

THE  
PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY  
AND  
PRINCETON REVIEW.

---

NEW SERIES, No. 20.—OCTOBER, 1876.

---

**Art. I.—AMERICAN METHODISM IN 1876.\***

By REV. W. J. R. TAYLOR, D.D., Newark, N. J.

IN 1776 the whole Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States of America was composed of twenty-five ministers and five thousand members, in eleven circuits, on the Atlantic slope. In 1781 it crossed the Alleghanies, and laid the foundations of the "Old Western Conference," which extended from the Northern lakes to Natchez on the Mississippi. Its first General Conference was held in Baltimore in 1784, at which Francis Asbury was ordained its first bishop at the age of thirty-nine. There were then about eighty preachers and fifteen thousand members. Thirty-two years afterward, when this remarkable man died, in 1816, the church numbered over seven hundred itinerant preachers and more than two hundred and eleven thousand members. Soon after Washington was inaugurated as President of the United States, Bishops Coke and Asbury read to him the congratulatory address of the General Conference, which was then in

---

\* Proceedings of the General Conference held at Baltimore, May, 1876.

## Art. VI.—THE GREAT AWAKENING OF 1740.\*

By LYMAN H. ATWATER.

THE great revival of 1740 in this country, in which WHITEFIELD, EDWARDS, and the TENNENTS were the most conspicuous human instruments, had for its efficient cause what will be assumed throughout this and the following article as the efficient cause of all genuine revivals, the sovereignly imparted and efficaciously transforming operation of the Spirit of God upon all who were the subjects of it. But, viewed from its human side, it had its upspring, mode of development, distinguishing features of truth and error, and results alike of immensely preponderating good, and incidental, but by no means insignificant evil, in a protest and reaction in behalf of experimental religion against the formalism which had so largely supplanted it. This formalism had arisen from an abuse or perversion of the scriptural doctrine of infant church membership, the relation of baptized children to the church, and the proper conditions of their admission to the Lord's Supper. The true doctrine on this subject, which more or less distinctly and intelligently had been accepted as the basis of membership in the Congregational and Presbyterian, or in general, the Calvinistic churches of this country, is: 1. That the visible church consists of those who profess the true religion and their children. 2. That these children were therefore proper subjects of baptism, and if properly taught and trained in the Christian religion, may be expected, through the inworking of the Spirit, blending with and rendering effectual this Christian nurture, to experience and manifest the saving and transforming power of the truths so taught and symbolized in their baptism; that is they will commonly be prepared, on reaching the years of discretion, adolescence or maturity, to "recognize their baptismal obligations," and come to the Lord's table upon an

---

\* *Thoughts on the Revival of 1740.* By Jonathan Edwards, the elder, President of Princeton College.

*The Great Awakening. History of the Revival of Religion in the Time of Edwards and Whitefield.* By Joseph Tracy. 1842.

intelligent, conscientious, and credible profession of their faith ; that this is the normal order, and contrary cases abnormal and exceptional. 3. That the only proper internal qualification for the communion is repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ, wrought by the Holy Spirit in regeneration ; and the only, but indispensable, external requisite is, what the church ought, in the judgment of charity, to regard and treat as a credible profession of the same. 4. That these qualifications might exist in the case of many, especially those baptized and brought up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, when it is impossible for the possessor of them to give any account of the particular time or conscious exercises of the beginnings of this Christian experience ; who can only say, I know not the time when I did not fear God : or “ whereas I was blind, now I see : ” and that the church or its officers, while glad to hear such historical accounts of the first uprising and progress of conversion, yet cannot rightfully make such a narration a test of fitness for communion, on the part of those who now, in the judgment of charity, appear to believe in and obey the Lord Jesus Christ. 5. That therefore such cannot be properly excluded from the communion of the church.

We suppose that none of these principles are now questioned, either theoretically or practically in the Presbyterian or other Calvinistic communions. But it is easy to see that great perversions of them might arise from a too exclusive respect to some portions, and neglect of other portions of them—the usual effect of one-sided views, and half truths, often resulting in the worst form of error.

The generic error which in various forms grew out of the perversion of this system, was a practical reliance on these externals of baptism, baptismal church membership, christian parental teaching and training, regular attendance on public worship, and a good moral life, to insure salvation. They did not, indeed, theoretically hold, and few if any ministers taught, that these things of themselves constituted religion, or superseded the necessity of a true evangelical experience in the soul, wrought by the supernatural agency of the Spirit. But multitudes were strong in the faith, that living thus they made sure that God would in his own time and way work in them whatever experience was

necessary to salvation ; that they were in reality safe, and in no danger of final perdition. It was but a step further, a step into which, in the absence of clear, earnest, and constant warnings fitted to dispel the delusion, many were sure to glide, that a moral life, and regular attendance upon divine ordinances, are the sole requisites for adult church membership, admission to the Lord's Supper, and a full title to heaven. Multitudes came to live and die in this delusive hope, which, if not directly sanctioned, was very inadequately undermined by a large body of the preachers and pastors of the time. In New England special theories and platforms were devised to modify the Congregational doctrine, that the only legitimate, organic, and visible church consists, as to matter, of regenerate believers, and, as to form, of a confederated local congregation of them, into accordance with this way of church life and procedure. Stoddard, the predecessor at Northampton, and maternal grandfather of Edwards, one of the greatest of New England's early divines, propounded, and published a treatise advocating, the doctrine that the Lord's Supper is properly a converting ordinance ; and hence, no credible profession of religion or evidence of regeneration are necessary to admission to it, while such coming to it affords every promise of subsequent conversion. Another practice more widely prevalent was the famous " half-way covenant," which, upon an assent of the parties to it, usually recently married persons, wherein they avowed their acceptance of the fundamental articles of Christianity, and promised for substance both to seek due preparation for coming to the Lord's table and to come to it when thus prepared, also to teach and train their children in a Christian way, entitled them to have their children baptized. The genesis of this whole system was due in part, not only to the causes we have specified, but to that early ecclesiastico-political system in New England, by which the church and town were so identified, that membership in the former was essential to the right of suffrage in the latter. We can only indicate this, without explaining or pursuing it further. In all such cases more than one cause is apt to be concerned in effecting the result. But the result, however caused, was simply this, that ways were devised, almost avowedly, to substitute the form for the power of godli-

ness; to provide a place in the visible church for those who had no presumptive place in the invisible through a credible profession of piety; and to lead men to rely on outward morality and religious service, in place of inward experimental piety. Even so, many truly pious people remained in the churches. But they contained still larger numbers who, though of Israel, were not Israel. Finally, religion and the distinctive manifestations of piety declined, and in the wake of their declension public morals also suffered great decay. The condition of a large portion of the churches was very analogous to that which succeeded the Revolutionary War in Massachusetts, and, wherever not corrected, went to seed in Unitarianism.

Against this dead formalism the revival of 1740 was a protest and an antagonistic reaction. It arose from the war made upon it by the sounder and more zealous divines of the Congregational and Presbyterian churches, led by Edwards in the former, the Tennents in the latter, and Whitefield in both. It had its origin and distinctive form of development in the Scriptural doctrines and practical truths they inculcated and urged from the pulpit and press; in making plain the delusion and danger of this formalism, along with the distinguishing characteristics of Scriptural religion, and the doctrines of grace on which it depends. In pursuance of this end, the following points were specially emphasized and pressed. We quote from Tracy's *Great Awakening*, the great work on this subject, which, along with that of Edwards, is to a large extent our authority for what we have said and shall say upon it; although we see cause occasionally to differ from his judgments and conclusions—scarcely ever to question his facts.

As early as 1734 Edwards preached to his Northampton congregation those great sermons on Justification by Faith, which form an important part of his published works, and ground of his title to greatness as a theologian.

“The effect of these discourses,” says Tracy, “was, first, to make men feel that they now understood the subject and had hold of the truth; and next, to sweep away entirely all those hopes of heaven which they had built upon their own doings—upon their morality, their owning the covenant, partaking the Lord's Supper, or using any other means of grace. They were made to see that God has not appointed anything to do before coming to Christ by faith; that all their previous works are unacceptable in his sight, and lay him under no obligation, either on account of their worthiness or his promise,

to grant them any spiritual favor. These discourses were followed by others, in which he taught 'God's absolute sovereignty in regard to the salvation of sinners, and his just liberty in regard to answering the prayers of mere natural men, continuing such.' That idea of 'God's liberty' is an idea of tremendous power. It includes all that is meant by the doctrine of election, and expresses it most philosophically, unencumbered by forms of speech derived from human ideas of time. God is at liberty with respect to bestowing salvation. His liberty is perfect. . . . And this liberty is just. . . . Sinners have merited and now deserve instant damnation; and God's liberty to inflict it upon them now, or defer it for the present, or save them from it wholly, according to his own pleasure, is a most 'just liberty.' When the sinner sees and feels this doctrine to be true, he knows that no course remains for him but to call on God for mercy; and he knows that when he calls upon God, there is nothing in his prayers that at all impairs God's just liberty with respect to hearing him, and that he has nothing as a ground of hope that he shall be heard but the mercy of God in Christ. He can make no appeal to the justice of God, for that only condemns him; nor to any other attribute but mercy, which in its very nature is free and not constrained. And he can find no satisfactory evidence that God is disposed to be merciful to sinners, but in the fact that he has given his Son to die for them. . . .

"But will not the cutting off of his hopes drive him to despair and make him reckless? It would but for the doctrine of 'Justification by Faith, which encourages him, who has no good works, to trust in him that justifieth the ungodly. It teaches the sinner that, in being destitute of all claim to acceptance with God, and dependent on his mere mercy, he is only like all others who have been saved through Christ, and therefore need not despair. . . . And this and faith works by love, and transforms the whole character."—*Great Awakening*, pp. 10, 11.

We wish here just to note, as the negative germ of some peculiarities of some earlier revivals of the past century, particularly in New England, that it is not quite explicitly enough stated that faith is simple trust in the promises of God, offering Christ and a free salvation through him and the sole merits of his blood and righteousness, to all who accept him as thus offered; and that, while God has not bound himself to give repentance or faith or any saving grace to the impenitent and unbelieving, he has sovereignly bound himself by word of promise unconditionally to save all who thus rest on Christ as offered in the gospel.

The effect of this sweeping away of formalism and the false hopes encased in it was to initiate at this early period a series of awakenings, in Northampton and vicinity especially, which culminated a few years later in the great and all-pervading

revival of 1740—so designated because then at its height, though reaching into preceding and succeeding years. It will be seen that it was produced instrumentally by bringing the doctrines called Calvinistic, but in reality Pauline and Scriptural, into unwonted distinctness and prominence, in preaching to congregations whose ministers, though generally Calvinistic, had neglected so to emphasize them as was needful to dispel prevailing formalism. All accounts agree that these were the doctrines preached and signalized invariably by the promoters and leaders of the revival; and that, under God, they incited, shaped, and moulded it, while the disorders and extravagances which marred and ultimately terminated this great work arose, or mostly took on their form, from certain exaggerations of Calvinism, or hyper-Calvinism.

One great practical principle grew out of this preaching, in contrast to the habit which had prevailed of vaguely confounding religion or a state of salvation with a merely moral life or formal observance of religious services, viz., that the religion of the gospel is a positive life of faith, repentance, holiness, quite above any mere worldly or natural desires, feelings, purposes, habits, and acts; that it is supernaturally imparted by the Holy Ghost; in short, a real religious experience; and that it is distinctive and ascertainable by the subject of it and by others.

It was but a corollary from this view that none should be admitted to the Lord's Supper who do not give credible evidence of such a change. This proposition, abstractly considered, and *in thesi*, is indisputable, and was even then scarcely contested by any class. It was rather in the mode of application of the principle, in the manner of ascertaining this change and the kind and amount of evidence required to make it credible, that a great revolution in practice arose. This demanded such a course of conscious evangelical exercises as the Scripture requires of and ascribes to those who obey the gospel, capable of being discerned by the subject of them as the evidence to himself, and of being set forth by him to others, especially to the church and its officers as the evidence to them, of conversion. Out of this grew the doctrine that truly experimental Christians could, from the narration of experiences, decide upon the genuineness of the conversion of those professing it, or

professing religion, and that they were warranted in rejecting from ecclesiastical and social recognition as true Christians, those who could not or would not give such a distinct and intelligent account of experiences, conformable to the standards of their judges and examiners. It was quite natural in such circumstances that it should come widely to be deemed and treated as essential to a sound Christian experience, that the convert should always be able to state not only his present faith in and obedience to the Saviour, but the history, time, origin, order of the upspring of these evangelical exercises in his soul. The carrying out of these principles, in the main essentially correct, subject to proper limitations and exceptions, in preaching and church administration, brought with it a virtual revolution and an overwhelming excitement in thought and feeling, life and manners, church and society. It gave the revival a tremendous impulse, both as to the zeal and numbers of those espousing and yielding to it, and the intensity of the opposition to it. The evils and disorders, too, which came in its train, and finally brought it to an end, were but the logical and necessary outcome of certain exaggerations and distortions of the foregoing principles, which we will now briefly note.

1. The overdoing and misdirection in the matter of judging of experiences, whether those of the person or parties so judging, or of others. In judging their own experiences, multitudes came to regard impressions upon their minds, especially if attended with the recollection of some text or verse of Scripture which they construed to be congruous with and confirmatory of these impressions, to be the voice of God to them; that thus they were divinely assured of their own salvation and of the genuineness and infallible truth of their own religious feelings and views, as a measure for judging, and a justification for condemning, those of others not according to their standard, whether in kind or intensity. Thus their own subjective states came to have the authority of a divine revelation over and above all other teachings of the word or ministers of God. Edwards well says, in his *Thoughts on the Revival*: "This error supports all other errors."

2. Rash and uncharitable judgments, with corresponding denunciations of ministers and Christian professors as unconverted who fell short of the measure of those thus self-exalted to the

throne of judgment. It first took the form of a simple denunciation, by some who were forward as promoters of the revival, of those who kept aloof from it as unconverted, no matter how devout and holy their lives, or fruitful their ministry in the quiet and steady winning of souls to Christ. While Edwards constantly exposed and denounced such procedures, there is no doubt that the earlier and more immature preaching of Whitefield was leavened with something of it, which he afterward came to see and deplore, while the preaching of the Tennents and their coadjutors in the Presbyterian church had too strong a tincture of it. Thus all alike contributed, undesignedly, to give it encouragement, and a far more dangerous impetus from the mouths of inferior men following in their wake. But as the spirit of exalting personal subjective impressions to the plane of divine revelations, co-ordinate with or superior to God's objective word, gained ground, all this uncharitable denunciation and fulmination against ministers and people truly or presumptively pious, of course became thrice offensive, destructive, and intolerable.

3. Closely connected with all this, and essentially due to the same causes, was the exorbitant exaltation of lay exhorters and teachers to invade the province, usurp the prerogatives, of and assume lordship over, the regularly ordained ministry. We need not here discuss the proper scope and limitations of lay-exhorters and preachers. That they have their field, and that this field has its metes and bounds is undeniable. What those bounds are is still a *quæstio vexata*. But all will now agree that where they claim a virtual inspiration and authority equal to the Word of God for their impressions, or an equivalent right to eject from the communion of saints, and deny the competency to preach and teach, of those who do not recognize their infallibility or God-sent character, they are intruders upon the rightful sphere and authority of God's ministers, and as such, ought to be frowned down by all Christian people. Such cannot succeed in making their way through the churches without scattering fire-brands, arrows, and death. Such a body of fanatical lay preachers, assuming the style and authority of official ministers, came to the surface in the latter part of the revival. They assumed the right to go into the parishes of ministers whom they denounced as unconverted, and to teach the

people their frantic extravagances as the infallible truth of God, for lack of which they were ready to perish. Of course they spread spiritual desolation in their track. It is easy to see how such a corps of self-commissioned preachers, mistaking their own conceit, arrogance, and dictation for a divine call and authority, should instigate the withdrawal of their followers from regular churches and pastors, and the formation of separatist churches under their own oversight. This divisive process went forward most extensively in the eastern part of Connecticut, and caused desolations of many generations. Rev. Dr. Asahel Nettleton, of whose career as a revivalist three-quarters of a century later we shall, elsewhere, have occasion to speak, labored in this region in early life, and was a close observer of the disastrous effects of these disorders. This, along with his personal traits, accounts for the extremely sensitive repugnance which he at a later period cherished against the disorders, real and apparent, connected with some Western revivals.\*

4. Less directly and logically connected with the foregoing principles, except as all fanatical disorder tends this way, were the bodily agitations, convulsions, outcries, and screamings in religious assemblies under stirring and startling preaching, which at length came extensively to characterize these awakenings; to be encouraged by forward, and especially fanatical revivalists, and to be by many higher men considered as evidential of or identical with true religious experience, or indicative of the highest form of it. No principle is better settled, than that these wild bodily agitations are no proof or disproof of the genuineness of the religious exercises which accompany them, and that they certainly are not religious exercises themselves. "Bodily exercise profiteth little." It is also certain that profound and intense inward emotions on religious or other subjects may betray themselves in the uncontrollable agitation, or strange aspects, or outbursts of the outward man. But no grosser delusion can exist than the idea that they are or evince the work of the Spirit, or that he who has them is therefore undergoing the throes of birth into newness of life. Their pre-

---

\* See Tyler's *Memoir of Nettleton*, p. 246, *et seq.* See also the errors of the Separatists, set forth by the Windham County Association in Connecticut, and the full justification of the same by extracts from the Confession of Faith of one of the Separatist churches.—*Great Awakening*, pp. 316-17.

valence in religious excitements tends to divert attention from the spiritual to the sensuous, from the soul to the body, as the cardinal element in religion; to substitute confusion for order in the house of God, and to banish to a returnless distance the Holy Spirit, which flies from the realms of noise and strife, thus making room for that other spirit which is from beneath. All history proves the evil of introducing these things into religious excitements, and their certain tendency to corrupt and arrest any work of grace. Yet, it is quite certain that the principal promoters of the revival, doubtless owing to previous inexperience, were not sufficiently guarded here; and that even Edwards, while carefully protesting that they were not of themselves spiritual exercises, or the necessary evidence or fruit thereof, did none the less believe and teach, not only that they might naturally result from intense emotions of the soul in regard to its relation to God and salvation, but that they were to be rather encouraged than repressed, because "the unavoidable manifestations of strong religious affection tend to a happy influence on the minds of bystanders, and are found by experience to have a happy and durable effect, and so to contrive and order things that others may have opportunity and advantage to observe them, has been found to be blessed, as a great means to promote the work of God."—See *Great Awakening*, chap. xiii: p. 229.

These disorders had their culmination under the lead of the Rev. James Davenport, in the early stages of the revival a favorite of Whitefield, but who afterward outran all the true promoters of it, and led the corps of irregular raiders on all Christian propriety and ecclesiastical order. He was condemned by all the true friends of the great and blessed work, and at length came to see the folly and mischief of his own career, and to endeavor to undo their effects as far as possible by a public "retractation" of his errors. But while he humbly and penitently confessed, he never could fully repair the evil he wrought. See *Great Awakening*, chap. xiv.

The consequence in New England was, that all parties, including the sober and judicious friends of the revival, as well as its opponents, found it necessary to organize for the repression of these disorders, which were so injurious to ecclesiastical order, doctrinal truth, and consistent piety. By the extreme fanatics

they were all, of course, denounced as enemies of the work of God. It must not be forgotten, withal, that many who ranked as opposers of the revival were not opposed to the genuine work of grace which it brought with it, but to the disorders and extravagances which they detected in it, and that their fault was chiefly that of so underrating the former, and overrating the latter, that in their view, the evil preponderated over the good in it. And they felt unwarrantable aversion, not so much to barring the communion against those who could not bear that undue inquisition into their religious experience which usurps the divine prerogative of searching the heart, as against any reasonable inquiry into the apparent Christian experience and evangelical feelings of the candidate. The great effect, however, of these disorders, was that they brought the revival which had been so fruitful of blessing to a melancholy close, but not so that it failed on the whole to have given the cause of religion a great and blessed advancement. Owing to the unhappy association in the minds of the ministers and people of religious excitements with such disorders, the disorganizing and anti-religious influence of the Revolutionary war, with its antecedents and consequents, political, social, and military, the influx of infidel sentiments from France, with rare and sporadic exceptions revivals disappeared from New England and largely from the Presbyterian churches for half a century.

In the Presbyterian church, then extending itself over the Atlantic slope south of New England, the course of things, though circumstantially different, was in essential features much the same. Instead of such a slight ecclesiastical rupture as that induced by it in New England, ending with some separatist congregations, the Presbyterian communion itself was split into Old and New Side Synods in 1841; the main issue being the manner of testing the fitness of candidates for the ministry and the Lord's table by an examination into religious experience; the denouncing of ministers and professors as unconverted who opposed or refused this; the intrusion into the congregations of such alleged unconverted ministers and people, to preach the gospel to those thus ready to perish for lack of knowledge, without consent of their pastors or presbyteries; the non-requisition of certain diplomas or other testimonials as to literary qualifications in candidates for the min-

istry who were found to possess the "gracious qualifications" for it; all which were too much sanctioned by the New Side, and resisted by the Old Side, with a vehemence and bitterness which resulted in the excision of the Presbytery of New Brunswick and those adhering to it by the Old Side. This, however, afterward dwindled, while the excised party increased in numbers, until both sides becoming sensible of, and acknowledging, their respective faults and the evils of outward division, healed the schism and became one body in 1758, and so continued till the second disruption on different grounds in 1837. There can be no doubt, however, that while both parties held to the Confession of Faith and preached its doctrines, the New Side party preached its distinctive and most Calvinistic doctrines with most clearness and intensity; that they relied on these doctrines for the promotion of the work of grace; and that, whatever their faults or irregularities, they were the great instruments of promoting the revival in the Presbyterian Church. They were in perfect accord and coöperation with the promoters of the revival in New England. Some of them, particularly Gilbert Tennent, preached there with such wonderful power and success, that his course was attended with one continuous series of great revivals. Whitefield had been the great preacher of the revival, both among the Congregationalists and Presbyterians, North and South. The work, however, did not stop among the Presbyterians as suddenly or completely as in New England. Revivals appeared in many congregations onward to and after 1750. They arose in Virginia from the reading of works on experimental religion where the people were without ministers, and produced the germ of churches, which were afterward enlarged and organized under the labors of the great President Davies and his coadjutors. Thus were the foundations of much of the excellent Presbyterianism of Virginia laid. The fact that Edwards was called from New England, and, after his death, Davies from Virginia, to the presidency of Princeton College, which was born of the revival and founded to promote it, shows the intimate relation between the revival leaders in New England and out of it.

Another attempt at inter-communion between the revival element in New England and Princeton is less pleasant to re-

late. It illustrates the danger of a union of church and state, no matter what may be the denomination of Christians placed in this relation. Until a long time after the great awakening, the parishes of New England were separated from each other by geographical, and generally by town boundaries, legalized by the State, which taxed the inhabitants within them for the support of the gospel—*i.e.* of the churches of the standing, legalized, or Congregational order. When the fanatics and separatists, at last thrown to the surface in this great excitement, had thoroughly aroused the leading ministers and laymen of Connecticut to organize against them, these invoked the strong arm of the legislature to aid in putting down these disturbers—by this persecution doubtless giving them a strength and vitality they would not otherwise have had. In pursuance of this end the Legislature passed laws ordering that all strangers, or persons unlicensed to preach by regular ecclesiastical authorities of the State, who should presume to preach within the geographical boundaries of any parish without consent of the minister of the same, should be arrested as vagrants and transported out of the colony. This was doubtless specially intended for Davenport and his like, his home being out of the State, in Southold, L. I. But in the height of their indignation at these intruders, they actually applied this monstrous law thrice to the Rev. Samuel Finley, the successor of Davies and predecessor of Witherspoon, as President of Princeton College, and once with special harshness and indignity, for preaching to a Presbyterian congregation in Milford, and a congregation in New Haven which had separated from the First Church, while the New Haven County Association forbade any member of the Presbytery of New Brunswick to preach within their bounds! Surely the world moves. And whatever may have been forty years ago, our New England friends will scarcely claim as against Princeton, or the Presbyterian Church, Old or New School, in view of the past or the present, a monopoly of revivals!—*Great Awakening*, pp. 237-8,

The contemporaneous awakening in Great Britain, under Whitefield and the Wesleys, which ultimately crystallized into organic Methodism, with its prodigious development in the Old World and the New, had many characteristics in common with that already sketched in this country. It had a like re-

lation to the prevailing formalism of the Anglican church, but accomplished its reformatory effects, not so much within that church, as by an exodus and new organism without it. Hence it retained, as a part of its recognized and permanent method some of those bodily manifestations as implicated with true Christian experience and emotion, along with some other things which were ranked prominent among the disorders coming in the wake of the great American revival that brought the latter to a close. Falling under the efficient lead of John Wesley, who broke with his co-laborer, Whitefield, on account of the Calvinism of the latter, it was also organized and developed upon the basis of Arminian theology. In regard to all this, however, we refer our readers to the first article in this number on Methodism. But what we wish to signalize now and here is the fact, susceptible of conclusive proof from a cloud of witnesses which we do not quote solely for want of room, but which may easily be found in Tracy's volume, that the revival of 1740, in this country, was carried forward under the emphatic preaching of the sternest Calvinism according to the *ipsissima verba* of our Confession of Faith, without the slightest softening dilution, or mitigation of what are esteemed its sterner features; and that its disorders and errors were mostly in the line, or in consequence of, the exaggeration or distortion of those principles.