unitarian insinuation attempted to be conveyed by the unreflecting repetition of, "Calvin burnt Servetus." Were it necessary, the state of things in Switzerland in the *nineteenth* century, opens a field, which strongly invites offensive operations. Geneva would present much, and the Canton of Vaud more, for thoughtful consideration, especially contrasted with the present state of England. If the theology of Dr. Ware's Letters be liberal and rational, the theology of the Canton of Vaud is liberal and rational. In both cases, and in that of Geneva also, it is anti-calvinistic. In regard to the doctrine of the Trinity, so far as I can learn, that is still held in the Canton of Vaud, but it is a solitary column of a once fair fabric already tottering to its fall. All the connected doctrines, which constitute what is here called the Orthodox system, have long since been given up. Why, then, should a writer in the *Christian Examiner* call the Canton of Vaud an "Orthodox Canton"? The term Orthodox, in Boston, has a settled meaning, and when used by a Unitarian, is of necessity supposed to express that meaning, unless otherwise explained. Did not this writer know that the Canton of Vaud is not "Orthodox," in the sense in which his readers understand that word? If he did not, "it is a shame for him to write so confidently" on a subject he does not understand. If he did, we allow him to select the epithet appropriate to the deed. If he meant by Orthodox, what is so called in England, he should, in all fairness, have said so. In that case, it means *anti-calvinistic*, the complete antipodes of *Orthodox* in New England; just what is here understood by Unitarian, in contradistinction from Evangelical. *The Mummies of Geneva and the Canton of Vaud have been ridiculed, or silenced, or imprisoned, or banished, simply and solely, because they preached distinctly and heartily the doctrines here held to be Orthodox; and were so exceedingly zealous as to hold night meetings, and to read the Bible, four or five of them together, and to pray over it for divine illumination.* This we assert, and stand ready to prove, was the head and front of their offending in *liberal, rational, anti-calvinistic Switzerland*. *Amphigouri* would seem not confined to the *Genevan* clergy.

Look at England for a moment. The House of Commons has recently astounded Mr. Peel and the High Church party, by a large majority for the repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts, and by a majority for removing Catholic disabilities. How happens this? Who does not know that, for the last thirty years, the Evangelical party in the Church and among the Dissenters has been rapidly in-

creasing, while the Arminian party has been diminishing? The result is seen in the late votes in the House of Commons, the members of which might be, and the great majority of them, probably, are, wholly ignorant of the *origin* of that public sentiment of which they are merely the organ. Bible, and Missionary, and Tract, and Education Societies, and Sabbath schools are at once raising heathen nations to the rank of Christians, and casting off shackles that have too long encumbered Christians in the land of our Fathers. These institutions, be it remembered, are principally Evangelical in their origin, their character, their influence, and their support.

If the history of religious sects and opinions establishes one fact, it is this, to which we particularly invite philosophical Unitarian minds, *Evangelical sentiments have ever favored civil liberty*. So true is the text and the exposition of the text, by Prof. Stuart, "where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty." The character and influence of the Puritans, as exhibited in the Edinburgh Review of Milton's Theological Treatise, arrested attention, and commanded universal approbation. I would suggest to the reflecting Unitarian, as a subject of curious investigation, the comparative influence and tendency of Calvinistic or Evangelical sentiments in England, and of Liberal sentiments in Switzerland.

The defection of Geneva from Evangelical sentiments, has been a subject of no slight rejoicing in this quarter. The mode, the circumstances, the consequences, have not been so much dwelt upon. We have not time nor space for detail here. We wish, however, to present a specimen of Unitarian "established" liberality. "The *Venerable Compagnie*," require all candidates for the ministry to sign a promise to abstain from expressing their opinions, either by a discourse, or *part of a discourse*, [Unitarians *can* be definite if necessary,] upon these topics—"1. The manner in which the divine nature is united to the person of Christ. 2. Original sin. 3. Efficacious grace. 4. Predestination." One would think this enough.—Not so the Venerable Company. The candidates must also promise "*not to oppose the opinions of any of the pastors*." The Venerable Company, in these few "promise notes," beat the Bishop of Peterborough with his eighty-seven questions, out and out. In England, the Bishop was met with a public frown, from which he soon fled. Not so in *liberal* Geneva. A writer upon the spot well observes, upon this Venerable Company; "Self-contradictory men, who renounced a profession of faith, and forced subscription to promises; who mocked at ancient formularies, and established new ones; who declared that the spirit of the reformation was a spirit of liberty, and

chained up instruction." Yet the Christian Disciple and the Christian Examiner, published in Boston, United States of North America, volunteer apologies for the Venerable Company.

NOTE G. *Page 74.*

References to passages of the New Testament, exclusive of the Apocalypse, which relate to evil spirits. Matthew, iv. 1—11, 24. viii. 16, 28—34. ix. 32—34. x. 1, 8. xii. 22—29, 43—45. xiii. 18, 19, 24—30, 36—39. xv. 21—28. xvi. 23. xvii. 14—21. xxv. 41. Mark, i. 13, 23, 27, 32, 34, 39. iii. 11, 13, 14, 22—27. iv. 14, 15, 24. v. 1—20. vi. 7, 13. vii. 24—30. ix. 17—29, 38—40. xvi. 9. Luke, iv. 1—13, 33—36, 40, 41. vi. 18. vii. 21, 22. viii. 12, 26—36. ix. 1, 37—42, 49, 50. x. 17—20. xi. 14—26. xiii. 16, 32. xxii. 31. John, vi. 70. xii. 31. xiii. 2, 27. xiv. 30. xvi. 11. Acts, v. 3. viii. 7. x. 38. xiii. 10. xix. 12—16. xxvi. 18. On the narrative contained xvi. 16—18, see Storrs, vol. ii. p. 26. Romans, xvi. 20. 1 Cor. v. 5. vii. 5. x. 20, 21. 2 Cor. ii. 11. iv. 3, 4. vi. 15. xi. 3, 14, 15. xii. 7. Eph. ii. 2. iv. 27. vi. 10—18. Coll. i. 13. ii. 15. 1 Thess. ii. 18. iii. 5. 2 Thess. ii. 9. 1 Tim. iv. 1. v. 14, 15. 2 Tim. ii. 26. Heb. ii. 14. James, ii. 19. iv. 7. 1 Peter, v. 8. 2 Peter, ii. 4—11. 1 John, ii. 13. iii. 8—12. v. 18. Jude, 6—9.

By Christ himself, by the eight writers of the New Testament, in sixty-seven different chapters, and in more than two hundred verses, the personal existence and agency of "the devil and his angels" are distinctly asserted. Are the united, explicit, and often repeated declarations of Christ and his apostles worthy of credit? Whose decision is authoritative and final, in the land of the Pilgrims, that of divine inspiration or that of a self-styled rationalism?

NOTE H. *Page 75.*

REASON—ITS PROVINCE AND USE. JUDGE STORY.

It is a common assertion with Unitarians, that their system is more rational than the Orthodox. If this be true, it is more worthy of credit, and the sooner its claims are substantiated, the better. The following remark is a fair specimen of Unitarian assertion on this subject. "In addition to novelty, it has the advantage of claiming a

more intimate alliance with reason than those systems, which require a belief in doctrines that are incomprehensible." Month. Rep. 1806, p. 434. Let us examine the validity of this claim. Do the Orthodox discard reason? Who dare assert it? Do they *undervalue* reason? To answer this question we must ask another, what is the *legitimate province* of reason? To this the Orthodox reply, that reason is properly employed, 1. In examining the evidence of the existence of the Divine Being. 2. In examining the evidence on which a professed revelation of the divine will rests. 3. In ascertaining the authenticity and genuineness of the documents, which contain the truly divine revelation. 4. In investigating the meaning of these documents according to the established principles of language.

The Orthodox, believing the Bible to be the Word, and to contain the will, of God, profess to use reason simply for this purpose, to discover *what the will of God is, as revealed in his Word*. They conduct the investigation on principles similar to those applied by the classical critics to Homer, Hesiod, and Euripides. These critics, however, do not feel bound to defend the sentiments of those writers as true or rational. They merely state them as they find them. The Orthodox, on the other hand, adopt this argument of an able reasoner, "no demonstration can be stronger than this, GOD HATH SAID SO, THEREFORE IT IS TRUE." And what is *true*, they hold to be *rational*. The Orthodox, then, use their reason to discover what God *hath said*, not what he *ought to say*. Unitarians, practically at least, adopt the latter course, or there is no dispute between them and the Orthodox as to the principle of reasoning in this instance. The course practically adopted by Unitarians, their opponents consider both *irrational* and presumptuous. Reason with the one party acts as a judge, deciding *what the law is*; with the other, it is too often a legislator, declaring *what the law shall be*. The Orthodox found the reasonableness of their belief, chiefly, on the declarations of that God, who gave them reason, who knows the truth, and *cannot lie*. What firmer foundation for a *truly rational belief* does the Universe afford? Who, then, make the *proper* use of reason,—those, who submit their reason to the declarations of the omniscient Jehovah; or those, who subject the declarations of the eternal God to their mole-eyed reason? If it be irrational to trust God rather than man, the Orthodox cheerfully submit to the imputation. It should be kept distinctly in mind, that the question here, relates not to the interpretation put upon any passage, but to *the principle of interpretation*, applied to the whole sacred

volume. Whether the Orthodox interpretation be true, is a question of grammar and philology. Not only the lexicons of Gesenius and Schleusner, but the dictionary of Calmet, may be properly studied. But human philosophy is to be silent, when the question relates to subjects on which the human mind never had experience. In this case, real philosophy listens, but does not speak ; questions, but cannot answer.

I have wished here to reduce the subject to its elements. A full discussion is unnecessary. Those, who *have* reason and are disposed to *use* it, will find this subject ably discussed in the appendix to the first volume of Storr, by Prof. Schmucker. See also the review of the Evangelical Church Journal, in the Spirit of the Pilgrims for April, 1828. The same subject is also discussed in Dr. Beecher's sermon, entitled, "The Bible a code of laws."* Intelligent, reasoning minds, of every denomination, who are willing to examine the foundations, not only of the Orthodox, but of *all religious* faith, for themselves, will find matter for deep and satisfactory meditation in the works just mentioned.

Though somewhat acquainted with Unitarian writers, I know not the book where the Unitarian views on this subject are presented in a simple, coherent, dispassionate, and intelligible shape. The fact is, that Unitarian writers, when they refer to this topic, are generally not a little confused, from their forced admission of the inspiration and authority of the scriptures, and their wish to appeal to human reason, separated from, and in contradiction to those scriptures. A confusion arising, not from the want of talent or general learning, but from the contradictions inherent in their system.

The proper use of reason in matters of religion is, surely, a subject of great importance, deserving serious thought. Bretschneider has said, in reference to the Supernaturalists, or believers in the plenary inspiration of the scriptures, of Germany, that "they believe that reason furnishes the proofs of revelation, and that revelation cannot possibly contain any thing *contrary* to reason, though it may contain much that rises *above* reason." This, he adds, was the ground taken by Döderlein, Morus, and Reinhard ; and it is the ground now held by Ammon, Schot, Niemeyer, Bretschneider and others. To this the Orthodox of this country would subscribe without a dissenting voice.

At the annual meeting of the Unitarian Association in May of the present year, a learned Judge addressed the audience on a variety of topics, among others, dwelling at some length on the

* Occasional Sermons, p. 138.

subject of this note. The original talents, the general acquirements, the unwearied application to his chosen science, and the laborious duties of his office, the judicial uprightness and intentional impartiality of Judge Story, to say nothing of his private character and social virtues, no one is more willing, or more happy to admit, than the writer. He honors a station that would honor any man. But that honorable gentleman will pardon me for reminding him, that there are *legal* subjects, and others *besides* legal ones, that require *to be studied, in order to be understood*; and he need not be in doubt as to the hint, that fluency of remark does not always indicate intelligence of the subject professedly discussed. Instruction from laymen, upon subjects bearing more or less remotely upon religion, is desirable. It will not, however, be thought asking too much that it *be* instruction, and not ignorant declamation. The *assertions* of even a Sir Matthew Hale, will not now pass for argument. There was propriety in the proverb adopted by the Latins from the Greeks, which it is not necessary to apply, "*Quam quisque nôtit artem, in hac se exerceat.*" Will the learned Judge pardon me for asking, if it be *judicious* to decide, in a popular meeting, a legal question that may come before him for legal adjudication? Whoever listened to the earnest remarks of the Judge, must have perceived that the zealot had got the better of the man, that the partizan had supplanted the judge. The rights of Mr. Story to the Unitarian belief, and to advance the Unitarian cause by proper means, personal, pecuniary, or other, are undoubted. But great legal questions (one of which has not yet been *argued*, or *even started*, in our courts*) with due deference to the Judge, I shall take the liberty to remind him, (though he long since knew, but seems recently to have forgotten it,) are to be presented in open court, where both parties may be heard; to be thoroughly investigated, by the judge or judges, in moments of cool, unbiassed reflection; and to be decided, without the impulse of passion, without the influence of prejudice, and without the remembrance of party. When a judge, throws his decision, *formed without examination*, into one of those scales, which he is bound by his oath to hold with even hand, while we may respect his social virtues and not despise his talents, we shall not long fear his influence. If Judge Story should contend that he had thoroughly examined the question, we should like to know how this will mend the matter, or relieve the difficulty? Will he, or any one, say, "he is a judge of the United States' Court, and this is a question for the

* The rights of VOLUNTARY religious associations to hold property by "trust deeds" under the Constitution of Massachusetts.

State Courts, and so he is at liberty to give his private opinion"? Let us examine this plea. A. B., a merchant of Boston, brings, or may be supposed about bringing an action for 100,000 dollars, against C. D., also a merchant of Boston. The question is to come before, and to be decided by Judge Parker. Mr. Justice Story, in the course of a public address at Faneuil Hall, takes occasion to argue and decide the question. The gentleman in whose favor Judge Story might decide, would, no doubt, feel additional confidence in his cause. But what would Judge Parker, and the good people of Massachusetts, think of Mr. Justice Story? The truth is, Judge Story has, in this instance, (on reflection, I am convinced, he will think so himself,) descended from that lofty eminence of impartiality, where he usually resides, and from that perception of the proprieties of his station, in which he generally excels. He was indeed unfortunate in the time, place, and mode of his descent. What he said on human reason, has been said a thousand times, and a thousand times shown to be mere declamation: and his argument about trust deeds, could be most easily shown to be of the same character. It was, in fact, but a repetition of the unfounded assertions of "A Layman," which had been a little before triumphantly refuted in the review of his famous pamphlet on trust deeds. Judge Story would do well to remember that the followers of Jonathan Edwards can reason; and that the descendants of the Puritans know to whom they owe allegiance, and of whom they may claim their rights.

Unitarians object to the term *rationalism*, as indicative of their system, though "it claims a more intimate alliance with reason" than Orthodoxy. But what is rationalism? Let Wegscheider define his own system. "It is an unquestionable fact, that in the canonical books of the New Testament, are contained the authoritative documents of the Christian religion, and of the divine truth, which it declares; and these documents are of the antiquity, which they purport, and are perfectly worthy of credit. This being the case, in conducting a system of instruction for mankind at large, it is our duty to employ the utmost attention and pains, that, laying aside those far-fetched conjectures and questions, equally difficult and unprofitable, which have been brought up in later times, concerning revelation and the inspiration of the sacred books, we should evince that the Christian religion, as well as the Holy Scripture, originated in God as its author, and should urge upon men the *truly divine contents* of the scriptures, which become constantly better understood, as what has proceeded from God, and *is the true word of God*; and therefore

should apply it to the practical use of life." What is there in this so frightful, that Unitarians shrink from it? Is it not *as near* a definition of American Unitarianism as can be given? Those who know what words mean, or do not mean, know, that this so plausible and smooth-speaking definition *excludes all revelation*.

I will only add that, if Unitarians continue to pervert the word rational, as for some time past they have done, we shall be obliged to renounce it, and use the word 'reasonable' for what 'rational' *once meant*. Knave formerly signified boy.

NOTE I. Page 83.


UNITARIANS AND UNIVERSALISTS.

What I have to say upon these topics, not very popular in some high places, I shall arrange under these heads, 1. Unitarianism, properly defined, includes both classes. 2. American Universalism is really the original American Unitarianism. 3. Unitarians, now so called, do not understand, or wilfully misrepresent, Universalism. 4. Unitarianism, in its largest, broadest sense, as believed by the greatest number of its adherents, is Universalism.

Can these propositions be made out? If they cannot be, I acknowledge myself obnoxious to the charge of bearing false witness against my neighbor. If they can be made out, the consciences of those concerned can decide on their past conduct and future duty. The community will also be prepared to take some new views of "the arguments of liberal Christians, that are before the public, and of their characters, which are the property of society." The first question, which arises in this investigation, and which must be settled before we proceed, is, what is Unitarianism? What is it in *its essence*, as defined and believed *by its friends*? This question shall be answered by English and American Unitarians. The Monthly Repository, the Christian Disciple, the Christian Examiner, and the Christian Register, shall decide this and other connected questions.

"The essence of Unitarianism is the doctrine of the One God, the Father. This is to be carefully distinguished from the heterogeneous mass (?) of opinions, which have in different individuals been combined with it." Month. Rep. Aug. 1827, p. 554.

Rev. W. H. Drummond, D. D. a Unitarian preacher of Dublin, in a work dedicated (the English reviewers say, "with great pro-



priety,") to Rammohun Roy and Dr. Channing, "has divided all Christians into two denominations, Unitarians and Trinitarians." Dr. Drummond adds, (and we shall soon see that his American friends chime in to the same tune,) "in proportion as the chords of a musical instrument are multiplied, the difficulty of preserving concord is increased." "The term 'Unitarian,' applied to our places of worship, should be understood as denoting *nothing more* than that all prayers are strictly addressed to the One God and Father of all," says a writer in the *Monthly Repository*. "The essence of [English] Unitarianism is the doctrine of One God, the Father," (without any reference to Jesus Christ, the Son of God.) American Unitarians have not, as yet, adopted quite so "exclusive" a creed. "The basis of the Unitarian creed is, the One God and Jesus Christ, whom he has sent." *Christian Disciple*, 1822, p. 313. This has rather an unusual share of Unitarian definiteness. With suitable explanations, it might apply to all Christians, of all countries, in all ages. Dr. Priestley would infer from this, that the church universal has been, and will be evermore, Unitarian. However, the following extract from the *Christian Register*, of Dec. 22, 1827, will help to define what might be thought *somewhat* indefinite in the preceding quotation. "Unitarians are those who believe, that there is one God, even the Father; and that Jesus is not this one God, but a distinct being, derived and dependent, and sent by God to accomplish his benevolent will on earth....Unitarianism excludes the doctrine of the Trinity, and the popular notions about atonement. *On other subjects Unitarians divide.*" We shall have occasion for this witness again.

Unitarianism, then, comprehending English and American believers in the doctrine, is simple monotheism, or pure theism. American Unitarians believe in this one God, deny that Christ, in any view of his character, was properly participant of the divine nature, but believe that he was (as every other prophet was) wholly derived and dependent, yet sent by God to accomplish his benevolent will on earth; and they also reject the popular notions of atonement. How long it will be before they will find that they have too many chords to their "musical instrument," it is not necessary to decide. It requires, however, a skilful hand to touch the remaining two, and not produce a *jar*. Unitarianism, defined by its friends, consists either in the belief of "One God the Father" or of "One God, and of Jesus Christ as sent to accomplish the benevolent will of God, excluding the doctrine of the Trinity and the popular notions about atonement; and on other subjects, Unitarians divide."

I shall now adduce the evidence of the truth of the two first propositions, *that Unitarianism, properly defined, embraces both classes, Universalists and Unitarians, and that American Universalism is really the original American Unitarianism.* The intelligence, competence, and credibility of the witness are beyond exception. In the *Monthly Repository* for March, 1827, p. 176, is a communication entitled, "Universalists in the United States of America," signed by Robert Aspland, a well known Unitarian minister of Hackney, near London. He says, that he has received a letter from the Rev. Thomas Whittemore of Cambridgeport, Mass., and adds, "the following account of the present state of the Universalists of the United States, in the words of my correspondent, is a pleasing proof of the natural tendency of serious minds towards scriptural truth, when they are not checked by the influence of institutions bearing a mingled civil and religious character." Then follows this quotation from Mr. W's letter. "The denomination to which I belong, is composed of upwards of three hundred societies, and about two hundred preachers. Their numbers are continually receiving accessions. We have increased most in New England, New York, Ohio, and Pennsylvania, though there are Universalists scattered all over the United States. It will, perhaps, be pleasing to you to learn, *that this sect is, with indeed a very few exceptions, entirely Unitarian.* I know of but *three* ministers in the whole order, who are *Trinitarians*, and I believe *the greater proportion are Humanitarian.* With the very few exceptions just mentioned, we concur in rejecting, as absurd and unscriptural, the old idea of atonement, believing that this scheme of man's redemption from sin, originates in the Father of all who sent his Son to commend his love to mankind."...."My friend, as the tenor of his communication authorizes me to call him, apprizes me," continues Mr. Aspland, "that the ministers of his denomination in Boston and its vicinity have sent me a package of their publications, presuming that it will be agreeable to the Unitarians in England to become acquainted with the numbers, doctrines, and arguments of the Universalists in the United States. In the package, I am informed, is a 'Treatise on Atonement' by Mr. Ballou, whose labours, Mr. Whittemore says, have greatly promoted the change which has taken place among the American Universalists, with regard to the atonement and the character of Christ. Of this 'Treatise' and its author he further says, that it is *the first American work in which the doctrine of Unitarianism was ever advanced and defended.* Here you find it distinctly stated and argued. This

work was first published about the year 1803, two years before Sherman's Treatise, which has generally, but erroneously been considered the first public attack on Trinitarianism, which America afforded; Dr. Priestley, being a European, I except. Mr. Ballou's work is the fruit of his own mind, aided by the scriptures. He never read an author, either on Atonement or the Unity of God, till after he wrote. I believe I have now extracted the whole of the intelligence relating to the Universalists furnished by my highly valued correspondent, which would be interesting to your readers."

It seems, then, that this sect with very few exceptions, three out of two hundred, are Unitarian, rejecting the old idea of atonement; and still more, that the first definite public statement and defence of Unitarianism and attack upon Trinitarianism were made by the leader of this sect about the year 1803. This was "a considerable time" before the present Unitarians acknowledged themselves to be of that sect; yes, while they yet resolutely denied it; while Dr. Channing himself was yet groping in a pene-Calvinism. Hereafter Mr. Ballou must be considered another "Venerable Lindsey," *the father of American Unitarianism*.* If the evidence before us do not warrant the conclusion that the present Unitarians are Universalists, this is certain *the Universalists are Unitarians*. The term Unitarianism, then, in its broad and proper sense, *includes or belongs to both the Universalists and the Unitarians of the present day*. Mr. Ballou's church is as truly Unitarian, the doctrine taught there is as genuine Unitarianism, as the church, or the doctrine taught in the church of Mr. Pierpont. Mr. Whittemore is as strenuous an advocate for Unitarianism as Dr. Ware. Mr. Turner of Charlton, is as *liberal* in his theology as Mr. Walker of Charlestown. The recent conjunction of these latter gentlemen shows that all imaginary differences are removed. They have risen above the prejudices of the day, and a prominent Unitarian minister has preached the installation sermon of a Universalist pastor over a Unitarian congregation. It does not appear that Mr. Turner, in passing from the Universalist to the Unitarian ranks, has altered or in any way modified his doctrinal views. He remains still, as he was before, a Universalist. Knowing him to be such, a council of Unitarian clergymen install him, and admit him to their ranks.

Let it be remembered, that Unitarians, *as such*, believe in one God, and Jesus Christ, whom he has sent, and reject the popular

* The slight exception at the Stone Chapel, is hardly worth noticing. Mr. Ballou first, openly, frankly, fully avowed Unitarianism. He is the first American "Author" of the system.

notions or old ideas about atonement; and on other subjects, divide. Here then the present Unitarians and Universalists are *one*; and one name should, unquestionably, be appropriated to one thing. *That American Universalism is the original American Unitarianism*, has also been made apparent. In 1803, Mr. Ballou, in his Treatise on Atonement, first advanced and defended from the American press the doctrine of Unitarianism. Here it was "distinctly stated and argued." This early *distinct statement* is noticeable. Whether all subsequent writers have followed Mr. Ballou in this particular, we cannot now stop to inquire. *The first public announcement of Unitarianism in the United States was in connexion with Universalism*. What Unitarianism is, in its own proper essence, detached from every thing extraneous, we have now seen; when it first made its *public* appearance in this country, under whose patronage and in what connexion, we have also seen.

I come now to the third proposition, which is, that Unitarians (using the word in its limited sense) *either do not understand, or wilfully misrepresent the opinions held by the Universalist-Unitarians*. This charge is not advanced without thought, nor without caution, nor, what is more, *without evidence*. In the Christian Examiner for 1826, is a Review of a Sermon by Prof. Stuart, in which the reviewer says, "the Universalist holds, in common with the preacher, the doctrine of atonement by the blood of Christ. He believes in a full atonement for all men, that Christ was a propitiation for the sins of the whole world." p. 236. This writer is no novice, and would not, at the moment of writing this review, have allowed his ignorance of the doctrine held by American Universalists. In the Christian Register, March 8, 1828, is an abstract of a sermon preached by Rev. Mr. Pierpont, at the ordination of Mr. Presbury. The preacher, attempting to repel the charge that *Unitarians are Universalists*, brings forward this as one of his strong reasons, "besides, do not Unitarians voluntarily retire from the great, the best ground on which the Universalist's doctrine can be built, i. e. *an infinite atonement*? If full satisfaction has been made, how can any more be demanded? If the sins of all men have been laid upon one, and he has borne the punishment due to all, why should any more be punished? An infinite atonement cannot be limited; a debt cancelled cannot be again demanded."* And more to the same purpose. The reviewer before quoted, writes in the same style. But, says Mr.

* In this passage, Mr. P. has the misfortune not to state correctly the opinions, either of the Orthodox, or the Universalists, or even of the Unitarians. "Distinct statements" of opinions, have gone out of fashion since 1803.

Whittemore, who certainly has the best opportunity of knowing, "Universalists, with very few exceptions, concur *in rejecting, as absurd and unscriptural, these old ideas of atonement.*" Here then, are two leading Unitarian writers, (to one of which the Christian Examiner gives the sanction of the Unitarian party,) charging upon a numerous and respectable body of clergymen opinions which they do not hold; opinions which they reject and decidedly condemn. *If these gentlemen have done this in ignorance*, let them, if they do not think it due to the interests of truth publicly to acknowledge an error publicly proclaimed, at least refrain in all coming time from a repetition of the same mistatements. *If they have done this, knowing at the time what they were doing*, "to serve a turn"*—but I will not trust myself to comment on a supposition I am reluctant to believe. It is hoped these gentlemen will not attempt to shield themselves behind what Chauncey, and others long since under ground, may have said. We do not hold Dr. Channing bound to believe "Bible News," nor even his own sermons published fifteen years ago. Those who set up for teachers, however, when they attempt to give the opinions of "two hundred clergymen," should know what they say, and whereof they affirm. It is said of some of old time, that they were "ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth." Is this applicable to past time *only*? Is this changeling race extinct?

My fourth remark is, that *Unitarianism, in its largest, broadest sense, as believed by the greatest number of its adherents, is Universalism.* By this I mean to say, that the great majority of those, who profess in England and America, to be believers in the simple Unity of God, in contradistinction from those who believe in the Trinity in Unity, are also believers in the final salvation of all men. About the American Universalist-Unitarians, there is no question; though it should be remembered, that some of these† believe in future punishment, which, however, will be limited and remedial, ending in the final restoration of all to purity and blessedness. What do English Unitarians believe on this subject? A writer already quoted from the Christian Register, says, "in England, where the doctrine of *necessity* prevails among Unitarians, the connected doctrine of the ultimate happiness of all human beings goes along with it." So

* A writer in the Christian Examiner says; the Orthodox charge the Unitarians with being Universalists *to serve a turn.* One thing is evident from Mr. Pierpont, this writer, and Dr. Ware, *Unitarians are ashamed or afraid to avow themselves Universalists.* Is it the name, they are afraid of? "What care we for names?" asked Mr. May, at the Unitarian Association.

† In what does this class of Universalists differ from the great body of Unitarians?

far then is plain, *the English Unitarians, and the whole Universalist class of American Unitarians, believe in the ultimate happiness of all human beings; or are Universalists.*

The question now remains, *What do those, known here by the name of Unitarians, believe on this subject?* I answer, that some leading Unitarians, who surely ought to know, state the final restitution of the impenitent to be a part of their system; that those, who deny it to be a *necessary* part of their system, admit that *many* Unitarians do hold this doctrine; that few, if any, *deny* a final restitution; and that *most reject* the proper eternity of hell punishments.

Can these propositions be made out? If they can be, will it be any longer asserted, that when the Orthodox charge the Unitarians with being Universalists, it is *to serve a turn*?

The writer already twice quoted from the Ch. Register, Dec. 22, 1827, begins his communication thus: "In looking at the first number of 'The Unitarian,' a new periodical published in New York, *which has many claims on patronage*, I find a sketch of Unitarianism, in which it is more than implied, that the doctrine of the final restitution of the impenitent, through the disciplinary and reforming power of future punishment, is a part of this system. Now that many Unitarians hold this doctrine is true, &c."....He then admits that "a free being *may* make himself sinful and miserable during his whole being. *I mean not, however, to object to the doctrine of final restitution.* I only say it is not Unitarianism," which he then defines as before quoted. The New York Unitarians, not slightly indebted to the Cambridge School for their liberality of thinking, "more than imply" that the doctrine of a final restitution is a part of their system. A Boston writer, somewhat more cautious in the use of words, "does not mean to object to the doctrine of final restitution" in itself, but only to say that it is not Unitarianism; i. e. as defined in this note. Mr. Pierpont, according to the Christian Register, tallies in his notions with this writer. Dr. Bancroft says, "For myself, I freely declare, that, from a diligent examination of the New Testament, I am satisfied it does not contain the doctrine of punishment, endless in duration." Sermons, p. 391. "Many who disbelieve the doctrine of eternal punishment, are afraid to avow their opinion, lest it should weaken the restraints of religion. This is not my fear."* p. 392.

We must omit a large mass of evidence, collected on this point, and close these extracts by a quotation which, (*let this be noticed,*) speaks

* What! Those who reject "the heart withering doctrine of eternal torments" afraid to announce the glad tidings. Afraid to preach the truth, they believe Christ came to publish! Afraid to preach what God has commissioned and commanded them to preach!! Are these the followers of Christ? the successors of Luther?

in the name of the Unitarian sect. "If by everlasting punishment is meant the proper eternity of hell torments, it is a doctrine which *most Unitarians of the present day concur in rejecting*; some understanding by that everlasting destruction to which the wicked are to be consigned, an absolute annihilation; others conceiving of their sufferings as consequential, and indefinite as to their duration; and others that all punishment will be necessarily remedial, and will end at last in a universal restoration to goodness and happiness." Christian Disciple, vol. iii. New Series, p. 451.*

The case stands thus. All the English Unitarians, with whom the American Unitarians are in an alliance as intimate as distance and political circumstances admit, and with whom they profess to be desirous of still more active co-operation in the great work of human illumination and mental emancipation, are Universalists. The largest and the original class of American Unitarians are Universalists, openly taking the name, and distinctly and honorably stating their opinions. *Some of the most intelligent among the Unitarian leaders, in "a periodical having many claims on patronage," more than imply, the doctrine of the ultimate restitution of all to holiness and happiness to be a part of their system. Many, who deny that this is a necessary part of Unitarianism, yet hold to the doctrine. Few, if any, deny a final restitution; and most reject the doctrine of everlasting punishment.* Surely, after this accumulation of testimony from their own writings, Unitarians will no longer attempt to disguise a fact, which they dare not deny, and which, if they would be frank, they would openly confess. Dr. Bancroft speaks his own opinions, with a distinctness that does him honor. He says, "future punishment will be of limited duration, and will terminate in the annihilation of the wicked." Sermons, p. 407. The only qualification, then, to the proposition, that Unitarians are Universalists, is, that some, apparently a very small number of Unitarians, are Destructionists; but the opinions of a small minority cannot affect the question, what the great majority believe.

While this subject is under investigation, and to prevent, if possible, a further recurrence to it, it may be well to sift it thoroughly, and, for this purpose, to view it in various lights. There is a gentleman at Cambridge, well skilled in the doctrine of chances, which he has lately presented in formidable array against the Pauline origin of the Epistle to the Hebrews. His formula is something like 999,999,999,999 to 1, against Paul as the author of that Epistle. If

* For further evidence, if needed, see the Spirit of the Pilgrims, March, 1828, p. 155.

his time and other avocations admit, he may, perhaps, be able to throw some light on this problem. Unitarians in England and America state but one article of a creed, which they all believe. On most other subjects they "differ widely," combining this one tenet "with a heterogeneous mass of opinions." But the whole body of English Unitarians, together with the Universalist-Unitarians of this country, agree in another article, to wit, *the ultimate happiness of all men*. Most American Unitarians reject the everlasting punishment of any. Few deny the final restitution of all. Some of the most intelligent and influential of the Unitarians, who cannot be ignorant of *their own opinions*, and ought to know what their system teaches, "more than imply the final restitution of all to be a part of this system;" and many not only believe, but openly acknowledge it. What, then, according to the doctrine of chances, is the probability that a believer in Unitarianism is a Universalist?

Again. American Unitarians, *as a sect*, are the same as the English Unitarians. There is a strong feeling of oneness, *of identity, as a sect*, in all they say of each other. The American Unitarian feels himself *at home* in the English Unitarian's pulpit. We presume no one ever thought of questioning this position, the English and American Unitarians are as much *one sect*, as the English and American Calvinists, Methodists, &c. But is it not fair to infer, that the *same sects* hold the same opinions, till they inform us otherwise?

Will it be thought irrelevant or impertinent, if the writer take the liberty to ask, what opinions are taught by the Hollis Professor on the subject of this note? *What is the doctrine, as to the duration of future punishment, taught in the theological school at Cambridge?* I forbear to dwell directly upon the attitude in which the Hollis Professor now appears before the public. The subject might be thought personal, because it is *official*, and would be thought invidious, because the attitude is, to say the least, neither frank nor honorable. This gentleman may not wish openly to express his sentiments, but *he cannot conceal them*. What "turn" is "to be served" by the course now pursued at Cambridge, though not matter of conjecture, it is unnecessary to specify. At all other theological schools, the professors think it rational to state fairly to the public what they believe the Bible teaches on this momentous question. At the Institution, which professes to be *rational* beyond all others, it is thought irrational to state either the opinions of the sect, or of the individual professors, who have made up their own opinions, and are appointed to teach others the doctrines of the sect. In the college, "no doctrines in particular" are taught. This would seem a meet intro-

duction to the divinity class, where some doctrines in particular are no doubt privately taught, though not publicly acknowledged—nay more, by implication at least, even publicly denied.

How shall we ascertain the opinions of the Hollis Professor? I shall not open his letters to Trinitarians and Calvinists. He does not allow them to be sufficiently definite for the public to infer Universalism from their statements or arguments. We will now grant that his letters on this subject are *ambiguous*. Is there any remaining source of evidence by which we may elicit his real opinions? I cannot say how other minds may estimate testimony, but were the question much more doubtful than it is, the following witness would satisfy me. There is a paper published at New York, called the *Olive Branch and Christian Inquirer*, edited by Rev. *Abner Kneeland*, a well known Universalist minister. In noticing the ordination of the Rev. Mr. Lunt, as pastor of the Second Congregational Unitarian Church, the Editor says, in the number for July 5, 1828, "The Rev. Mr. Ware, [of New York,] in giving the right hand of fellowship, stated, that after laboring so many years, (six if my memory serves me,) this was the only church with whom he could have fellowship as a sister church, and Mr. Lunt, the only minister with whom he could reciprocate an exchange of gifts in this city. Now we would ask, why is it so? Are they Unitarians? So are we. Do they believe that 'in the resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth, we have an assurance of our own resurrection and immortality'? So do we. Do they believe that 'the production of happiness is the great aim in all the dispensations and plans of divine providence'? So do we. Do they believe that all suffering is either indispensable, or 'else is made subservient to the same good and sublime end; that it will therefore be disciplinary, remedial, purifying, saving in its character, and will consequently some time cease'? So do we.* [See the 'Unitarian, No. 1,' written by the Rev. Mr. Ware, of New York.] Now, we beg to know and wish Mr. Ware or some other Unitarian would inform us, what it is which the Unitarian believes, that we do not believe, which prevents their fellowship as well as with those who bear the *name* of Unitarian; or is it wholly because we do not appear in a *mitre and gown*? We have

* "In addition to our own society, and the other Unitarian-Universalists in this city, [New-York,] there is the Rev. Mr. Clough, who has his peculiar views, it is true, but he is a decided Unitarian, and has done as much, perhaps, towards disseminating the Unity of God, as the Rev. Mr. Ware himself. There is also the numerous class of liberal Friends, who are decidedly Unitarians, and who can bring as much scripture for their peculiar views, as Unitarians can bring for what they call "infant baptism." Why then should the doctrine of Unitarianism, and the fellowship of Unitarians, be confined to the Unitarians of the Cambridge stamp alone!"—*Olive Branch and Christian Inquirer*.

not the least wish to crowd ourselves into company where we are not wanted; but we should like to know the true reason why we are excluded. We wish to have it distinctly understood that the doctrine of Unitarians, so far as the unity of God, or the person and mission of Jesus Christ is concerned, we firmly believe and heartily fellowship; but with bigotry and illiberality we have no fellowship, though they should bear the name and wear the garb of a Universalist."

This extract is of much, and various value. Mr. Kneeland informs us, that it is the Rev. Mr. Ware who asserts in the Unitarian, "that all punishment or suffering will be disciplinary, remedial, purifying, saving in its character, and will consequently some time cease." This does somewhat "more than *imply*" the final restitution of all men. Is the Rev. Mr. Ware of New York a fair representative of Cambridge theological students? May we not presume that his opinions are the opinions of the Hollis Professor? Has he departed from the opinions taught him in childhood, from the instructions of his collegiate and the doctrines of his theological education? Till otherwise informed, we shall feel ourselves warranted to take the opinions of the Rev. Mr. Ware of New York, published in the organ of Unitarianism in that city, as the opinions held at the theological institution, in which he received his education; we shall take his opinions to coincide with those of the Hollis Professor, till he or the Professor explicitly, intelligibly, and unambiguously denies it. We then assert, on this evidence, that *Universalism is the doctrine taught by the Hollis Professor in the theological school at Cambridge.* Will he deny this?

Will Unitarians notice the questions propounded by Rev. Mr. Kneeland? Why does Dr. Channing refrain from offering to exchange pulpits with Mr. Ballou; or Dr. Lowell with Mr. Dean? or Mr. Ware with Mr. Streeter? Why do Unitarian ministers wish to exchange pulpits with the Orthodox, who, they say, "deny the Lord Jesus" and from whom they "differ widely," while they refuse to exchange with the Universalists with whom they agree, and who are willing "to reciprocate an exchange of gifts" with them? There is something rotten in a system afraid of itself and ashamed of its shadow. I forbear to press this subject farther, not that the materials at hand are all exhausted, or that numerous and pertinent inquiries might not be pressed, but because enough has been produced to satisfy ingenuous minds, hitherto held in the dark by intentional ambiguity of language, of the Universalism of Unitarians. The difference between Universalists and Unitarians is this, the former openly state their opinions; the

latter disingenuously conceal them. Which is most worthy of confidence,—*honesty or craft?*

Since writing the foregoing remarks, an authority has come to hand so full and so explicit, that, one would think, it must settle the question “whether Unitarians are Universalists,” forever. It should be premised that “the Olive Branch and Christian Inquirer,” from which a quotation has already been made in this note, is a paper formed by the union of the two whose names it takes. The former of these has been for some time avowedly a Universalist weekly paper, edited by the Rev. Mr. Kneeland; the latter was a Unitarian paper, edited by the Rev. Mr. Bates. Of these, the Unitarian paper failed for want of patronage, and the Universalist paper was in nearly the same predicament, when a joint effort was made to sustain one weekly “liberal” newspaper. The first number of the new journal appeared 17th May, 1828. From this the following extract is taken, signed and evidently written by “A New York Unitarian.” He is giving his reasons for being pleased with the re-appearance of the paper under new and favoring auspices.

“1. It will have a tendency to make Unitarians and Universalists better acquainted with each other than they now are. There is no good reason, which I discover, why these two sects of liberal Christians should remain at so wide a distance from each other; and I am persuaded it is only necessary that they should be better acquainted with each other’s sentiments to create mutual esteem and good will. Some Universalists, I am sorry to say it, have indulged in unwarrantable severity of remark upon the New England Unitarians, and on the other hand, some Unitarians, not understanding the doctrine of the Universalists, have made unfair statements of the tendency of their sentiments. These things have operated to keep the two sects wider apart than any minor differences of opinion seem to justify.

“2. Another reason why I am pleased with this new arrangement is because both sects are firm believers in the doctrine of the divine Unity; and equally advocate the same spiritual and rational views of the character and mission of Jesus Christ.

“3. Another reason and the only one I shall now notice, is *that both denominations believe in the final restoration of all men to virtue and happiness*. It is true a few Unitarians may believe in the Orthodox doctrine of eternal misery, and a small number also may be the advocates of the annihilation of the finally impenitent; yet the great mass of Unitarians both in this country and in Europe

boldly avow their disbelief of eternal misery and their firm persuasion of the restoration of mankind to holiness and happiness. So obvious is this fact that there is no publication of any Unitarian of respectability, but what discloses these views, and it is one of the charges of unsoundness of faith which is brought against them by their Orthodox opponents. It is, however, an acknowledged fact that Unitarians have not felt themselves called upon to say much on this subject, but when called upon they have not shunned to declare this part of the counsel of God. In England it is otherwise, for as there are but few, if any Universalist societies, in contradistinction to Unitarians, the ministers of the latter both in their preaching and writings boldly and fearlessly declare their belief in the doctrine of universal restoration. That there is a difference of opinion between Unitarians and some Universalists as to the time when it will take place, I freely confess; *but that they agree in the ultimate destination of man to virtue and happiness, all must allow.* As this then is an admitted fact, I cannot possibly conceive that this difference of opinion should any longer operate to keep them from acting in concert in the common cause of liberal Christianity."

Comment is unnecessary. Is it to express a fearfully important truth, or is it merely "to serve a turn," that the Orthodox call the Unitarians, Universalists? Hereafter, be it remembered, this is "an admitted fact," admitted by the New York Unitarians, admitted by the Rev. Mr. Ware in the first number of the "Unitarian." Will the Unitarian Advocate, or Christian Examiner, or Christian Register favor the Rev. Mr. Kneeland with the precise reason why he and his Universalist brethren are refused "an interchange of gifts" with their Unitarian fellow labourers? Why, (we repeat this question and wish it deeply pondered,) *why do the Unitarian Clergy of Massachusetts seek to exchange pulpits with the Orthodox, who, in their view "are guilty of denying the Lord Jesus," while they close their own pulpits against the Universalists, with whom they are essentially agreed; and who desire to "reciprocate an exchange of gifts" with them?*

NOTE J.

ARE UNITARIANS CHRISTIANS?

Unitarians complain that the Orthodox deny them the name 'Christian.' If the term properly belong to them, the Orthodox have no right to withhold it, and the Unitarian complaint is not without

reason. In what sense, then, is the term withheld? Not in its geographical sense. Those that live within certain lines and colours on the map, are Christian, or Mahometan, or Pagan. Unitarians and the Orthodox and Deists are all, in this sense, Christian. If the term *Christian*, mean merely reputable, honest, kindhearted, intelligent men, in this sense it is cheerfully conceded to a great majority of Unitarian professors. But if the term be understood as indicative of a saving faith and holy character; indicative of those, who will at the last day be acknowledged as the real followers of Christ, it is as generally withheld in this sense, as it is conceded in that immediately preceding. That there may be real Christians in Unitarian churches and, of course, that *such* deserve the name Christian, in the sense last explained, the Orthodox do not deny. They do not pretend, they do not feel themselves called upon, or competent to decide, how much error may be innocently connected with a saving knowledge of the truth; nor how small a portion of divine truth may be made instrumental to the saving of the soul. But that those, who, understanding at the time what they say, *deny the original entire corruption of the human heart, the divinity and atonement of Christ, regeneration by the Holy Spirit, gratuitous pardon through the merits of the Redeemer, and the everlasting punishment of the impenitent, are Christians*, they cannot concede without renouncing all their main principles, without giving up the whole subject in debate. To insist upon the Orthodox yielding to Unitarians the name Christian, in this sense, *is to insist upon the Orthodox renouncing their principles and becoming Unitarians*. A very modest request, surely; or, at least, a very liberal one! It seems to be a favorite argument, with some "rational" preachers, addressed to the prejudices of their hearers and personal friends, who know them to be estimable men in their civil and social relations, *the Orthodox deny that we are Christians, therefore we certainly are; and they are bigoted Calvinists, disposed to imitate their master, who burnt Servetus*. If it were necessary, passages might be adduced, the *logic* of which fully equals this.

But, not to dwell on this, do the Unitarians of Boston *worship Christ*? No. They refuse to worship him. Was Socinus a bigot? No. He is held in high estimation by the Unitarians of Boston, as an enlightened, *liberal, rational* Christian. Toulmin informs us, in his *Life of Socinus*, page 467, that "Socinus denied that those who refuse to worship Christ are to be called Christians." Let Socinus speak for himself. Speaking of Paleologus, he says, "he was one, and, if I mistake not, the chief standard-bearer among those, who at this day affirm that Christ is not to be adored and invoked in prayer,

and yet in the mean while *have the effrontery to call themselves Christians.*" Lindsey's Historical View of Unitarian Doctrine, p. 263. In the judgment of Socinus, the hierophant of Unitarian mysteries, the Humanitarians of Boston, refusing to worship Christ, do not deserve to be called Christians. Is it a clear proof of fire-and-faggot, Calvinistic bigotry, to coincide with the first great leader of their sect? Dr. Priestley, at once the Briareus and Corypheus of his party, frankly said, "the truth is, there neither can, nor ought to be any compromise between us. *If you are right, we are not Christians at all; and if we are right, you are gross idolaters.*" He considers it "ridiculous that Unitarians should be allowed to *think* Trinitarians idolaters, without being permitted to call them so;" and adds, "I have no idea of being offended with any man in things of this kind, for speaking what he believes to be the truth." Dr. Priestley here speaks like a man in earnest, believing what he said to be truth. Why should the admirers of the Doctor wish for a compromise, when the fact is just as stated by him, *either Trinitarians are idolaters, or Unitarians are not Christians?* Why should not the Orthodox say what they believe? Or why should they be compelled to say what they do not believe? The gentleman, who writes with such flippant ambiguity about the "exclusive sect" and system, might take a profitable lesson from the frank and unjustly persecuted philosopher of Birmingham.

Let us vary this subject. Who are Christians? Are not those *who worship one God and only one, and acknowledge Jesus to be a divinely appointed prophet, and believe in a future life, Christians?* I shall not take the trouble to verify this definition by reference to Unitarian writings. But if any one, entitled to notice, calls for verification, it can be given in abundance. Unitarians are Christians in the sense just defined, believing and doing all which that definition requires. But let me ask the Boston Unitarian, is the Mahometan a Christian? Are the Turkish armies, engaged in butchering the Christian Greeks, Christians? Certainly not. But the Turks worship one God, and only one; acknowledge Jesus to be a divinely appointed prophet, and believe in a future life. The Turks, then, or Mahometans, are, according to the Unitarian definition of the term Christian, Christians, *believing precisely what the Unitarians believe.* But Mahometans, in the judgment of Boston Unitarians, are not Christians, wherefore Unitarians, according to their own reasoning, are not Christians. The logical force of this argument will be more clearly seen thus. If Unitarians, *as such,* are Christians, Mahometans, being Unitarians, are Christians; but

Mahometans are not Christians, wherefore Unitarians, *as such*, are not Christians. Taking the English definition of Unitarianism, *and allowing that a believer in Unitarianism is a Christian*, this argument is irresistible to prove that he is *not*. If that, which constitutes men Unitarians, makes them also at the same time Christians, Mahometans believing precisely what constitutes men Unitarians, are of course Christians. There is no possible way for a Unitarian to avoid this conclusion. He must then admit Mahometans to the fellowship of Unitarians, as "good Christians," or he must adopt some other definition of a Christian than that already given. But Monotheism is not Christianity nor Mahometanism. Unitarians, to deserve the name *Christian*, must adopt some other article into their creed than that quoted in the preceding note from the Monthly Repository, or those from the Christian Disciple.

Boston Unitarians, it appears then, in the opinion of the Orthodox, of Socinus, and (shall it be said?) *of themselves also*, are not Christians. Must the Orthodox yield a name, which Dr. Priestley allows Unitarians do not deserve, *if Orthodox views be correct?*

Here then we might rest our defence, exonerated, as we trust, from the charge of illiberality, bigotry, a disposition to persecute, &c. &c.; but we have other facts and reasons for our conduct, to which we ask the particular attention of candid, inquiring Unitarians. We believe the fact, that the Orthodox deny that Unitarians are Christians, *from the manner in which this denial is represented by Unitarians themselves*, forms in many minds a strong objection to Orthodoxy. This forms one of the most popular *ad invidiam* arguments of Unitarian writers. I shall not stop to inquire whether the same argument, in the same manner, was not advanced by the opponents of the early Christians; nor shall I adduce any quotations from Gibbon to show the "exclusive," "intolerant" character of the gospel of Christ, compared with the elegant forms and liberal spirit of paganism. I choose to take another, and a somewhat unusual course.

I premise, that the Unitarians of Boston entertain, and have often expressed, a high opinion of the learning, the piety, the enlarged and genuine liberality of the Polish Socinians. They would have us understand that they have not done this ignorantly. Will they abide the decision of *their Polish brethren* on the question "whether they are Christians?" Let them recollect the character they have repeatedly, in their publications, given these Polish Unitarians, and they will, doubtless, be happy for an appeal from bigoted Calvinists to the learned, pious, and liberal-minded Polish Socinians.

The opinion of Socinus we have already seen, but in this he may have been singular. We will not again appeal to him. What we wish is the opinion of the whole body of Polish Socinians. Is it to be had? Happily it is. The first Polish Socinian catechism was published in 1605, and in 1609 was printed at London. In it are this question and answer. "Question. What think you of those men who do not pray to Christ, nor allow that he is to be worshipped? Answer. I think they are by no means Christians; because in fact they do not own Jesus to be the Christ, and though in words they dare not deny it, yet they do it in their deeds." More to the same purpose may be found in Lindsey's *Historical View of Unitarian Doctrine*, p. 252. This catechism was published after the death of Socinus, and is known to embody the deliberate opinions of that numerous, original class of Socinians, whose extensive learning, unshrinking piety, and unquestioned liberality, have been the theme of repeated commendation from American Unitarians. We ask for a passage in any Orthodox catechism, wherein those, who refuse to worship Christ, are as explicitly denied to be Christians, as in this first Unitarian catechism published after the Reformation. We hope after this, either to hear no more commendations of the liberal Christians of Poland, or no more censure of the Orthodox for that in which they agree with them. Let not my object here be mistaken. I am not attempting to prove any thing *because the Polish Socinians believed it*. I am attempting to silence a Unitarian objection by an appeal to their own much applauded, much quoted, much credited witnesses.

Let us vary this subject once more, and view it in yet another light. Intelligent Unitarians in England and this country perceive and allow, that the scriptures confine prayer or invocation and adoration to that divine Being, who will not give his glory to another. To invoke or to worship Christ is said by them to be unscriptural, irrational, improper and idolatrous. No Unitarian minister in Boston is ever guilty of the impropriety, the idolatry, of invoking or calling upon Christ in prayer. The case of Stephen is thought to have been extraordinary and unique, he having had especial manifestation of Christ, which made it peculiarly proper for him thus "to call upon the Lord Jesus to receive his spirit." The Unitarians of Boston agree with Lindsey, Carpenter, Davidies and Paleologus in withholding adoration and supplication from Christ. Yet in the scriptures, the primitive Christians are described as "those, who called upon the name of Christ." How can this difficulty be got over? How can the contrariety between present Unitarian, and apparently primitive Christian practice be reconciled? The intelligent Unitarian, who

understands the original Greek in these passages answers, "very easily, thus; the phrase, which, in various places, is translated, 'those who call upon the name of Christ,' is mis-translated; it should be rendered 'those, who are called by the name of Christ;' i. e. this expression simply designates them, as Christians, followers of Christ, and must have been so understood by those, who first used this language. Those, who were called by the name of Christ were Christians, just as those, called by the name of Plato were Platonists; or of Calvin, Calvinists; or of Socinus, Socinians. This expression then, on which the Orthodox have so confidently relied to prove the divinity of Christ, from the fact that the primitive Christians addressed prayers to him, means nothing more than *that the disciples were called Christians*, no very strong argument, surely, unless it will also prove that the Unitarian Christians of Boston worship Christ." I ask intelligent Unitarians if this is not a fair statement of their opinions on these disputed texts. It will not be denied that these passages mean either, *to be called by* the name, or, *to call upon* the name, of Christ. These are the only interpretations, which professed scholars will venture to produce. Should these words, then, be shown to mean simply *Christians*, without pointing them out as those that invoked Christ, though the Unitarian critics would effectually remove one class of texts on which the Orthodox have placed some reliance to prove the divinity of Christ, they would deserve credit for presenting us with *simply scriptural truth*. This, certainly, is of higher importance than any mere support of party or sect. *We should willingly follow where truth leads*, come what of contempt, of odium, of persecution there may.

But how shall we know, in the present case, that the Unitarian interpretation is the true one in preference to the Orthodox and commonly received interpretation? Each party claims Greek usage and Greek authorities. I am not disposed to enter into this discussion, whatever may be the truth. The reader of the English Testament *merely*, may stand in doubt, when Mr. A. affirms and Mr. B. denies. Let us grant, for sake of argument, that the case is doubtful, that the evidence for each interpretation is equal. The scales now hang *in equilibrio*. Is there any weight which may turn them? What would Gesenius, and the whole class of consistent thorough-going rationalist scholars, say upon these passages? Will Unitarians abide their decision? But this would not help the English reader, who wishes for argument and not authority. Is there any way in which a plain common sense English reader can determine this much controverted question to his own satisfaction? Let us

see. Suppose we can fix by one and the same historian, upon the time and place when and where the disciples were *first called Christians*; and suppose, according to this historian, that this expression was in common use *before* the disciples were so called, will not the question be settled that whatever this controverted expression may mean, it does not simply designate the name Christian? For this purpose compare Acts xi. 26 and ix. 14. "The disciples were called Christians first in Antioch." This was, according to the chronologists, between A. D. 42 and 44. Ananias answered, "Lord, I have heard by many of this man, how much evil he hath done to thy saints at Jerusalem; and here he hath authority from the chief priests to bind all *that call on thy name*." This was A. D. 34 or 35, i. e. from 7 to 10 years before the disciples were called *by the name of* their master. It should be borne in mind, that it is the same historian who relates both facts. Comment on these passages in this connexion is almost superfluous. Yet I will ask, whom did Ananias address by the word, *Lord*? Not the Father, certainly, for Christians were not called *by the name of* the Father. "By thy name," as Unitarians would render this passage, they themselves say, is to be understood the name of Christ. Here then is an explicit instance of an early disciple calling upon the name of Christ, or invoking or praying to Christ. Was Ananias guilty of uttering in prayer a solemn falsehood to Christ, saying that the disciples were called by his name seven years before they were so called? Or did Luke forget in the eleventh chapter, what he related in the ninth? Or is this an instance in which he only related, according to the best of his knowledge, but certainly erred? To sum up all in one question, I ask the English reader of the New Testament and the most learned biblical critic, whether the disciples of Christ at Jerusalem and elsewhere, previous to the time when Barnabas and Saul assembled themselves with the church a whole year and taught much people at Antioch, where "the disciples were first called Christians," were not described *as those that called upon the name of the Lord*? In the Improved Version these passages are rendered thus. "The disciples were first called Christians at Antioch." "He hath authority to bind all, who are called by thy name." Whatever system of chronology we adopt, it is admitted on all hands, that this latter assertion, made by Ananias in prayer to the Lord, must have preceded the other fact recorded by the same historian, that *the disciples were first called Christians at Antioch*, by some years. I ask if this testimony is not sufficiently explicit, of sufficient weight, to turn the scales, and decide the question forever? Is not the practice of Ananias an intelligible comment on his words? If Ananias

might properly address Christ in prayer, why might he not describe others as accustomed to do the same? Had not Stephen just commended his departing spirit into the hands of the Lord Jesus? Will Unitarians still think it unscriptural, irrational, and idolatrous to imitate Stephen, Ananias, and the saints of the Lord?

Other considerations strengthen this view of the subject. At the time of Paul's journey to Damascus, "the disciples," were not yet called Christians at *Jerusalem*. Ananias had never known such a name applied to "the saints" of the "Lord;" or at least, without assuming the point in debate, there is no evidence that he ever had, and, *if the historian is to be credited as to its subsequent origin and application*, he never had. It is apparent from the narrative of Luke, that it was a new name, first given to the disciples at Antioch, before and elsewhere wholly unknown. At Jerusalem the name *Christ* was synonymous with Messiah, anointed of the Lord. The disciples would not take the name from reverence to their Lord.* The Jews would not give it because it would imply that the Messiah had come, and that these followers of the despised Nazarene were believers in the true Christ. At Antioch the case was different. The heathen converts had not the same reverence for the mere name, and those, who continued heathen might very naturally apply the term as an opprobrious epithet, which would readily be adopted by those, who were spoken evil of "for the name" of their master. These considerations, suggested on reflection, lend additional weight to the opinion, which is *forced* upon us by the comparison of the two passages already quoted from the Acts.

"Those that called upon the name of Christ" means, then, those that invoked or prayed to Christ, and not merely those that were called by his name. Let liberal minds follow out their principles, and as they allow that invocation or prayer is a proper, *and the most proper* act of religious worship; and as the scriptures limit such religious worship to the one Supreme Jehovah; let them not shrink from the conclusion that the Lord from heaven is, in some view of his character, truly and properly divine; GOD OVER ALL, BLESSED FOREVER.

One word as to a name appropriate to the present Unitarians, and distinctive of their creed. What objection can there be to the term *Humanitarian*? In England, it is proposed by a writer in the *Monthly Repository* to substitute Philadelphian for Unitarian. By the extract before made from Socinus, it appears that Paleologus was

* Besides, why should they not be called after, or take their name from, Jesus? "Thou shalt call his name Jesus."

the first and the chief standard bearer among those, who, after the Reformation, denied that Christ was to be worshipped, and yet "had the effrontery to claim to be Christians." In the view of Boston Unitarians, he must have been a most enlightened Christian, *liberal* and *rational* beyond his age, throwing all other of his contemporary reformers into the shade. Would not the name *Paleologians* be at once appropriate, definite, and distinctive for American Unitarians? But we have no dispute about names. We are quite willing to be called Calvinists, (claiming the liberty of defining what we mean by the term,) than which, Unitarians being judges, no name can be less desirable or less honorable. Will Boston Humanitarians be afraid of the name of their "standard-bearer"? Will Unitarians longer "have the effrontery" not only "to call themselves Christians," but *to insist upon the Orthodox calling and considering them such?* At all events, the Orthodox cannot be thought bigoted for agreeing with the Polish Socinians, that those who refuse *to call upon* the name of Christ, do not deserve *to be called by* his name.

NOTE K.

It has been seen from the preceding Letters and Notes, that American Unitarians have at length reached the point where the canon is openly, and the inspiration and authority of the sacred volume are really, to be called in question. I do not believe that all, who bear the Unitarian name, or are claimed as of that sect, are willing to expunge the Epistle to the Hebrews from the sacred volume, or to adopt the sweeping process of reasoning by which the writer in the Christian Examiner would undermine its authority. Still the leaders of the party are committed to reject that Epistle, and we have already seen that *the principle of reasoning* by which it is rejected, goes to an entire subversion of the whole sacred volume. What ground the Unitarian critics will now take, and how far the party will follow the leaders, remains to be seen. To all who reflect and understand the subject, it is apparent that the same questions are soon to be debated here, that have long been discussed between the Supernaturalists and Rationalists of Europe. Professor Stuart, ten years ago, predicted this result. By his Commentary on

the Epistle to the Hebrews, he has compelled the Unitarians to show their colours. They must either acknowledge Orthodoxy, to be the doctrine of inspiration, or reject the Epistle to the Hebrews, (which all well-read critics must allow to be Orthodox,) as part of the inspired volume. They have chosen the latter alternative. What ground will be taken by the Christian Examiner when the Epistle to the Romans shall be given to the public by the Professor, though matter of conjecture, is hardly a matter of *rational* doubt.

As this work may fall into the hands of some young or inquisitive minds, who have not yet examined the great subjects of revelation and inspiration, it may aid them in their investigations on these all-important topics to have a few of the best authors pointed out. The following list may all be studied to great advantage and, perhaps, in the order in which they here stand as well as in any other. *Dr. Channing's Duddleian Lecture*. This is a beautiful specimen of composition, having the writer's usual elegance, and an unusual share of logic. *Leslie's Short and Easy Method with Deists*; an incontrovertible argument as Middleton, with his infidel prejudices, candidly acknowledged. *Erskine's Internal Evidence*; a scholar-like, philosophical and truly rational work, in which vital religion is divested of technicality, and presented in its own lineaments, colours and proportions. The last edition is the best. *Paley's Horæ Paulinæ*; the most original and masterly production of its author; containing, not only an able defence of Christianity, but the most satisfactory proof of the genuineness of the documents of Christianity to be found in the English language. *Bishop Marsh's Lectures* contain the most *scientific* view of the evidences of Christianity accessible to the English scholar; though designed as a directory for theological students, they will richly reward the study of intelligent laymen. If but one book could be read, *Paley's Evidences* should probably be selected. In addition to the preceding list, *Bogue's Essay on the New Testament*, and *Littleton's Conversion of St. Paul*, might be studied with great profit. To remove difficulties and silence objections, *Butler's Analogy* is unequalled. It were easy to swell this list, but these works are among the best, and deserve to be first studied; and he, who has mastered these, will be master of the subject. In regard to the canon, inspiration and authority of the scriptures, *Storr* unquestionably holds the first place. *Jahn's Introduction to the Old Testament* has recently been given to the public, for which the translators deserve many thanks; this, together with *Hug's Introduction to the Writings of the New Covenant*, which has recently been translated and published in England, supply a de-

sideratum long felt in our Biblical apparatus. Horne's Introduction is worth having. As an Introduction to a particular book, *Professor Stuart's Introduction to the Epistle to the Hebrews* is a work, that will be more highly appreciated the more it is known, and will be most highly valued by those best able to estimate its worth. The Rationalists may despair of success, when they see every attack anticipated, every argument sifted, every fallacy exposed; every absurdity portrayed, before hand.



14 DAY USE
RETURN TO DESK FROM WHICH BORROWED

LOAN DEPT.

This book is due on the last date stamped below, or
on the date to which renewed.

Renewed books are subject to immediate recall.

6 Jan '65 VJ

REC'D LD

JAN 5 '65 -9 PM

OCT 22 1968 6 5

RECEIVED

OCT 10 '68 -11 AM

MAR 24 1969 10 0

LD 21A-60m-4,'64
(E4555s10)476B

General Library
University of California
Berkeley

25149

BT975

S5

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY

