

6
EPISCOPACY EXCLUSIVE:

OR

TWO SERIES OF LETTERS,

BEING A REVIEW

OF

DR. COIT'S SERMON AND PAMPHLET.

[First Published in the Troy Daily Times.]

BY N. S. S. BEMAN.



TROY, N. Y.:

L. WILLARD, 245 RIVER STREET.

1856.

ADVERTISEMENT.

The following pages need but little explanation. In December, 1855, an article appeared in the *Troy Daily Traveler*, announced in the following terms: “*The Rev. Dr. Coit’s Christmas Eve Sermon. The Episcopal Church Vindicated from the Charge of Illiberality and Exclusiveness.*” It is subsequently said: “The following is a “sketch” of Dr. Coit’s remarks.”

More than five weeks after this publication appeared, I wrote, and printed in the *Troy Daily Times*, Twelve Letters, containing what I deemed merited strictures on this “sketch.” This Review called forth a Pamphlet from Dr. Coit, which must be read before its characteristics can be even guessed at. No description can convey a full idea of it. It should be read twice or thrice. If the copyright of this pamphlet were not secured, I should like to include it in this publication. That publication I examined in a Second Series, containing Seventeen Letters — and these two series, at the request of many persons, here and abroad, are now collected, and a few notes added, and thus given to the public. Important facts of human history and great principles of revelation, are involved in this discussion, and those who consider it a mere matter of form, and having no influence upon the vitality of religion, must have been dull observers of the course of ecclesiastical events. American Christians especially should study the revelations of God on these points, and it is with a hope, at least, that the knowledge of the Bible and the true structure of the primitive church, may be promoted, that these Letters are now presented to the public in this compact and corrected form.

N. S. S. BEMAN.

Troy, June 20th, 1856.

DR. COIT'S CHRISTMAS EVE SERMON.

NUMBER I.

MR. FRANCIS—This is a very remarkable discourse, and some of its positions are so strange and so extraordinary, that they should not go unnoticed in this Christian community. As the reasons for these assertions will fully appear hereafter, I will not consume time unnecessarily in exordium or preface.

The Sermon, as appears from the *Troy Daily Traveler*, whose "sketch" I shall use in my present strictures, was founded on the Gospel of John, iv, 19: "For the Jews have no dealings with the Samaritans." The object of the discourse, as announced by the reverend speaker, was "to repel the charge of *exclusiveness* which the enemies of the church are continually preferring against her." How far this point has been made out by the Doctor, we shall see in the course of this inquiry. If the text was intended to be *suggestive*, I suppose the Jews are the Episcopal Church—the Samaritans, a sort of mongrel race, symbolize other denominations. "The Jews of old," says the Doctor, "held no communication with the Samaritans, because they, the Jews, were the peculiar people of God." We are now somewhat prepared to hear him say, 'The Jews did right—acted correctly in pursuing this course; and *we*, who occupy the position of the ancient Jews, take the same course in relation to all modern Samaritans, and for the same reasons. We are *THE church*.'

The *fact*, that the Episcopal Church imitates the old Jews, is fully acknowledged by the Doctor: "because we refuse in religious matters to have anything to do with the denominations around us." But that no injustice may be done to the Doctor, in saying that he does not deny, but acknowledges, this part of the charge brought against the Episcopal Church, by her "*enemies*," as he calls all those who belong to other Protestant Churches, let me give the whole sentence: "We are likewise accused of arrogating to ourselves exclusive pretensions of being the true Church of God, because we refuse, in religious matters, to have anything to do with the denominations around us." The former part of this allegation is denied—the latter is not. In other words, while the Episcopal Church refuses religious co-operation with other denominations, it is not, says the Doctor, because we arrogate to "ourselves *exclusive* pretensions of being the true Church of God." Let this remark be remembered. It will be of use

hereafter. "This charge," he says, "is founded upon a very erroneous conception of the true state of the case." But what is "the true state of the case," according to the Doctor's own exposition? Why do Episcopalians "refuse in religious matters to have anything to do" with others? Why, according to Dr. Coit, simply this, and nothing more nor less: "As churchmen we believe our church to be the best and purest branch of the Church of Christ." But is this a reason for 'refusing' all religious co-operation with other Christian churches? By no means.

I make two suppositions here, and apply them to this case, and ask men of thought and candor to judge for themselves. Suppose that this estimate of the Episcopal Church which places it so high in the scale of *purity* and *perfection*, rests on the partial opinion of "churchmen" themselves—then what does it prove? Why, that if men *think* themselves more correct than their neighbors, they are justified in separating from their company. I say, if they only *think* so. This *may* be modest, and it may not be, according to men's opinions of themselves. But suppose this opinion, of which the Doctor says, Episcopalians "*have not the shadow of a doubt*," is true—and it would hardly be prudent to deny it, in the face of such evidence,—that is, the judgment of men in their own case. Say it *is true*. There is no such church on earth for "doctrine," "discipline," "worship" as this. Does it follow that such a church must separate "in religious matters" from all others? Just the reverse. They should diffuse their *salt* among the churches. They should let their light shine, broad-beamed and full-orbed over all Christendom.

But let us hear the Reverend Doctor still farther, on the same point, before we dismiss it. "And was (were?) our Lord to appear now upon the earth, we make no doubt but that amidst the multifarious forms of religious belief, our church would be recognized by him as nearest to that which he established in the world."

For the sake of testing *principle* by *practice*, I will here grant all the Doctor assumes; and see if his inference will follow with any logical or moral propriety. He thinks if Christ were to come on earth again, he would recognize the Episcopal Church as being "nearest to the church he established in the world." The Doctor, no doubt, honestly believes this. And yet other men see with very different eyes; and they may be equally honest too. But this is nothing to the purpose. Why did he not say, if Christ were here he would not only recognize our church as the *best* and *purest* in the world, but he would *act* as we do, and "refuse in religious matters to have anything to do with other denominations?" This he must say in order to carry out his reasoning, and justify his conclusion. But the Doctor would not hazard such an assertion. The facts of the Saviour's life would have looked him in the face most significantly. Christ belonged to the *only* true Church of God, and yet such was his charity, and so free was he from the spirit of exclusiveness, that the woman of Samaria wondered how a "Jew" could be so liberal, and the disciples who were yet tinctured with Jewish *high-churchism*, " marvelled " that their Master should so far forget himself as he did on that occasion. And it was no doubt attributable to the same open, charitable, and co-operative spirit, that his enemies accused him of being him-

self a Samaritan, and having a devil. And if he were here now, I have no doubt he would so *act* as to subject himself to the charge of being a *schismatic*, or at least no better than a *low-churchman*.

As Dr. Coit has given his opinion freely of what the Saviour would say of the Episcopal church, if he were here, and as opinions are *cheap*, I will venture to give one myself. If Christ were to make a second visit to our world, in this age, and for the same purposes for which his first mission was executed, whatever he might say by way of commendation of the Episcopal Church, in relation to its structure, he would, without doubt, dissent from Episcopal *practice*, in that particular which I am now discussing. He would not refuse all religious intercourse and co-operation, in doing good to a world of perishing men, except with that church alone. If he should do it, he must have greatly changed since he left the earth for heaven.

NUMBER II.

MR. FRANCIS—Your readers will recollect where I left my friend, Dr. Coit, at the close of my former communication. I must refer again to the position in which he has placed himself and his branch of the Christian Church by refusing, in religious matters, all fraternal co-operation with other denominations, while he disclaims all “exclusive pretensions of being the true Church of God.” If the Doctor had carried out the analogies of the text, his reasoning would have been far more logical and conclusive than it now is. The form should have been something like this: ‘The Jews were the peculiar people of God, and they had no dealings with the Samaritans. This was all correct. They were bound to occupy this *exclusive* position. We Episcopalians take the place of the old Jews, and all the Christian world are to us only as Samaritans, and we are bound to stand aloof from them.’ This would have been logical and conclusive. But when the Doctor tells us, that Episcopalians only claim to “be the best and purest branch of the Christian Church,” he has stated nothing which justifies a separation, “in religious matters,” from other churches. This conclusion is as destitute of the strong fibres of logic, as it is of the sweet cords of charity. If Christ tacitly rebuked the Jews, by his silent example, which is clothed with a charming moral beauty, for their bigotry, much more would that sweet heavenly example, if he were once more in our world, stand in strong contrast with that of the Episcopal Church, which according to the Doctor’s own showing, has much less reason for their separation from the great Christian community than the Jews had for their non-intercourse with the Samaritans. The Jews *claimed* to be and *were* the only true Church of God, and Christ reproved them for their exclusiveness, and how much more would that church which only claims to be a little better and purer than others, fall under his holy censure.

But the Doctor has given us another argument for the purpose of repelling the charge of illiberality and exclusiveness which is often brought against the Episcopal Church, which must be noticed in this place. It is spread over a large space, and presented with a sort of

triumphant air, which seems to claim the victory before the battle is fairly begun. The point or drift of the argument may be stated in a few words. It is embodied in the following sentence: "We Episcopalians are not more *exclusive* than our neighbors." Suppose for the purpose of discovering the truth, this position is conceded—and then what follows? Why, all branches of the Christian Church are narrow, and illiberal, and clannish, and *we* have a right to be so too. This is the amount of all the Doctor has said under this particular. He has said a great deal, it is true, but this is the amount of it when subjected to condensation. He has beaten it out as *thin*—I will not say as gold-leaf, for I do not think the material would sustain the figure—but as *tinfoil*; and here it is in its compact and solid state.

Now let us grant the truth of all this. The world is full of bigots, and upon the strength of this fact, shall a minister of Christ justify the same unlovely temper in his own church? This is the ground taken by Dr. Coit. Other denominations are as illiberal and exclusive as the Episcopal Church, because after all, they set bounds to their liberality. But hear the Doctor: "The Presbyterian, the Baptist, the Methodist, is not so liberal, but that the dimensions of his rule of liberal orthodoxy fails to cover the Socinian." And then he goes on to show that if a Christian, or a minister, or a church, professes to adopt the scheme of liberal and co-operative Christianity, there is no stopping place till he embraces the "Universalist," the "Deist," the "Atheist," and the believer in "the fashionable, modern Pantheist abstraction." Nor is he yet at the bottom of the yawning gulf which a man enters when he assumes the position of a liberal, co-operative Christian, among his Christian brethren! He must hold communion with the person who believes "Man himself is but a vegetable." The Reverend Doctor concludes this paragraph against a liberal and fraternal Christian fellowship, in matters of religion, with this fearful picture: "In the sublime climax of theoretical development we are brought into contact with the very prince of non-exclusiveness. In this last development, the theory of our opponents reaches its legitimate consequences. God and eternity; virtue and vice; heaven and hell are swept away; and on the chaotic elements of an extinguished world, Pantheism rears its throne as the prince of non-exclusiveness; and reigns most supremely and most gloriously, as the ultimate exponent of the boasted theory of non-exclusiveness and liberality.

I must be honest enough to say, *this is a magnificent piece of sublime nonsense!* And especially taken in its connections. No wonder the Doctor commenced this alarming description as he did. He says, as he opens his formidable batteries upon the Presbyterians, Baptists and Methodists, "Let us, my brethren, drive this idea of liberality to its legitimate conclusion, and see where this boasted evidence of orthodoxy will lead us." And then the Doctor *does* "drive." And such *driving* I have not read of since the days of Jehu, the son of Nimshi! And if he intends to "drive" all the Christians who can hold fellowship in well doing, in this bad world, and who can labor side by side, in Bible Societies and other great benevolent movements of the age, into the awful gulf which he has opened and depicted, it becomes not only Presbyterians, and Baptists, and Methodists, but the *low church* Episcopal—for they too are tinctured with this *heresy* of liberality—to take heed, for they are all on the brink of ruin!

But we need not be alarmed. There is such a thing as evangelical Christianity, and men who have the spirit of Christ and the gospel, can act together in very many things in order to make the world better; and their united action is *strength*. While it improves the graces of good men, it impresses *thinking* men, though far from God, with the truth and power of religion. I can see no good reason why an Episcopalian, *pure* as his church is in his own estimation—and I would not disturb his self-complacency—may not give away a Bible, in company with “the Presbyterian, the Baptist, the Methodist”—or even with “the Socinian or Universalist,” without injury to any one, or the sacrifice of any great Christian principle. And more especially, where different churches agree in the grand essentials of doctrinal and vital religion, it is quite Christ-like for them to harmonize in benevolent action. Such a picture has its subduing beauty. And man never appears so *little*, as when he suffers a mere FORM to mar this sweet harmony.

NUMBER III.

MR. FRANCIS—After the close of the “*sublime climax of theoretical development*,” executed by the Doctor, and which I noticed in my last paper, he makes the following personal and pungent address to each and every individual Christian who is exposed to the catastrophe which he has so graphically depicted: “Advocate of the so-called charity and liberality, are you willing to follow the logical deductions of your own premises? Are you willing to submit to the supremacy of Pantheism? Or does your soul revolt from the loathsome embrace of so foul and so execrable a delusion?”

I am not authorized to answer for others who believe in the power and sweetness of fraternal co-operation among Christian ministers and Christian churches; but I will answer for *myself*. I am not willing that the Doctor should “*drive*” me by the new propeller he has invented, into the great gulf which he has opened, nor can I consent to shut myself up in the nut-shell of denominational bigotry. There is a large territory between the two, where candid and Christ-like men may meet and pray and labor together, without the sacrifice of any great fundamental principle. If the Doctor has not made this discovery, with all his other attainments, it would be in vain for me to undertake to instruct him. The ministers of Christ and his people may act on rational principles, and use their discretion, like other men. No one need run into the *fire*, because he wishes to keep out of the *water*. The great principles of godliness lie in a middle region, and are not inherent to the framework or rituals of a church organization. In these, evangelical Christians essentially agree; and here we have a basis for a beautiful fellowship in benevolent action—while each church may maintain its own peculiarities in its own sanctuary and around its own altar. All this may be done safely. Thousands here and in England and in other parts of the world, and many Episcopalians are among them, are now acting most harmoniously and efficiently together—and so far as I recollect, during a long life, I have not seen the first man leap into the hideous gulf of Pantheism

from this cause! I do not believe the respected Pastor of St. John's Church in this city is one inch nearer the frowning brink the Doctor has laid bare before our eyes, than he was before he preached, in his own duly consecrated sanctuary, the Annual Sermon before the County Bible Society—though he was surrounded by multitudes belonging to other denominations. There were Episcopalians, and Methodists, and Presbyterians, with their hearts full of love for each other, and their hands full of Bibles for the poor. A blessed picture! The foreshadowings of heavenly union are in it. While I have never known any ill effects to follow this mingling of charities and of action, I have witnessed humiliating results from the opposite course. Many men have stood up *so stiff* in denominational exclusiveness, and braced themselves with *such manliness* against a liberal interchange of ministerial and Christian labors, in reclaiming a lost world, that, before they were fairly aware of their position, they have lost their existing attractions which kept them at a *very holy* distance from all other Christian Churches, and they found themselves in the centre of ecclesiastical gravity at Rome! They are safe from the assaults of liberality and charity of every kind. The history of exclusiveness in the United States and in England, for a few years past, reads many grave lectures to us on this point.*

I have heretofore noticed the position which Dr. Coit claims for his branch of the Christian Church. He does not "arrogate" any "*exclusive pretensions of being the true Church of God.*" This is his own language. Hear him again: "As churchmen we believe our church to be the best and purest branch of the Church of Christ." And he says again, "Were our Lord to appear now upon the earth we make no doubt but that, amidst the multifarious forms of religious belief, our church would be recognized by him as nearest to that church he established in the world." As a matter of mere opinion, I do not object to this. Most men think well of their own church. But does the Doctor adhere to this modest claim? I think not. He does not appear to be quite satisfied in drawing his strong inference of exclusive action from these slender premises; and hence it is, no doubt, that he insensibly falls into a very different theory respecting his branch of the Christian Church. It is the high-church theory. It is not openly avowed, but it leaks out. He speaks of "*the enemies of the church*"—when he means only non-Episcopal Christians—just as other ministers of Christ would speak of infidels or atheists. If there is not an implied claim here which is *exclusive*, I do not understand the force of plain English. The Episcopal organization is *THE church*; and all who refuse to acknowledge this position are "*the enemies of the church.*" This is certainly not very *modest*. In another connection, he intimates, or rather *affirms*, that, if the Episcopal Church were to give up her present ground of separate action, and hold fellowship in Christian effort with others, it would be "to pare down and adulter-

* I recently clipped the following from a respectable paper. You will take it for what it is worth. Probably it is essentially correct: "It is said that one hundred clergymen have, within a short period, seceded from the ministry and communion of the English Church, to join that of Rome—a number unparalleled since the days of Cranmer."

ate the essentials of doctrine, discipline and worship." Again, speaking of the "principles and doctrines" of the Episcopal Church, he says they are those "which we believe to be essential to the integrity of the Christian Faith and the Christian Church."

Then the Doctor has manifestly shifted his ground. Just now we were told that "churchmen believe their church *the best and purest* branch of the Church of Christ"—they have not "the shadow of a doubt" of it—they think if Christ were to come into the world again, he would think and say the same; but they set up no "EXCLUSIVE *pretentions* of being the true Church of God." Then the Doctor gives us to understand, that they alone have "THE ESSENTIALS of *doctrine, discipline and worship*"—and these "principles and doctrines" are "essential to the integrity of the Christian Faith and the Christian Church." If this is not "*arrogating*" "*exclusive pretentions*," I am laboring—to borrow the Doctor's language—under "a very erroneous conception of the true state of the case," without being able to see it. There is no other church. There can be no other, if the above statements are true. What sort of a church would that be, which is destitute of "THE ESSENTIALS of doctrine, discipline and worship?" "*The essentials*," recollect! Certainly, no church at all. Or what church would that be, which embodies neither the "principles" nor "doctrines" which are "*essential* to the integrity of the Christian Faith and the Christian Church?" And such, the Doctor intimates, would be the character of the Episcopal Church, if she were to recede from her present position and her separate action respecting other denominations. And such, in his estimation, must be the character of all churches, except the Episcopal. They have 'pared down and adulterated the *essentials* of doctrine, discipline and worship'—they have ceased to 'maintain those principles and doctrines which are *essential* to the integrity of the Christian Faith and the Christian Church.' This is the opinion of Dr. Coit. This position of my neighbor must *un-church* the whole of Christendom, except Episcopalians! If this were true, it would be alarming; but as it is mere assumption, without any gospel basis for its support, no one need be frightened. And especially all good men may be composed and calm, when they remember that the Doctor is far more candid and charitable, in those former positions I have noticed, in which he only claims for the Episcopalians a superiority over other branches of the Church of Jesus Christ. Few men—and especially men of strong party or sectarian zeal—are always consistent with themselves.

NUMBER IV.

MR. FRANCIS—I wish to make a few remarks on Dr. Coit's notions of *unity* and *schism*. Of the former he says, "Christ's Church can be *but one*, for we have his holy word for the assurance that there is but 'one Lord, one faith, and one baptism.'" "Yes, *one, not an hundred*." And from these premises, on which the Doctor puts his own construction, he arrives at the following conclusion: "The various sects are involved in an inextricable dilemma. If they believe their difference

to be essential and fundamental, they exhibit the palpable inconsistency of opposing us for maintaining the peculiarities of one (our?) church upon the identical grounds upon which they justify their several organizations. On the other hand, if they declare their peculiarities to be non-essential, and matters of mere taste or preference, they can by no sophistry or special pleading clear their skirts from the awful guilt of schism."

There is a style, or manner, apparent in the above, which I regret to say, pervades a large portion of this sermon. I would not characterize it with severity and disrespect, but yet things should be called by their right names; and as the Doctor has been very *frank*, I hope it will be deemed no sin in me to follow his example. The style, or manner, to which I refer, I should call assuming—denunciatory—pugilistic. "*The various sects*" are spoken of in a manner which would do credit to my Lord, the Archbishop of York or Canterbury. Why did not the Doctor respect himself, as well as the non-Episcopal Churches in this country, by using the more courteous—not to say the more Christian, descriptive language, 'the various *other* sects.' This would have been respectful, and according to fact, for the Episcopal Church or community, is no less a "*sect*" than the Methodist, the Baptist, the Dutch Reformed, or the Presbyterian. This language is a part of a system of assumption, which may be grateful to those who revel in everything which promotes self-glorification, but is in low repute among high-minded, impartial, and independent thinkers. Again, speaking of those who do not believe in the Episcopal organization of the Church of Christ, he says, "They can by no sophistry or special pleading clear their skirts from the awful guilt of schism." The language is all I wish now to notice. There is but little said, and much implied. These "*sects*" are men who try to maintain their position and sentiments by "*sophistry and special pleading.*" They try these weapons, but it is all in vain. "No sophistry or special pleading" can "clear their skirts from the awful guilt of schism." To say nothing of the argument of the Doctor, I am truly sorry that worldly men and infidels should find any specious ground in a public sermon for their common allegations against Christian men and Christian ministers, that all these religious discussions are 'only trials of skill and aspirings after victory; and that the weapons they employ are "*sophistry and special pleading:*" that is, they do not scruple to use dishonest and disingenuous means—such as making false issues, employing specious, though *unsound*, arguments, and establishing conclusions which they know can not be justified by the premises. All this is implied in the Doctor's boast over his opponents—"the various sects" to whom he refers. But let the *language* go, as it is of no use except to show the *animus* of the preacher.

But now to the argument. Let us look at the "dilemma" in which the Doctor thinks "the various sects" are involved. We too believe that there is "one Lord, one faith, one baptism"—but we do not believe this "*one Lord, one faith, one baptism,*" are confined to any one Church organization. Nothing in the text has an inkling that way. And the context settles what Paul meant by this Christian ONENESS. In the previous verse he says—"Endeavoring to keep the UNITY OF THE SPIRIT in the bond of peace." It is the *unity* of the SPIRIT, not the

unity of a CHURCH ORGANIZATION. It is a gratuitous assumption to apply it in that sense. There is no scriptural authority for it. Look at the concluding part of the sentence quoted by the Doctor. (Eph. iv: 5, 6.) "One Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all." Would any man—I mean any Protestant—limit the latter part of this sentence, which is contained in the 6th verse, to any one church organization? Would the Episcopalian do it, and thus understand the passage as teaching that the ONE God and Father of all, who is above all and through all, is IN ALL *those alone* who are found in the one great catholic framework of unity? I think not. And if so, any man can see how perfectly nugatory is the quotation of the 5th verse, made by the Doctor for the same purpose, and how utterly it fails to support the assertion for which he cited it. He says the "Church can be *but one*, for we have his holy word for the assurance that there is but 'one Lord, one faith, one baptism.'" This text does not prove the *oneness* of the church at all—and especially in its visible framework. But it does prove what the apostle wrote it for, that as Christians have "one Lord, one faith, one baptism," they should "walk" together "with all lowliness and meekness, with long suffering, forbearing one another in love; endeavoring to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace." This is just what we want our Episcopal brethren to do in relation to other churches. Any one who will read the first six verses of the fourth chapter of Paul to the Ephesians, can not but see that they contain a tender exhortation to the members of that church to walk together in unity, and this exhortation is enforced by the very passage the Doctor has quoted to prove that there is but one visible church. I say *visible*,—because he is speaking of different church "organizations." Just see how much better the words suit the Apostle's objects than the Doctor's. I change the order only to make the matter still plainer. There is "one Lord, one faith, one baptism," and therefore my Ephesian brethren, "walk worthy of the vocation wherewith ye are called"—"forbearing one another in love"—"keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace." This I understand to be the Apostle's object and argument. By the side of this look at the Doctor's. There is "one Lord, one faith, one baptism"—therefore "the Church can be *but one*"—"yes, *one, not an hundred*." And this he applies to the *visible* church, because he is discussing church "organizations." Should the Doctor disclaim this, and say he only meant that there is but one great invisible church, embracing all the sanctified in Christ Jesus, belonging to every church organization, or to no church organization, then there is an end of this part of the controversy, for "the various sects" all believe this; and to this I do myself most heartily subscribe.

The Doctor has made one great mistake in the declaration contained in the following sentence. He is speaking of "the various sects," and says, "If they believe their difference to be essential and fundamental, they exhibit the palpable inconsistency of opposing us for maintaining the peculiarities of our church upon the identical grounds upon which they justify their several organizations." No one opposes the Episcopal Church "for maintaining their own *peculiarities*." Many Christians do not approve of them all, but I have never seen the first

man who denies their right to maintain them. "Organizations" and "peculiarities" are not the matters in question or debate—but *separate and exclusive action*, withdrawing from all other Christians and churches, in consequence of these. Every fair-minded man will cheerfully subscribe to this view of the subject given by Dr. Coit. "Each one thinks that his religious system is the best to serve God in here below, and to give him an easy transit to the joys above." This free thought we all approve. Let every church maintain its own "peculiarities," and let them do it on the ground stated by the Doctor. This is not objected to by any. But what grieves many warm-hearted and devoted Christians is, that some in the Episcopal Church—not *all*—think their "religious system" is so good "to serve God in here below," that they will not serve him in fellowship with anybody else, and so well adapted to give them "an easy transit to the joys above," that they seem bent on making that "transit" all alone! These things do not inhere in the system,—they are no part of the "peculiarities," of Episcopacy, as many facts both ancient and modern testify,—and the Doctor has fallen into an error when he supposes that "the various sects" *oppose the Episcopalians for maintaining their own peculiarities*, when they object only to the exclusive and unlovely appendages which some men have very unnecessarily and unwisely attached to the system.

My remarks on "the awful guilt of schism" which is the other horn of the dilemma presented to "the various sects," by the Doctor, I must reserve for another paper.

NUMBER V.

MR. FRANCIS—I promised to devote this paper to the discussion of SCHISM. "On the other hand," says Dr. Coit, "if they declare their peculiarities to be non-essential and matters of mere taste or preference, they can by no sophistry or special pleading clear their skirts from the woful guilt of schism." I shall not attempt the strength—or rather *weakness*, as the Doctor considers it—of "*sophistry or special pleading*," but try what a plain tale of truth can accomplish. We do not say that our "peculiarities" are "matters of mere taste or preference," and yet we do not consider them "*essential*" to the existence of a church. We stand on the same ground which the Doctor says is occupied by the Episcopal Church; we think our "religious system is the best to serve God in here below." And is it *schism* for us to follow out that system? We *unchurch* nobody else. We deny nobody of Christians the same liberty.

But what is schism? It is defined by Walker to be "a separation or division in the church." By Webster—"Breach of unity among people of the same religious faith." But from whom have we separated and broken unity? Surely not from the established Church of England, nor from the voluntary church organization called Episcopal, in this country. We—"the various sects"—never belonged to either. We have made no breach in the church, and we have none to heal. I might apply the Doctor's reasoning to himself with the same

force with which he applies it to other sects or denominations. He says, "They claim no more nor less than we,"—which is, "each one thinks that his religious system is *the best*." If this be the state of the case, then the Presbyterians might charge the Episcopal Church with the "woful guilt of schism," for not coming over and joining them; and so might the Baptists, or Methodists, or any other Christian Church.

But the Episcopalian has adopted a theory respecting *unity* and *schism*, which should here receive a critical examination. Before the English reformation, in the reign of Henry VIII, the church was one in organization—it was the one Catholic Church—the Church Universal. The head was the pope. His authority was as supreme and absolute in England, as anywhere else. That authority was renounced under this king. The motives which led to this revolution—or *reformation*, for such it really was—were of a complex character. They were partly *religious* and partly *political*, in the great body of the nation, while the throne had its ends to accomplish, which every one knows were base enough. But I do not wish to bring the *motives* of Henry into the account at all—for I would not disparage a good enterprise because it was conducted by a bad leader. We have now to do only with *principles* and not with *men*. Grant that the corruptions of the Romish Church were a thousand fold greater than they were—that *reformation* was called for by stronger and more imperative motives than have ever been alleged—a grave question presents itself, which has never been answered by those who maintain the high Episcopal doctrine of *unity*. What right had a small *minority* in the church to rebel against the will and decrees of the *majority*? Against the church itself? The church is ONE—its earthly HEAD, long acknowledged by this insurrectionary minority as such, is *one*—the seat of "unity" is *one*, and that seat is Rome! If the doctrine of one universal catholic UNITY is true, then the glorious English reformation was a schism in the church of God—his only church! It is the great schism, and the only great one, which has ever occurred in the Christian Church, unless the division into the Eastern and Western Churches, which was fully developed in 484, may be looked upon in this light. Every actor in this movement against Rome—that is, against "the church," is chargeable "with the woful guilt of schism." No fair course of reasoning can save them from the charge.

It is vain to say that a whole kingdom, with the throne at its head, was in this act of separation. "THE CHURCH" embraced many kingdoms, and England was a mere speck by their side. It is of no avail to allege, that their ecclesiastics of every name, from archbishops to the lowest orders in the descending scale, were numerous and learned, and generally united in the movement. They could have been outvoted by thousands, by men equal in position and talents and learning, in the one great consolidated UNITY. It is equally unavailing to affirm that the English Church was planted by the Apostles themselves, or by some early Christian Missionaries who had no connection with Rome. According to the doctrine of unity or oneness of ecclesiastical organization, the Anglican Church must have been constructed subject to this universal order of things, in the Kingdom of Christ. Turn it which way you will, and there is no such thing as

justifying the English reformation on the principle of one extended, external unity in the structure of the church. According to this scheme that movement was the grand schism recorded in history; and the Episcopal Church stand convicted of its "awful guilt." And yet this is the branch in the great family of churches, that is always harping upon "*heresy and schism.*" It is said that persons who have committed murder, always seem to see blood spots everywhere, and are perpetually brushing their clothes and washing their hands, to remove the unseemly and admonitory stains.

No man rejoices more than I do in the reformation effected in the English Church. The practical evils of the Romish system had been long felt by the nation, good men were scandalized by the existing, and often open depravity of the church, and King Henry had strong personal and social motives to place himself at the head of the enterprise; and I can for one bless God that good men and bad men united to throw off an oppressive yoke which they had consented to wear too long and too patiently. They were not troubled about "the woful guilt of schism." They felt, as rational men, that they had a right to sever themselves from a corrupt church—they felt themselves bound to heed the voice of God crying to his own in Babylon, "Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues!" And they obeyed. These were the grounds of their separation.

There are inherent rights in man—these rights are fondly cherished by the Anglo-Saxon race, and they will show their existence and their power, when the proper occasions present themselves. We have an illustration of these deep-seated principles in the English reform and the American revolution. Men may cry *schism* and *rebellion*, but the work will go on—for God is in it. The early English Episcopalians acted on the same principles with the great reformers on the continent—and often acted with them. They felt themselves not only authorized, but *bound*, to come out of a corrupt church organization, and to reconstruct one more agreeable to reason and the word of God. This was not *schism*, but *reform*. And now shall we be told, that those Christians who were not quite satisfied with that reformation, and especially with the political and governmental aspects of it—men who have departed some steps farther from the humanly-imposed "peculiarities" of that ancient and gigantic structure, are stained with the "*woful guilt of schism!*" *Schism*, for what? Not for separating from Rome? This they did in connection with the Episcopalians. *Schism* for acting upon the very example set them by this large and respectable body of reformers? I hope the Doctor will withdraw this serious charge. It would do him honor, thus to act.

NUMBER VI.

MR. FRANCIS—The assault made by Dr. Coit upon John Calvin, deserves more than a passing notice in this review, on three distinct grounds. It is illiberal in spirit, inaccurate in point of historical fact, and quite unseemly and out of place as coming from an Episco-

palian. That Calvin had his faults, we would not deny. Whether his theology was true or false, is not the inquiry here. But that he was a great man—one of the brilliant lights of the age in which he lived—one of the strongest and most successful champions of the Reformation—intellectual, learned, and pious, is the uniform testimony of all or nearly all who were engaged with him in the work of emancipation from the tyranny of Rome. This sentiment prevailed not alone in Geneva, France and Germany, but in ENGLAND also. The unsparing attack made on him by the Doctor, has a spirit and a manner which we should not expect in any circumstances in relation to a man of Calvin's eminence, and one to whom the world has been so much indebted. But let this pass, as the sermon seems to have been prepared and delivered under some peculiar excitement.

What is said of Calvin in relation to his treatment of Servetus, is not correct as a matter of history. I do not charge the Doctor with intentional misstatement, but he seems to have taken up the rumors circulated by his enemies, without a cautious examination of facts. This is an ordinary failing in controversies—and especially in religious controversies. But let us first look at what the Doctor says, and then compare it with the page of well authenticated history. "In bringing Servetus to the stake he was guilty of the most palpable inconsistency. The peculiar instruments of Roman inquisitorial power became the chosen implements for the promulgation of his own ideas and opinions."*

This statement should be examined critically, and in detail—and under that process, it will be found inaccurate in more than one particular. From the Doctor's statement, we might naturally conclude, that the whole matter of burning this amiable, though somewhat erratic man, was the work of Calvin. But how stand the facts?

I can here give only a few leading details of this melancholy case. Servetus published a book at Vienna entitled *Christianity Restored*, which gave great offence both to Catholics and Protestants, particularly on account of its violent attack on the doctrines of the Trinity. The book bore only his initials, and the act of authorship was not easily established, as he professed to be a sound Catholic, and, as a *physician*, was under the patronage of the Archbishop and Clergy of Vienna. Suspicion finally fixed on Servetus, and process was commenced against him before the Inquisition. At first the proof was deemed insufficient; but the court still proceeded in the matter with zeal, and as they obtained more and more evidence against him, Servetus, anticipating the result, made his escape. The court issued the case in his absence, and condemned him. Servetus took shelter in Geneva, and as he was about to enter a boat to depart for Italy, he was discovered by Calvin, who gave information to the government; and he was apprehended and brought before the council—a civil tribunal. Calvin's secretary was his accuser, and Calvin no doubt drew up the thirty-eight articles of charge against him. In the first hearing, Servetus acknowledged that he was the author of the book, and explained, or justified, the positions he had taken. In the second, Calvin was present, and exposed his evasive pleas.

* See the Lecture itself on this point—"DR. COIT'S PAMPHLET," No. 12.

In the meantime, the Council of Geneva wrote to the authorities of Vienna, informing them of the arrest of Servetus, and inquiring relative to the proceedings had against him there. The governor of the Castle of Vienna came to Geneva, exhibited a copy of the sentence passed upon *Servetus*, and requested that the prisoner might be delivered up to him to be taken back to Vienna. Servetus entreated the court, with tears, not to deliver him up, but to try him in Geneva. To gratify him the court proceeded to his *trial*. He denied the competency of a civil court to try for *heresy*. His objections were overruled. He appealed to the council of two hundred, but the appeal was denied. As Calvin's influence was alleged to be great in Geneva, he begged to have his case tried by the other cantons; and it was granted that Calvin should state the objectionable things contained in the book, and Servetus should subjoin his explanations, and that the whole should be transmitted to Berne, Basle, Zurich and Schaffhausen, for their opinions. Their unanimous reply was that the Genevans were bound to restrain the madness and wickedness of *Servetus*. The manner was left to themselves—though Basle intimated that perpetual imprisonment might be sufficient.

The court then unanimously condemned Servetus to be burned alive the next day. Calvin and the other ministers of Geneva interceded for a *milder death*, but the court would not yield. It is farther to be remembered, that, "in that age, the ancient laws against heretics, enacted by the Emperor Frederick II, and often renewed afterwards, were in full force at Geneva." (See Mosheim's Inst., vol. 3, pp. 256–258).

I have endeavored to give succinctly the facts in this case, without the least wish to exculpate any one connected with this melancholy transaction, or to favor Calvin in the least.

But let me now repeat the words of Dr. Coit, and compare them with these historical facts. "*In bringing Servetus to the stake he was guilty of the most palpable inconsistency. The peculiar instruments of inquisitorial power became the chosen implements for the propagation of his own ideas and opinions.*" The blame of this whole transaction is evidently here attributed to Calvin. A person unacquainted with the affair, as many of the Doctor's hearers were, must conclude that Calvin was at the bottom of the whole persecution; and that he controlled the whole movement. But was it so? By no means. Servetus was first prosecuted before the Romish Inquisition, and by that tribunal was condemned. The penalty was the same that was finally inflicted upon him, for the same law—an old Roman Catholic statute—was in force at Vienna and Geneva. Calvin's great fault was giving information upon which this fugitive from bitter persecution, was arrested. Servetus was finally tried and condemned by a civil court or council, according to the uses of the age, and Calvin's participation was that of one who tabled charges, or prepared the indictment; and, on the second hearing, he prosecuted, or rather summed up the case.*

Nor is it correct to say, that Calvin engaged in this matter "*for the propagation of his own ideas and opinions.*" The "*ideas and opinions*" which Calvin *defended*—for "PROPAGATION" had nothing to do with the

* Calvin did only what he was requested to do by the council.

case—were those of Christendom,—of Catholic and Protestant Christendom. And yet any simple-hearted man, not well read in history, might conclude that Calvin held certain “ideas and opinions” peculiar to himself—some Calvinistic dogmas, which Servetus would not receive, and for this obstinacy he had him burned to death! Nor is it correct to say, as the Doctor has said, that Calvin “brought Servetus to the stake.” And much less, can any man be justified in asserting that “the peculiar instruments of Roman inquisitorial power”—“fire and faggot”—were Calvin’s “CHOSEN *implements*” when any reader of history knows, that Calvin used all his influence and all his eloquence, to obtain for this persecuted man, a milder death! The plain statement or *intimation*, not to be mistaken, of the Doctor, is, that Calvin “chose to have Servetus burned at the stake.” There are places where such an intimation might go uncontradicted, but Troy is not among them. The Doctor thinks Calvin, by his agency in the death of Servetus, “lost his claim to the name of Protestant.” There is a want, both of *historical correctness*, and of discrimination in this remark. Calvin, or any other man, would lose all “claim” to Protestant principle, and Christian principle, who should do what he did, in *our* day. But the true principles of freedom and toleration were, at that period, hardly understood or practiced at all.

The learned and candid translator of Mosheim, closes a note on this subject, with the following judicious and discriminating remarks: “*Calvin*, therefore, who had some hand in the death of *Servetus*, was censured by a few Protestants; while the great body of them, and even the mild Melancthon, fully approved of his conduct. Some of the moderns have unjustly charged Calvin with being actuated solely, by personal enmity against Servetus, and by the natural severity of his disposition. On the other hand, some have attempted entirely to exculpate him, and to attribute his conduct to the purest motives. He, doubtless, thought he was doing right, and had the approbation of his own conscience; *as he certainly had of the wisest and best men of that age, who, as occasion was presented, pursued the same course themselves.* But had he lived in our age, he would, undoubtedly, have thought and acted differently.”

Here we have the PHILOSOPHY OF FACT, which men often lose sight of, and then pounce upon a single man, or a particular set of men, and make them responsible for the perversities of the age.

NUMBER VII.

MR. FRANCIS—I have one thing more to remark relative to Dr. Coit’s attack on Calvin. What he has said, and the manner of saying it, place him in a peculiarly awkward position, as an Episcopalian. This may not be understood by all your readers, and perhaps not by all of the Doctor’s own church; but I think I can make it plain. The early reformers in the English established church held John Calvin in high estimation, and he contributed, not a little, to the present improved form of what the Episcopalians characterize, in a sort of stereotyped phrase, “OUR EXCELLENT LITURGY.”

Calvin, it is well known, was the author of several of the forms in *The Book of Common Prayer*. In the first book of Edward VI, the service began with the Lord's prayer. Peter Martyr and Martin Bucer recommended some preliminary forms, and this was the origin of what we now find in the Book—embracing the SENTENCES, the EXHORTATIONS, the CONFESSION, and the ABSOLUTION. These elements were not taken from any ancient formulary, as many suppose, but from the *Strasburgh Ritual drawn up by Calvin*. The RESPONSE, after the Commandments, is taken from Pollanus, who translated the *Strasburgh Liturgy*, and published it in London, 1556, just three hundred years ago. Here again we have Calvin in the Prayer Book. Archbishop Grindal calls the city of Geneva "*a nursery unto God*"—and he likewise translated from *Calvin* a prayer which was used during the great plague in London—a form which has become a model. Jeremy Taylor says, that in framing the Liturgy, "They called for the advice of the eminently learned and zealous Reformers in other kingdoms." And *Calvin* was one of these. And I may here add that *John Knox*, who was no less than "Calvin, the great leader and light of modern predestination," as Dr. Coit has styled him, was appointed one of the chaplains of Edward VI, and when he visited England in 1551, he assisted in the revision of the Prayer Book, which was then in progress. And John Knox, perhaps more than any other man, had an agency in bringing about that change in the Communion service by which the real presence, in the Romish sense is excluded. The same man in 1552, was employed on a revision of the Articles of Religion previous to their ratification by an act of Parliament. (See M'Crie's, Knox and Strype's Cranmer.) I can give my authorities—and most of them Episcopal—for all I have said as to Calvin's contributions to the Book of Common Prayer. I have no other motive for not stating them here, than the want of space in a newspaper article. I hope Dr. Coit's holy horror of CALVIN, as "*the great leader and light of modern predestination*," and for "*bringing Servetus to the stake*," will not destroy his relish for those excellent portions of the Liturgy, which emanated from that mighty mind. As a man of learning and of extensive reading, and especially as a critical student of his own religious system, he could not have been ignorant of these facts—and it strikes me as unseemly, and, I might say, *ungrateful*, for him to make such an attack, as I have noticed, upon one of the early *benefactors* of his church!

What I have stated above, gives us an important and instructive view of the early English reformers, both as respects their doctrinal position, and their lovely co-operative spirit in the work of saving men. They had no dread of those doctrines commonly called *Calvinistic*, but which were adopted by Luther and most of the early Protestants. I say nothing here of the truth or falsity of these theological views. This is not my object. But that they entered largely into the system of the Anglican Church, there can be no doubt. Let me subjoin a few authorities.

The 17th Article of THE THIRTY-NINE, contains as strong a view of "modern predestination," as Dr. Coit would call it, as can be found in any of the ancient creeds or catechisms—but it is too long for me to quote here. I well know—having myself been educated in the

Episcopal Church—how it is explained away, and set aside; but the language of it is exceedingly explicit, and teaches as high a form of Calvinism as is taught in the Westminster formulas. Thousands of churchmen in England, and many—very many *clergymen* among them—fully believe and adopt this construction. And I can truly say, that the most ultra Calvinism—what is called supra-lapsarian, or hyper-Calvinism—which I heard preached in England, was announced and defended in *Episcopal* pulpits. But I do not intend to discuss doctrines here at all. I am dealing with important facts, touching belief and practice, connected with this inquiry. Whether these doctrines are true or false, is nothing to my present purpose. My sole object is to show that an Episcopalian can not denounce Calvin but with an ill grace.

• But let us look a little further back, and see what the early fathers of the English Episcopacy were. As to their doctrinal sentiments we have the most ample testimony. Macaulay has truly said, “The doctrinal confessions and discourses, composed by Protestants, sets forth principles of theology to which Calvin or Knox would have found scarcely a word to disprove.” “A controversialist who puts an Arminian sense on his articles and homilies, will be pronounced by candid men to be as unreasonable as a controversialist who denies that the doctrine of baptismal regeneration can be discovered in the Liturgy.” In the reign of Elizabeth, the disputes between the Anglican Church and the Puritans, related almost exclusively to church government and ceremonies. “The doctrines held by the chiefs of the hierarchy touching original sin, faith, grace, predestination, and election, were those popularly called Calvinistic.” The Lambeth Articles, which were drawn up by her favorite prelate, Archbishop Whitgift, and the bishop of London, affirm “the most startling of the Calvinistic doctrines” with “a distinctness which would shock many who, in our age, are reputed Calvinists.” (For the above see Mac. vol. 1, pp. 59, 73, 74.)

I might multiply authorities on this point—but I have said enough for the purpose I have in view. Even Hooker, who occupied a middle ground in theology, “pronounced Calvin to have been a man superior in wisdom to any other divine France had produced.” It was subsequent to the Synod of Dort, 1618, that a great change took place in the Anglican Church. Macaulay says, “Opinions, which at the time of the Accession of James, no clergyman could have avowed without imminent risk of being stripped of his gown, were now the best title to preferment. A divine of that age who was asked by a simple country gentleman what the Arminians held, answered with as much truth as wit, that they held all the best bishoprics and deaneries in England. I intend no *discussion* of doctrines, but to advert to the history of some of them in the English Church.

As to the spirit of the fathers of the Anglican Church, so far as co-operative Christianity is concerned, it was pre-eminently fraternal. They held the most liberal views as to church government. They retained Episcopacy, but they did not hold it to be “*essential* to the welfare of a Christian society, or to the efficacy of the sacraments.” “Cramner, indeed, plainly avowed his conviction, that in the primitive times, there was no distinction between bishops and priests, and

that the laying on of hands was altogether unnecessary." Jewell, Cooper, Whitgift, and other eminent doctors, defended prelacy as "*innocent*," but "never denied that a Christian community without a bishop might be a pure church." "An English churchman, nay, even an English prelate, if he went to Holland, conformed without scruple to the established religion of William." (*Ibid.*) It is a well known fact, that in the Synod of Dort, made up of "Doctors not Episcopally ordained," two English delegates, commissioned by the head of the church, sat and deliberated, and voted, and preached with them. One was an English bishop and the other an English dean. This dean was subsequently Bishop of Norwich. Speaking afterwards of his commission to this synod, he says: "My unworthiness was named for one of the assistants of that honorable, grave and reverend meeting." In that day, too, benefices were held in the English Church by many who had been admitted to the ministry in the Calvinistic form on the continent; nor was reordination by a bishop deemed "necessary, or even lawful."

Give us such an Episcopacy, and we should have few such sermons as the one I am noticing, and the broad circle of a sweet co-operative gospel, with its warm heart, and its broad enfolding arms, would affectionately include the Episcopalians with other Protestants, in the activities of a Christian brotherhood. This is *the good old way of* EPISCOPACY. Many are sorry it was ever deserted.

NUMBER VIII.

MR. FRANCIS—No position assumed by Dr. Coit in his sermon, has so much surprised me as what he says of the Church of England in connection with the Puritans. As I propose to test this assertion by submitting it to the right ordeal of *facts*, I will first give the Doctor's paragraph in full:

"But the Church of England, while maintaining her own principles, has ever shown herself tolerant in matters of opinion. Thus she tolerated Puritan principles while they were quietly maintained, but when the arm of Puritanism was raised to prostrate her in the dust, then she manfully withstood the assault. It was the darling object of Puritanism, not only to promulgate its own peculiar opinions, but at the same time, in one fell swoop to blot out the existence of England's National Church and cover her very name with the mantle of oblivion. The Church of England withstood the assault nobly and manfully. She fought for her life—her existence. Had the hands of Puritanism been strengthened by the continuance of power, the gallows would have reared its gloomy form in the streets of London as well as in the town of Boston.*"

Take it all in all, this is one of the strangest paragraphs which

* The lecture is quite as objectionable, in language and spirit, as the "sketch." The lecture affirms that the Church of England treated the Puritans gently: "*She treated them gently.*" (See *Lecture*, p. 16.)

Let us look at a few of *these gentle acts*. The Liturgy as revised in 1548-9, was confirmed by act of Parliament, and its use commanded on the ultimate penalty

has issued from the modern press. Why the Doctor should indulge such a spirit of bitterness against the Puritans, is better known to himself than to me. If he were of Celtic origin, or had been educated at Oxford, or at Rome, it would not appear so strange. But my business is not with motives, but with facts. I have no wish to deal in personalities; and while I shall take the liberty of examining this whole statement, by the lights of history, I disclaim all ill-will towards its reverend and respected author, or the church to which he belongs. My only inquiry is, whether the above statement concerning the relations of the established Church of England and the Old Puritans is correct? My only aims are truth and facts.

Has the Church of England "ever shown herself tolerant in matters of opinion?" That is, *always*? So says Dr. Coit. And by way of proof, or illustration, he adds: "Thus she tolerated Puritan principles while they were quietly maintained." Is this a historical fact? Not as I have read the records of the past. I am acquainted with no historian who will sustain this declaration. Open Macauley—himself an Episcopalian—and what does he say on this subject? Speaking of the Puritans in the early dawn of their existence, as distinguished from the established church, he states the point in contest, and the ground occupied by each party, long before the opening of those fearful scenes of the great drama, which embroiled the nation in a civil war.

"They had recently," says he, "in reliance on their own interpretation of scripture, risen up against a church strong in immemorial antiquity and catholic consent. It was by no common exertion of intellectual energy, that they had thrown off the yoke of that gorgeous and imperial superstition, and it was vain to expect, that, immediately after such an emancipation, they would patiently submit to a new spiritual tyranny. Long accustomed when the priest lifted up the host, to bow down with their faces to the earth, as before a present God, they had learned to treat the mass as an idolatrous mummery. Long accustomed to regard the pope as the successor of the Chief of the Apostles, as the bearer of the keys of earth and heaven, they had learned to regard him as the beast, the anti-Christ, the man of sin. It was not to be expected that they would immediately transfer to

of imprisonment for life. The Liturgy was again revised in 1551 and ratified in 1552, and enforced by the same penalties. (*See Burnet's Hist. Ref.*)

At the celebrated Convocation at Lambeth, the question was put to the assembled ministers of London, whether they would conform to the appeal established by law, and subscribe their submission on the spot? Those who should refuse, were to be suspended immediately, and after three months, deprived of their livings. *Thirty-seven* out of one hundred utterly refused, and were immediately suspended, and those thirty-seven, as their oppressor admitted, were the best and ablest preachers in the city. (*See Stripe's Life of Parker.*)

"Surely it had been a strange and portentous thing to see such men as Miles Coverdale, the translator of the Bible, in his feeble and most venerable age, and Fox, the martyrologist, whose writings had done so much for the overthrow of popery and the support of the reformed faith, driven from their homes and weeping flocks and exposed to reproach and poverty, because they would not consent to disfigure their persons with the gaudy vestments characteristic of Romish superstition." (*See Hist. Westminster Assembly, p. 35.*)

But all these acts and a thousand others of a still deeper dye, were, in the opinion of Dr. Coit, so many illustrations of the *gentleness* of that church which he styles "the would-be mother of us all." (*Lecture, p. 22.*)

an upstart authority the homage which they had withdrawn from the Vatican ; that they would submit their private judgment to the authority of a church founded on private judgment alone ; that they would be afraid to depart from teachers who themselves dissented from what had lately been the universal faith of Western Christendom. It is easy to conceive the indignation which must have been felt by bold and inquisitive spirits, glorying in newly acquired freedom, when an institution younger by many years than themselves—an institution which had, under their own eyes gradually received its form from the passions and interests of a court—began to mimic the lofty style of Rome.”

This, recollect, was in the reign of Elizabeth ; and the Puritans had done nothing but claim the right of private judgment. They were, in the language of Macaulay, not “*afraid to dissent.*”

These men, as the same historian tells us, thought the “reform which had been effected under King Edward, had been far less searching and extensive than the interests of pure religion required.” But what did they do ? They petitioned the throne ; but as our historian records, “it was in vain they attempted to obtain any concession from Elizabeth.” Now, I do not suppose Dr. Coit, or any other Protestant, will say these Puritans were guilty of any wrong in forming a “private judgment” in religious matters, or in “dissenting,” or in “petitioning” the throne. The Doctor can not charge these men, for *these* acts, with “lifting the arm of Puritanism” to “prostrate the established church in the dust.” No.

And what was the very next step, according to Macaulay ? I quote from the very same page I have cited above, and the very next paragraph. “Since these men could not be convinced, it was determined they should be *persecuted*. PERSECUTION produced its natural effects on them. It found them a sect : it made them a faction. To their hatred of the church was now added hatred of the crown.” These persecutions, which consisted in various disabilities—in depositions—in forbidding them the free acts of social worship—in fines—in imprisonments, are recorded not only by Macaulay, but by Neale, and even by Hume himself, who hated the Puritans “with a perfect hatred.” No acts of the past are more strongly or universally attested than these. (See Macaulay’s Hist. vol. 1, pp. 55, 56.) “Since these men could not be convinced, it was determined that they should be *persecuted*.” Persecuted for *opinion’s* sake. And yet Dr. Coit tells us, that the Church of England has “ever shown herself tolerant in matters of opinion.” If this is toleration—fines, and imprisonments, and many social disabilities, for the act of mere *dissent* from a creed and forms of worship imposed by government—I hope we may be long exempt from the blessing ! And at this period “Puritan principles were quietly maintained.” These men must give up their own judgment and convictions, or be “*persecuted*.” They could not be convinced, and they *were* persecuted.

Now let the reader mark, this was long before “the *arm* of Puritanism” was raised at all. There is not a page of reliable history to prove, that “it was the darling object of Puritanism,” at this period, “not only to promulgate its own peculiar opinions, but at the same time, in one fell swoop, to blot out the existence of England’s National

Church, and cover her very name with the mantle of oblivion." The Doctor has transposed the philosophical relations of cause and effect. These *persecutions* for non-conformity to a state religion, of the same character with those which had been inflicted by Rome, did stir up animosities which shook the kingdom to its foundations. The English Church began the conflict and struck the first blow; and long before the deadly struggle described by Dr. Coit, *political* as well as religious elements, mingled in the strife. The Puritans stood not alone. Republicanism stood by her side. The great struggle, as it finally shaped itself, was between the friends of civil and religious liberty on the one side and the advocates of monarchial and high church domination on the other.*

But I can not dismiss the Puritans, towards whom the Doctor indulges such *peculiar* feelings, without a word more. I say *peculiar* feelings; for Wm. H. Seward, an Episcopalian; has done them justice—the historian Bancroft, a Unitarian, has spoken well of them—and Macaulay, whom I have already quoted, could see and appreciate their high excellencies, while he was not blind to their faults. At the very period when Queen Elizabeth was immuring these remarkable men in dungeons, for their non-conformity, a fierce warfare was waged by the Catholic powers of Europe against her throne and kingdom. And what were the sympathies and conduct of these men? Macaulay says: "The Puritans, even in the depths of the prisons to which she had sent them, prayed, and with no simulated fervor, that she might be kept from the dagger of the assassin, that rebellion might be put down under her feet, and that her arms might be victorious by sea and by land." If we look for a parallel to this spirit of the old Puritan, we shall find it only in the elevated, and almost super-human character of the Christian of the apostolic age.

Macaulay, in his article on Milton, inserted in the *Edinburgh Review*, in 1825—has these forcible remarks on the Puritan character: "Most of their absurdities were mere external badges, like the signs of freemasonry or the dresses of friars. We regret that these badges were not more attractive. We regret that a body, to whose courage and talents mankind has owed inestimable obligations, had not the lofty elegance which distinguished some of the adherents of Charles I, or the easy, good breeding for which the court of Charles II was celebrated. But, if we must have our choice, we shall, like Bassanio in the play, turn from the specious caskets, which contain only the death's head and fool's head, and fix our choice on the plain leaden chest which conceals the treasure." It is not every man that can appreciate the Puritan character, because it is not every one that can

* Hume hated the *Puritans* quite as intensely as Dr. Coit appears to do,—but he hated *oppression* more. You see both of these characteristics, in the following records from his pen:

"So absolute, indeed, was the authority of the crown, that the precious spark of liberty had been kindled and was preserved by the Puritans; and it was to this sect, whose principles appear so frivolous, and habits so ridiculous, that the English owe the whole freedom of their constitution." Again, "It was only during the next generation that the noble principles of liberty took root, and spreading themselves under the shelter of Puritanical absurdities, became fashionable among the people." (*Hume's Eng.*, vol. v. pp. 183, 469.) I never knew a friend of *popular liberty*, who did not admire the *Puritan's spirit*.

understand it. But Macaulay *could*. He did not look at the cut of his garment, the form of his hat, the clippings of his hair, or his, not unfrequently, stern visage,—but he went down into the depths of the hidden man, and there he found the riches of mind, at once bright and solid as pure gold.

NUMBER IX.

MR. FRANCIS—I shall notice, in this paper, the attack made by Dr. Coit upon the “Presbyterian Confession of Faith.” But let me say, I have no sensitiveness of a denominational character, on account of this or any other reference made to this platform, or to the church to which I belong. I hold neither the *one* nor the *other* to be *infallible*; and shall even deem it kind in the Doctor, or any one else, to name anything which seems to be wrong in our faith or practice. Any Christian, or any denomination that can not accord to any fair opponent this privilege, assumes a position, and manifests a haughtiness, which are very little Christ-like.

But when unintentional, or intentional, error may be detected in a reference, or in the uses made of it, or in the inferences drawn from it, it becomes an honest man to look into the matter and show where that error lies. This is my object now.

We will first hear the Doctor: “But the senseless charge of illiberality and uncharitableness is repeated again and again. But the whole face of the charge consists in simple assertion. Where are the proofs? Let us see against whom this charge justly rests—our opponents or ourselves? It is said that we unduly exalt the church, and attach an undue importance to connection with it. Let us see how our opponents view this matter. Take for instance the Presbyterian body, and what says the Confession of Faith, respecting the nature of the church, and the importance of connection with it. After stating what it considers to be the church, it comes out with those solemn and awfully important declarations, ‘*Out of which (i. e. the Church) there is no ordinary possibility of salvation.*’ Words of fearful import.”

This passage is adduced by the Doctor, to show how “*senseless*” Presbyterians are in their “charge of illiberality” against the Episcopal Church, while “this charge justly rests” with still greater force against themselves. But it would have been an act of simple fairness for the Doctor to give the words of the “Confession,” that every one might judge whether the reference sustains the allegation. I will give these words and let your readers judge for themselves. “The visible church, which is also catholic or universal under the gospel, (not confined to one nation as before under the law), consists of all those throughout the world, that profess the true religion, together with their children; and is the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ, the house and family of God, out of which there is no ordinary possibility of salvation. This every one perceives is “the visible church”—not the *Presbyterian*. It “consists of all those throughout the world, that

profess the true religion." It is "the house and family of God." It is "the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ." There is no exclusion here. It is the broadest definition that can be given to the church. Every thing named as a necessary qualification in order to belong to this great *visible* "family," or "kingdom," is to profess "the true religion"—that is, the revealed system of God, or the gospel. Any church, or sect, that has any claim to the distinction of *Christian*, must be embraced in the limits of this definition.

This is a very different matter from any exclusive denominational claim. It does not even look that way. That thought was foreign from the purpose for which the article was formed. And yet the Doctor seems to have quoted it for that purpose *alone*. He would have us believe that the Presbyterians are more exclusive in their church claims than the Episcopalians—whereas all that is stated here is claimed as much for one church as another—as much for the *Episcopal* as the *Presbyterian*. It is the *great visible church* "throughout the world," of which "the solemn and awfully important declaration" which so much shocks the Doctor's liberality, is predicated. The outward kingdom of Christ takes in all Christendom, and excludes no part of it, professing the true religion. And what are "*those solemn and awfully important declarations*"—"words of fearful import"—compared with which, the Episcopal Church "has never ventured to utter so sweeping an assertion?" Why simply these: That out of this great, universal Church of Christ, extending over all nations, and embracing all denominations professing the religion of the gospel, "There is no *ordinary* possibility of salvation." In other words, that we may expect, under the gospel, men who love God, and renounce sin, and have a title to heaven through the blood of Christ, will show some signs of these inward graces by obeying the simplest and most obvious commands of God—that they will confess Christ before men, be baptized, and become members of *some* branch of the visible church. In other words, the great sentiment here embodied is, that we may *ordinarily* expect to find pious or religious men in the Christian Church of *some* denomination, and that ordinarily those who stand aloof from *all* church ordinances, and have not even a *visible* connection with the great family of God, in *any of its branches*, are such as deny Christ before men, and are very likely to be denied of him before the Father and the holy angels. All this must of course be restricted to those who enjoy the gospel, and who *may* profess their faith in Christ, and obey his commands, or refuse to do these things, according to their own option. "The *ordinary* possibility of salvation" is *in* the Christian Church, and not *out* of it. Not the *Presbyterian* Church, but the great, "visible," "catholic," "universal" Church of Christendom—embracing all the churches holding the great truths of revelation. If this is narrow and exclusive, the charge must come from those who have a respect for no *church*, and who think it is as easy to please God and attain heaven *without* churches and ordinances as *with* them. And I am quite sure that neither an *Episcopalian*, nor a *Presbyterian*, can be that objector, when he looks at this matter as it is. The Presbyterian article to which the Doctor has objected, when carefully examined, I am sure, is quite as liberal as *his* creed or *mine*, touching the spiritual *influences* and

spiritual *indications* of church membership and the visible communion of saints.

The issue the Doctor has made on the point before us, renders it proper for me to state some things which the Episcopal Church has "ventured to utter," respecting the influence upon salvation of membership in that *particular* communion. It is a very significant fact, that, in the burial of the dead, the prescribed service of the Episcopal Church is not to be used in the case of "unbaptized adults"—thus placing them on a level with those who "*die excommunicate*" and who "*have laid violent hands upon themselves.*" I am not finding fault with this injunction; but I refer to it here to show that the Episcopal Church has "ventured to utter" some things that indicate the great importance which she attaches not only to connection with the Christian Church, but to a *single* ordinance of the church; and, in the case of those who believe that *baptism* in order to be valid must be administered by Episcopal hands, here are "words of fearful import," that these "*unbaptized adults,*" though they may have received the ordinance from other hands, being doomed to unchristian burial, stand a poor chance for an entrance into the kingdom of heaven. This is something more '*illiberal and uncharitable,*' as it strikes me, than the position he complains of in the Presbyterian confession, which confines the "*ordinary possibility of salvation*" to membership in *some* branch of the great visible "family of God."

Take a few specimens from Episcopal writers of high authority in that communion, in order to ascertain whether that church *does*, or does *not* hold illiberal sentiments on that very point which Dr. Coit has attempted—though *ineffectually*—to make the Presbyterian church guilty of using "words of fearful import." Centuries ago, Dodwell consigned all the reformed churches of Europe, except the Episcopal, "*to the uncovenanted mercy of God.*" This was quite kind compared with Rome who consigned them *all*—Episcopalians with others—to purgatory—if not *worse!* In the *Companion for the Altar*, by a late favorite bishop of this state, we are told: "Where the gospel is proclaimed, communion with the church, by the participation of its ordinances, at the hands of the duly authorized priesthood, is *the indispensable condition of salvation.*" Comment is not needed. The bishop of the Eastern Diocese—I know not whether to call him *late* or *present* bishop—teaches, on the doctrine of UNITY—"None but the bishops can unite us to the Father, in the way of Christ's appointment; and these bishops must be such as receive their mission from the first commissioned Apostles." The Episcopal Tract Society teach, "That none who have not received Episcopal ordination are lawful ministers of the church, or warranted to perform any acts in the name or with the authority of God." I might multiply quotations of this character indefinitely, but I can not do it here. I am willing to leave these by the side of the Doctor's attempt to charge "illiberality and uncharitableness" upon the creed of Presbyterians—and let your readers decide whether he has gained a *victory*, or sustained a *defeat*, by "*carrying the war into Africa.*"

NUMBER X.

Mr. FRANCIS—I shall notice to-day the philosophical delineations of Romanism and ultra-Protestantism, which Dr. Coit has given us in his Christmas Eve sermon ; and they appear to me so entirely different from anything I have ever met with in my perusal of books, ancient or modern, and so unlike anything I have ever conceived of myself, in any of my former theological speculations, that I shall not hesitate, for a moment, to accord entire *originality* to the theory. But it is a courteous rule, that a person should always be heard before he is answered—and so I will quote the Doctor at large, and then subjoin what I have to remark by way of comment.

After stating how easy a thing it is to gain admission to the Episcopal Church, he adds: “How marked the contrast between her position and that of Romanism on the one hand, and ultra-Protestantism on the other. Rome, leaving the *heart*, presents her exactions and requirements to the *head*. Whatever may be the state of one’s intellectual organs, it inexorably demands that the creed of Pope Pius IV, together with the accumulated interpolations and incrustations of ages of development, be received and digested. Ultra-Protestantism, on the other hand, flies to the opposite extreme, and arrays its inquisitorial judgment upon the secret feelings and emotions of the heart. Its demands are as inexorable as the exactions of Pope Pius ! It invades the domain of the Infinite, probes the secret recesses of the soul, and, arrogating to itself that province of judgment over men’s hearts which belongs to God alone, it has the daring presumption to receive, reject, or condemn, according to the weak conclusions of finite judgment. My friends, between two such systems of error I could have no hesitation in the choice of the former, since the Romanist admits that some degree of mental ignorance, obliquity, or obtuseness, may be uncovered without absolute peril to the soul’s salvation. In the latter case, if the heart is involved in serious obliquity, everything is lost.”

If I understand this description, its philosophy is erroneous, and not accordant with facts and some of the principles, instead of being fairly stated, are caricatured. I charge no intentional mis-statement on the part of the Doctor, but a strong tendency to *hyperbole*. As to the philosophy of religious systems here given, this is the first time in my life that I have heard, that Romanism makes its appeal to “*the head*,” or the *intellect* of man, in order to multiply converts, or to its own disciples for their edification ; and ultra-Protestantism—by which I suppose we are to understand *Puritanism*, in some of its branches—makes *its* appeals only to “*the heart*.” According to this theory, we might expect to find Romanists the most *intellectual* among the professors of Christianity, and these ultra-Protestants, in their religion, a mere mass of *excitability* and without intellectual culture or intelligent thought. But what are the facts ? I will not say just the reverse of this in *all* respects, but it is certainly so in *many*. So far as the Romish Hierachy is concerned, the DOGMAS referred to by the Doctor

must be received "en masse," but not as he intimates on investigation. No one is required to "*digest*" them. They are only to be *swallowed*. "THE HEAD," the intellect, the legitimate exercise of free, intelligent thought, have little or nothing to do with the process. It is for the most part a matter of authority on the one hand, and implicit submission on the other. "*The head*" must exercise a very limited agency, when the whole man acts under arbitrary and unbending dictation.

But the philosophical theory of this sermon will appear still more incorrect and baseless, when we consider the fact, that the *people*, and not the *priesthood*, are here referred to. "Rome," says the preacher, "presents her exactions and requirements to THE HEAD." This is her mode of teaching her disciples. Nothing could be wider of the mark. It is a random assertion which has no fact to support it. The great masses of the Roman Catholic population who go to make up her 130,000,000 in our world, know very little more of "the Creed of Pope Pius Fourth," and "the accumulated interpolations and incrustations of ages, of development," as a SYSTEM, than they do of the creed of the man in the moon, and "the incrustations of ages of development" in that secondary planet. I say as a *system* of religious belief, presented to the *thought* of man for reception or rejection—that is, to the intellect, or "*head*." The people are to receive what the *priest* tells them—and thinking is a mortal sin. A late convert to Romanism, an American too, who was not long since asked if he believed in the claim to miraculous power asserted by a certain Romish priest, answered, "*Sir, I believe all the priest tells me.*" And this system of priestly dictation, is described as the religion of "*the head*." Why, a man might have just as much of this kind of religion without a head, as with one, if he could only learn to bow implicitly to spiritual dictation, while this necessary organ of thought and reasoning, was entirely wanting! The great object of Rome has ever been to annihilate human heads, or paralyze the brain, or stop its intelligent operations, at least so far as religious investigation is concerned. This philosophical theory of the Romish system, is so far from being correct, that it is not even plausible. It is as *incorrect* as it is *new*.

Nor is the Doctor more happy and discriminating in his delineation of what he considers the antagonism of all this. "Ultra-Protestantism, on the one hand, flies to the opposite extreme, and arrays its inquisitorial judgment upon the secret feelings and emotions of the heart. Its demands are as inexorable as the exactions of Pope Pius!" I may not be correct in my impressions respecting the ultra-religionists here aimed at by the Doctor; but putting all he has said, both in previous and subsequent passages together, in order to form one entire delineation, I conclude he must mean those Christians and churches who believe it proper to examine persons who apply for admission to the sealing ordinances of the gospel on the subject of personal and experimental religion. The old Puritans, and their descendants and successors and representatives, are, no doubt, included in the category. This is the system that "invades the domain of the Infinite, probes the secret recesses of the soul, and, arrogating to itself that province of judgment over men's hearts which

belongs to God alone, it has the daring presumption to receive, reject or condemn, according to the weak conclusions of finite judgment." We have here in this description the same thing I have before hinted at—a strong tendency to *hyperbole*: "invading the domain of the Infinite"—"arrogating to itself" that "which belongs to God alone"—and in a former quotation, "arraying its inquisitorial judgment upon the secret feelings and emotions of the heart"—and the like. I have called this *hyperbole*; but this does not fully describe a *manner* which characterizes a large portion of the sermon. If I were to make a RHETORIC, I would invent a new figure of speech to meet a peculiar mental idiosyncrasy we sometimes meet with, which can not well help indulging in the language of extravagance, even in plain matters of fact. The mind—the soul—the whole man, is too highly charged to hold in. The expression which is prompted by it, is rather a *character* than a *crime*? I should call my new figure "*the impassioned hyperbole*." And if I should ever use it myself, no man would have a better right.

All the Doctor has said above, and which I need not repeat, belongs to this descriptive figure. Disrobe it of its rhetoric, and it is merely this. These ultra-churches believe in experimental religion, and they examine candidates for admission to the peculiar ordinances of the house of God, on this vitally important matter. But there is no such power assumed, or judgment exercised or pronounced, as the Doctor has described. He has presented a picture of *fancy*, and it seems to me, and I say it gravely, that it would have borne fewer earthly tints, if he had had the Ninth Commandment before his eyes, when he wrote it: "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor." I do not charge the Doctor with the infliction of *intentional* wrong, but he has been carried away by the figure of speech I have named. This figure alone can save him. I name it for his benefit.

I will again say, that the practice so severely denounced by Dr. Coit of inquiring seriously, kindly, and affectionately into the religious convictions and experiences of candidates for church ordinances, is not only reasonable, but, in all respects, scriptural. I can give references to the word of God if required. If this were done in all churches, there would be fewer unconverted and worldly members within their pale.

We have a much better characteristic description of the three branches of Christendom referred to by Dr. Coit, than the one which I have examined in part. It is from the pen of one of the most analytic minds of our age, and himself an Episcopalian. It relates to the early age of the Anglican reformation. I hope many who read it, may mend their philosophy of religion. The writer is speaking of the Episcopal Church. "In general it may be said, that she appeals more to the understanding, and less to the senses and the imagination, than the *Church of Rome*, and that she appeals less to the understanding, and more to the senses and imagination, than the *Protestant Churches of Scotland, France and Switzerland*." Here we have "*multum in parvo*;" and the person who should need a long sermon to elucidate this sound and obvious text, would prove himself deficient in the knowledge of church history, or wanting in personal discrimination.

NO. XI.

MR. FRANCIS—It was not practicable for me to finish, in my last number, what seemed to me proper to be said on Dr. Coit's characteristic delineation, as he would have it, of Romanism, Episcopalianism, and ultra-Protestantism. I wish here to give a few definitions which may not be without their use to some who would be instructed on the subject of true religion. The religion of "*the head*" consists in an intelligent reception of the gospel, as a system, while the affections and the life are not brought under its subduing influence. The Bible abounds in graphic delineations of this kind of religion. It is 'holding the truth in unrighteousness.' The *head* is right, but the *heart* is untouched. This is not a definition of *Romanism*. As to "ultra-Protestantism," I have never seen anything that answers to Dr. Coit's description; and yet I know of a system which, by the aids of a fervid imagination and the colorings of strong sectarian prejudice, may be wrought up into just such a picture as the Doctor has presented. I think he must mean that system; because I do not think he would encounter a nonentity—a shadow—a man of straw. It is, as the Doctor has said, the religion of "*the heart*." So far he is correct. And in this respect it accords with the teachings of God in the Holy Scriptures. There is not a claim of heaven which is not laid upon *the heart*. That obedience which does not flow from the heart, is no obedience at all. It is hollow—hypocritical; "sounding brass, or a tinkling symbol." I know the Doctor will most cheerfully subscribe to all this.

But I apprehend the difficulty lies in another place. Men 'invade the domain of the Infinite,' and 'judge of men's hearts,' because they require candidates for the communion to "give a reason of the hope that is in them." It may not have occurred to the Doctor and others, who are so much afraid of any process by which the affections of the heart may be ascertained on the subject of experimental piety, that wise men pursue this very course in everything else. A beggar gives you a tale of his woes, and you search him by many a question to see if he is a true man, and has stated facts. Your little son has done a grievous wrong—but he professes penitence. You examine him, as to the state of his mind; yes, to borrow the Doctor's appropriate language, you "*probe the secret recesses of the soul*," that you may judge whether your child's sorrow is deep and ingenuous, and whether you may rely upon it as the moral basis of a permanent reformation. And every person does form his own judgment in such a case, and he never once dreams that he is usurping the prerogatives of God. The heart is the moral character; and we always judge of this by certain outward indications. We are commanded to do it. "By their fruits ye shall know them." Why, there is not a *jurist* in the world—not a judge on the bench—who would not marvel at the theory of Dr. Coit, on the subject of searching men in order to ascertain the *motive*—the moral state of the heart! Why those long and searching cross-examinations—those '*probings*'—unless it is to see whether the tongue and

the heart accord—whether the *outer* and *inner* man are the same? And how often the judge “*invades* the domain of the Infinite,” and charges the jury not to believe one word the witness has sworn to? And why? Because, that, by a searching inquiry, which every man of common sense uses on all grave occasions, he has ascertained that the heart and tongue are world-wide from each other. Call this what you will—“ultra-Protestantism,” or by any other name, it is just what every man even of ordinary sagacity, does every day of his life.

The Doctor seems to think Episcopalianism occupies a middle ground between the two systems he has described; but I should judge from what he says, that HE stands much nearer the *one* than the other. After having depicted “Romanism” and “ultra-Protestantism”—but neither of them with discrimination or correctness—he says: “My friends, between two such systems of error I could have no hesitation in the choice of the former, since the Romanist admits that some degree of mental ignorance, obliquity, or obtuseness may be uncovered without absolute peril to the soul’s salvation. In the latter case, if the heart is involved in serious obliquity, everything is lost.”

In this declaration, some things surprise me, and others do not. I *am* surprised that he should think the “Romanist” quite liberal and reasonable, because he “*admits that some degree of mental ignorance, obliquity, or obtuseness,*” may consist with true piety. Is there a man in any church who does not *admit* this? Certainly not. The reason, then, which the Doctor assigns for his joining the Romanists, in a certain contingency, would be equally strong for joining any *other* Christian Church, for all admit the same. And yet the Doctor strongly intimates, that the “ultra-Protestants” he has in his eye, hold the sentiment, that if a man has any “*mental ignorance*” in religious matters, he is not a Christian, and must not come into the church—if he evinces any “*obtuseness*” in these sublime inquiries, he must be *rejected* or *condemned*, “according to the weak conclusions of finite judgment”—and if any “*obliquity*”—even the slightest deviation from a perfect rule may yet be detected in him, he can not be ‘*received*.’ And this is “*mental*” obliquity too. I say, the reason why the Doctor would join the Romanists *rather* than the ultra-Protestantists, is because the former admit the positions stated above, and the latter deny them. Now I affirm that all Christians admit the same—unless it may be some stark mad fanatic whose creed can not give character to any church. The Doctor ought to know this—and I think he does. But still it is not my province to fix limits to his knowledge.

I *am* surprised, again, that the Doctor has failed, in the last sentence of this paragraph, to carry out his logical contrast. He is speaking of the “ultra-Protestants.” He says: “In the latter case, if the heart is involved in serious obliquity, everything is lost?” Here the Doctor, very adroitly or very accidentally, has failed to finish his antithesis, as he should have done as a logician. The whole drift of his remarks require him to say, “in the latter case,”—that is, with the “ultra-Protestants,”—“if there is any degree of mental ignorance, obliquity, or obtuseness,”—“all is lost.” He was bound to say this, if he would preserve either his logic or rhetoric! He has said it constructively, and by implication, as I have already shown.

But why did he not say it in so many words, as propriety required him to do? No doubt, because no one holds such a sentiment. While the reader of close and consecutive thought, is all expectation for this finishing up of the whole matter, he is suddenly "switched off" upon a short rhetorical curve, and is presented with a very different position. And what is it? "If the heart is *involved in serious obliquity*, all is lost. This is not only a very different, but a very *innocent* charge. If this is *all*, or even the *main* object which lies against "the ultra-Protestants," I think I should be willing to join them, if I am not already in their fraternity. Just look at it. What do they do? They think "if THE HEART is *involved in serious obliquity*" a man is not a Christian. And who does not believe the same." Does the Doctor, who is so shocked at this sentiment of those "ultra-Protestants," that he is ready to plunge into all the absurdities of Romanism in order to avoid their heresies, teach his people the opposite of this? Does he tell them that *the heart* may be *involved in serious obliquity*—and it is *moral obliquity* of course, if it is predicated of "*the heart*"—and yet that heart be right with God? I can not think he does.

I am *not* surprised at the Doctor's sympathies for Rome, especially when it comes in contrast with anything which has a tinge of Puritanism in it,—that he should be willing to swallow the "*creed of Pope Pius IV, together with the accumulated interpolations and incrustations of ages of development*,"—that they should all be "received and digested," rather than to have any fellowship with such a fraternity. A man who has written a book, must try to make its positions good. And yet I *am* again surprised, that Dr. Coit should *avow* these predilections in the presence of many intelligent and high-minded laymen, who have no sympathy with anything that belongs to this giant tyranny of our world,—this "mother of abominations," as the spirit of God has pronounced it! When such declarations are made from Episcopal pulpits, and from those which are occupied by the first men of the denomination, it is unreasonable, if not puerile, for any one to complain as the Doctor does in this sermon,—"*Our church itself is considered the NATURAL ALLY OF ROME.*" I do not charge this upon the Episcopal church, but the common mind will do it, *must* do it—*ought* to do it, just so long as the utterance of her pulpits are so incautious and sweeping as they now are. Any man who is at all acquainted with the history of our own times, must know the fact that the Episcopal church, in this country and in England, *is* the field where the pope enlists most of his raw recruits. I am sorry for it. It pains me to the heart. And I will be honest enough to lay the blame where it belongs—upon a certain portion of the Episcopal clergy. This sermon of Dr. Coit's will do much more to make *Romanists* than to make *Christians*.

NUMBER XII.

MR. FRANCIS—After having noticed the principal things worthy of remark in the sermon of Dr. Coit, delivered on Christmas Eve, I shall close my strictures to-day by presenting a few miscellaneous matters which would have been out of place in my previous numbers. They

are not necessarily connected with the main points of this discussion, and yet they are such in their relations, that I ought not to close without presenting them.

It may be objected—indeed I am told it has been—that I have been engaged in reviewing a discourse which Dr. Coit never delivered, and that I have entirely missed my mark. I reply, that I gave notice in my first number, that I should use the “*Sketch*” of this sermon given in the *Troy Daily Traveler*. That “*sketch*,” furnished by an Episcopalian, and a friend of the Doctor, I *have* reviewed, keeping close to its letter, and striving to ascertain its spirit—for I believe in searching into the *spirit* of a PRODUCTION, as well as into the spirit of a MAN—and in no instance, have I intentionally put a forced or unauthorized construction upon any thing there embodied. If there is any mistake, it was not purposed, and I shall certainly regret it, when I am apprised of the fact. If Dr. Coit has a sermon preached on Christmas Eve materially different from the *Traveler's* edition, I hope he will give it to the public, that we may see it as it is. My remarks apply to the printed “*sketch*.” And it is still inquired, why notice *that*, I answer; that “the sketch” had been between five and six weeks before the public, was extensively read, and by those who heard the discourse, it was thought to be very much like the one delivered by the Doctor. In addition to this, no one put in a disclaimer, and, I think, there is internal evidence, that the person who made out that “*sketch*” had enjoyed access to *the manuscript*. This opinion may be incorrect. I will change it when I have evidence that it is so. At any rate the *Traveler* would have no motive to do Dr. Coit injustice in the reported and published “*sketch*.” But if we have another edition, let it be the very sermon preached, and not one got up to suit a new set of circumstances.

There are assumptions in this sermon, which, to say the least, are far from being *modest*. No less than *ten times*, is the term “*church*” employed in an exclusive sense, and applied to the Episcopal organization, as if there were no other. It is *THE church*. There is so much reiteration and ringing of changes upon “*THE church*,” that one becomes sick of it. In addition to its arrogance, it is certainly in bad taste to be forever blowing a loud trumpet about it, in the ears of the public, even if it is held as a truth. It is verily sickening, coming from this quarter, to any man who is well read in the history and character of the different Christian churches. And this assumption of which I have spoken, and which seems to say, ‘We are the people, and wisdom will die with us’—is mingled with a bitterness of language towards other Christians and Christian churches not frequent in gospel sermons. But perhaps the theory of the Doctor may bear him out, and justify him, inasmuch as these are the sentiments of the *head*, and do not interfere with the charities of *the heart*.

I will give a few specimens by way of illustration. And let me premise that the select epithets and appellations which are here used, are not aimed at infidels and atheists and scoffers at religion, but at non-Episcopal Christians. Not at *Romanists* even, but principally, if not exclusively, at evangelical Protestants. This may be inferred from the whole drift of the discourse. And this is a description of them. “The *enemies* of the church”—the various *sects*,”—“the thou-

sand and one sects around us"—“ oft-repeated watchword in all their contesis with the church ”—“ we indignantly repel the accusations ”—“ allegations like the WAR-CRIES of a nation ”—“ the senseless charges ”—“ the church’s most formidable opponents ”—“ daring presumption ”—“ specious cavelling of our opponents ”—“ the power of perverse insinuation ”—“ the clamor of our adversaries: ” and then to crown “ this sublime climax ” of rhetorical invective, we have the following war-like flourish! “ The clamor of our adversaries fain would imitate the aspirations of Jerusalem’s opponents of old, who, viewing the Holy City in her beautiful garments, burst out in those exclamations so significant of destructive desire—raise it—raise it *even to the ground!* ” Then there is the Episcopal Church, robed in glory, like Mount Zion of old, and the fierce Edomites and Babylonians investing her walls and storming her citadel with a determination not to leave one stone upon another! (See Ps. 137: 7, 8). And who are these beleaguering heathen hosts, who breathe out this “ destructive desire ” against the modern Jerusalem, “ the Holy City in her beautiful garments? ” Why, merely those branches of the Protestant Church which think best to worship God with a little more of gospel simplicity, as they think, than is to be found in the Episcopal Church. Now, the Doctor may justify himself in the use of these hard words, by an ingenious theory he has invented, that charity has nothing to do with the *head*, but relates only to the *heart*. This philosophy needs a little illustration. Charity, to be sure, is a moral exercise, and of course belongs to the heart. But it by no means follows that a man may not intellectually embrace a *theory* which violates every principle of charity. A man might hold the sentiment, and teach it, too, according to Dr. Coit, that every man on earth, except himself, would be *inevitably and forever lost*, and yet there would be no breach of charity in all this, if a man should hold this *sentiment* CHARITABLY!

But there remains one instance more of church assumption, in this sermon, which I have never seen equalled except in the discourse of Archbishop Hughes, preached on his return from Rome with the *pallium*. I published a few strictures on that production, at the time; and I have been more than once reminded of that sermon by several passages in this. Whole sentences, and even paragraphs, might be transferred from *either* to the *other*, without breaking up the symmetry of the whole. Their views of the church are the same, only one is the Church of PETER, and the other the Church of HENRY.* But each one is *THE church*, and the *only* church, to the exclusion of the other, and all the rest of Christendom. The two preachers, the Archbishop and the Doctor, my neighbor, speak of the assaults made upon the

* Many Episcopalians are very sensitive when allusions of this kind to Henry VIII, as the supreme head of the established church, are made. But facts are *facts*, and they should be known and studied. That the essential *body and soul* of Romanism were retained by the king, long after his ecclesiastical independence of the pope, may be thoroughly established by a few facts.

The title assumed and worn by King Henry was this: “ THE PROTECTOR AND SUPREME HEAD OF THE CHURCH AND CLERGY OF ENGLAND. ” In this there was a transfer of the *papal* power from an *imperial* to a *regal* head. The king was a new pope with a restricted dominion, and with slightly abridged powers. A *spiritual* reformation had hardly commenced. Auricular confession was held to be necessary, the corporal presence of Christ in the sacrament was maintained, reverence to images and

church in essentially the same language—all professors and ministers, however pious and devout they may be, are her enemies, unless they are within her pale, or at least if they dare to assign their reasons for discarding her organization, and rejecting her ritual. And both preachers apply to their respective churches the gracious promises of God which are made to Christians, as the spiritual children of Jesus Christ, and not to any body of men—converted or unconverted—in any particular organization, or ecclesiastical framework. And, in this respect, they both misapprehend and misapply the gracious encouragements of the gospel, in “the exceeding great and precious promises” of God.

I might give examples from both of these most singular productions. I have incidentally noticed some already in Dr. Coit’s sermon, especially in the spirit of it. But I give one more which can not be misapprehended: “What may be the future of *our* church we know not. It may be that calumny and detraction is still farther to exhaust itself upon us. Hope deferred, may yet sicken our hearts. But the struggle must be maintained, our duty is before us. God is above us; and there rises into view the inspired declaration of the Apostle: All things are yours; whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come, all are yours; and ye are Christ’s, and Christ is God’s.” There can be but one meaning—one application of this. It is “*our church*,” not the great spiritual Church of God, those who rest for salvation on the only “foundation—Jesus Christ”—who “are the temple of God,” as the Apostle teaches in the context. It is the *Episcopal* Church. *They* are heirs of all things. Paul and Apollos and Cephas, and the world and life and death, and things present and things to come—all belong to the *Episcopal* Church. So says Dr. Coit. And if such sermons make an humble and praying people, I shall think the laws of mind, if not of matter, have entirely changed. If Dr. Coit should publish his own edition of this sermon, you may be assured he will revise this closing paragraph. It reads badly.

praying to saints were approved of, and conceptions and ceremonies, without number, were left untouched.—(*Burnet’s Hist. Ref.*, v. 1, pp. 333–338).

Six articles were brought before the House of Lords, by the Duke of Norfolk, in 1539, and, though opposed by Cranmer, were adopted, and the kingdom were commanded to receive them on the penalty of imprisonment, forfeiture of property, or death as heretics. They embraced the following tenets: “The real presence in the elements; communion in one kind only; the celibacy of the clergy; that vows of chastity by either sex should be observed; that private masses should be continued, and that auricular confession was necessary.” Such facts as those show us how little of Protestantism there was in the early English reformation.

DR. COIT'S PAMPHLET.

NUMBER I.

MR. FRANCIS—I must beg a space in your paper for a few numbers on a pamphlet of 72 pages recently issued in this city, bearing the following title page: “EXCLUSIVENESS ; a *Lecture for Christmas Eve, delivered on Monday, December 24, 1855, by THE REV. DR. D. W. COIT, Rector of St. Paul's Church, Troy, New York.* This work is accompanied by a preliminary address to the public, and by copious notes of a miscellaneous character, all of which will be respectfully noticed in their proper place.

It is a duty which I owe to myself, and to this community, with whom I have lived for a period more protracted than is assigned to one generation of our race, and among whom, I may say without arrogance, that I number many good friends and true, not inferior in talents, learning and moral worth to any citizens of Troy, to make a few plain remarks on this very anomalous production. I feel myself impelled to the execution of this task, by a Christian principle; and I hope to do it with a Christian spirit. There are difficulties in my way. They are not those, however, which pertain to the *merits* of the production, but to its novel character—to the vast number of extraneous and irrelevant matter which has been collected from the four winds, and pressed into this discussion. The real issue has often been lost sight of, in quotations in Latin, Greek, French and English, about almost every thing, and about almost every *body*, who has ever figured in the history, and especially in the ecclesiastical history, of our world—and all these are interspersed by decorations from the poets, sharp arrows from the satirists, and especially illustrated and enforced by large references to the author's OWN WORK ON “THE PURITANS.” If a man were about to write a prize essay on *pedantry*, he would find the most reliable materials in this little pamphlet. He might be sure of the *premium*, unless perchance the Doctor might be a competitor, and outdo all his former achievements in this style of execution.

I shall not pursue the zigzag course adopted by the writer of this little book. Should I do it, I fear we might *both* of us be looked upon by straight-forward thinkers and consecutive reasoners, as men a little bewildered by excitement, and “in endless mazes lost.” I am not willing to forfeit the good opinion of persons possessing sound judgment, Christian candor, and sober common sense, by entering

upon such a war of words, concerning everything which has ever been talked about, or dreamed of, in our world. I select a few points only, and rest the whole matter pending upon these. All I ask is, that the community will read dispassionately, and then decide. I hope to write so as to be understood.

The first thing I notice is the *personality* which characterizes this work. I have read various controversies on different subjects, political and religious, and conducted by almost all sorts of writers, but I have never before witnessed the same amount of violent and vindictive *personality* condensed into the same space. But I shall not rest this matter on assertion, or general description, but give specimens—a few only from many—for the confirmation of what I have said. And let the reader remember; that the select phrases I quote are designed by “THE REV. DR. T. W. COIT, RECTOR OF ST. PAUL’S CHURCH,” as he styles himself in the title page, to be the true delineations of my life, character and doings, personal and social—and though not very flattering, I shall copy them truly and faithfully for the information and benefit of the good people into whose hands these numbers may chance to fall. I commend them to all denominations of *Christians*, and especially to THE LADIES, who are generally thought to be endowed, by the hand of nature and God, with a finer taste in the use of language, and in the social courtesies of life, than *our* sex. I add a number of *Italics*, to those which the author has given, merely to fix the eye and thought.

These assertions are made of me, most of them directly, a few by implication—“He clung *like a leech* to the irresponsible Sketch”—“the awkward and *ungentlemanly* predicament into which he has thrust himself”—“a lack of *common civility*”—“the *bad manners* and *sorry morality* of his position”—“an object of *mirthful pity*”—“not content with one *brood* of *ludicrous* errors, he forthwith *hatches* another”—“not a ray of light from his *amiable countenance*”—“he need not in this way, have informed *this community* who *know him* so WELL, that he is a *self-constituted* champion, who, while he *appears* to be fighting a legitimate battle, is *really* contending for *mere personal victory*”—“his long life of warfare of *all* sorts, has satisfied them upon this point *to the utmost*”—“dragged as I am before the public, and by *such an adversary*”—“take away,” from such persons, “their *railing*, they have not a *word* to utter”—“what I should not have done for *Dr. Beman’s* sake, or a thousand more *like him*”—“who *perversely misappropriate* its authorship”—“not very *sharp sighted* about such matters”—“any sort of *exaggeration* which will relieve *atrabilioussness*”—“*Dr. Beman’s striking* example”—“*queasy* and *churlish*”—“wielding *perverted* abilities”—“*Credat Judæus Appella, aut Beman*”—“let the circumcised *Jew*, or BEMAN believe it”—“Heaven be thanked, that human *curses* are not immortal, or some heads in *our* neighborhood would be in doleful peril from Calvinistic execrations”—“to which *Dr. Beman condescends* to be gracious”—“our *HALF-brethren*”—“any creed that *Dr. Beman* should choose to propound, on his *individual infallibility*”—“which he *vociferously* applauded”—“precisely so did ancient *heretics*”—“shall remember him when we pray, as in the Litany, may it please thee to forgive our *enemies, persecutors* and *slanderers*, and to turn their hearts”—“in *sheer ignorance* of such over-

whelming testimony"—“and then be all the while *wiping* his mouth, in *innocence*”—“he threatens me with a *stoppage of breath*”—“to others I may say, but *never to Dr. Beman*”—“he is a minister, bishop, metropolitan, patriarch, cardinal, pope, or whatever he chooses to call himself, *jure humano*”—“increased *violence*”—“temporary suspension of his *constitution fever*”—“the completely *one-sided*”—“Dr. Beman may therefore indulge his surprise till it turns into an *anodyne*”—“such is the *raw and viprey** testiness, that they are ready to *hiss* you out of existence”—“this is another of his *blunders*”—“very wholesome doctrine among the *Jesuits*, and acted upon by many a person not jesuitical in *name*, but perfectly jesuitical in *principles of action*.” But it is time for us to pause in the midst of this tempest of invective, and take breath, that we may begin afresh in a new paragraph.

And here it is: “I do not wonder the *poor* Doctor was *terribly gravelled* by such abnormous philosophy,”—“most *ponderous logic*,”—“*more Bemanico*,”—“I do not care enough about his *blunders*,”—“his own *ridiculous errors*,”—“his last and *deadliest* thrust,”—“all his virulence is roused and concentrated,”—there came a *viper* out of the heat,*—“controversial *defamer*,”—“he *may find* his own *place*,”—“already men,”—“begin to say of his long, yet *constantly belligerent* life, and *discourteous* methods of controversy,”—“an imitator of the archbishop’s *faults*, though by no means of his *talent*,”—“the Dr. himself is but a *JESUIT IN DISGUISE*,”—“he may be an ostensible Presbyterian, or Congregationalist, and *none the less a Jesuit* for all that,”—“that old stereotyped *Jesuitical sneer*,”—“what a *Jesuit* would of course maintain most *sturdily*,”—“no topic on which the *Puritan Papists* inveighed with more earnestness,”—“the Dr. has labored assiduously to *gratify Rome*, in this particular,”—“he is a regular *veteran in HER service*,”—“the Dr. has proved a regular *coadjutor of Romanism*,”—“The Dr.’s *secret Jesuitism* is now rendered formidably significant,”—“his *Jesuitical tendencies* breaking loose,”—“Oh, how he would like to be a *genuine pope*, and not a mere *popeling*,”—“too great fondness for *pontifical authority*,”—“his *real character* will be inevitably blazoned,”—“proves, but too clearly, what has been *bread in the bone* with him,”—“a most unfortunate exhibition of *Jesuitical art*,”—“nothing is commoner than for a *Jesuit* when caught in *flagrante delicto*, to dodge behind a technicality, like an *Indian* behind a tree,”—“three more specimens of *art Jesuitic*,”—“such Jesuitism becomes somewhat *ranced*—its *odor* can not be stifled,”—“for the denial of *Jesuitical marks and characteristics*, with silent contempt, or the broadest amazement, with scorn, ridicule, or even with *execration*, may not avail him,”—“the peering eye of *suspicion* may fasten on him,—its whispers may *dog his footsteps*, as he patrols the streets.”

I pause again in the violence of this “windy storm and tempest,”

* This seems to be a favorite allusion with Dr. Coit. In his *Puritanism* (p. 39), we have the following: “The name, indeed, of Brownism was abandoned,—but its spirit—alas! its spirit! even at this distant day, do not its *vipers* come out of many a heat to fasten on *Apostolic Hands!*” And here “comes” another of these *snaky* apparitions,—and the Doctor seems to be shaking his hands over the fire as if in anticipation of *something* which may yet take place! SEE ACTS xxviii, 5. “Alas,”—“these *Apostolic HANDS!*”

to give the reader an opportunity to draw a long and refreshing breath. I add, "Charges so *disgraceful* to their author,"—"they demonstrate indellibly the *spirit* and the *animus* of the man,—of the MAN, I say, not the *gentleman*; since they are incompatible with the dignity of *gentlemanly and Christian refinement*." "Such a man is *unworthy* of further notice, and I leave him with the wretched company he has chosen for an associate, his *own dishonor*." One touch more of this delicate pencil, dipped in these heavenly dyes, would have finished the glowing picture; and that might have been borrowed from Archbishop Hughes, in one of his letters to Mr. Brooks. "I take him, consequently, with covered hands, to the nearest open sash of a window, and send him forth, with the single mental observation—Go hence wretched and vile insect: the world has space for you as well as for me." Or perhaps Sterne's valedictory to the liberated fly—from which the Celtic prelate has almost literally borrowed—might be deemed preferable, both on account of its laconic expressiveness, and its ecclesiastical affinities.

No one who knows me, will expect a grave reply to these select and chaste epithets and appellations, and descriptive phrases. I only wish to have them read and inwardly digested. And let it be remembered that they come from the pen of a clergyman who has undertaken to read HOMILIES to me on "*the dignity of gentlemanly and Christian REFINEMENT*." This same clergyman has gravely quoted, for my benefit, the following sentiment from Archbishop Tillotson: "There is no readier way for a man to bring his own worth into question, than by endeavoring to detract from the worth of other men." And this same clergyman has taken for his practical motto, as he informs us on the seventh page of his late publication, Paul to Timothy, "The servant of the Lord must not strive; but be gentle unto ALL men." I make no application. I publish no comment. I leave it all with your readers. Our citizens are apt to think for themselves, and it is all in vain to try to cure them of the habit. It is with great pleasure that I submit this matter, pertaining to these violent personal onslaughts, and all others pending in this discussion, to their cool and dispassionate verdict.

NUMBER II.

MR. FRANCIS—My first number is fresh in the minds of your readers. I wish only to add here, that I have given not a *tithe* of the hard and coarse language of personal vituperation which might be collected from the Rev. Dr. Coit's pamphlet. I shall not enlarge the catalogue, as such an act, on my part, would be unnecessarily exposing the *infirmities* of an opponent. I could not have done less than I have, without seeming to be wanting in Christian self-respect. Having said this much, I can truly declare, that, if the use of such terms as he has selected and applied to me, can afford him any gratification, or enlarge the sphere of his usefulness, or create one sweet reflection in the final conflict, or add one star to his anticipated crown—I do assure him, that I am quite willing he should pursue

this course to any extent which may best suit his own taste, or most effectually secure the purposes he may have in view. Such bitter words will fall harmlessly upon me, as the gentle dews from above.

But one thing is certain: Dr. Coit has written under very strong excitement, and I am arraigned as the guilty cause of all the hard things he has said and insinuated. All his charges against me may be embraced in two categories—*intellectual* and *moral*. To the first may be referred my *ignorance* and my *slender talents*, and to the second my moral *obliquities*, too numerous to be particularized, but which are presented in clusters, and in detail, in a variety of quotations which I have made from the Doctor in my former number. As I am charged with offences of no ordinary baseness against the laws of propriety and the decencies of life, and especially against Dr. Coit, I am disposed to look into this matter, and let the public see the length and breadth of my offending, that they may judge between the Doctor and myself. If there is any just cause for the unwonted heat which burns on every page, and in almost every sentence, of the pamphlet, I ought to make some apology; but if the Doctor has taken offence where none was intended, and indulged in paroxysms of feeling and intensities of language uncalled for in this discussion, then the tables will be turned, and a judicious public will see it. This much I will say, in this stage of my inquiry, that, if I had been aware that the Doctor carried loose gunpowder in his pocket, I should have been more careful of any sparks of fire which might come in contact with it, and thus cause an explosion! This must not be taken as an apology, for I am not yet aware that any is due from me.

My first offence was a review of a "sketch" I found going the rounds of a newspaper called "*The Traveler*," in January, 1856. It was announced to the public in the following terms: "THE REV. DR. COIT'S CHRISTMAS EVE SERMON,—THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH VINDICATED FROM THE CHARGE OF ILLIBERALITY AND EXCLUSIVENESS." A short preface followed the above title, in these words: "A large congregation assembled at this church on Monday evening to witness the customary observance on the eve of the Christmas festival. The service commenced with an anthem; after which evening prayer was read by the Rev. Mr. Pennell, the Rev. Mr. Mulchahey pronouncing the Absolution and reading the concluding prayers. After the singing of an anthem, the Rector, the Rev. Dr. Coit, ascended the pulpit and delivered an able and very interesting sermon from the following text: St. John, chap. 4th, verse 19th. 'For the Jews have no dealings with the Samaritans.' The following is a sketch of Dr. Coit's remarks."

This "*Sketch*" introduced to the public, with these formalities, was published on the 26th of December, 1855, and it was circulated and read, and was the topic of much remark both of condemnation and of praise, for more than five weeks, when on the 1st of February, 1856, I began a notice of the same in "*The Troy Daily Times*." Some persons who heard the sermon, and others who had read the "sketch," thought it should not be suffered to pass in silence. Its character called for a reply. Besides, it was delivered to a large audience consisting of members from most of the Christian churches in the city

To be sure, Dr. Coit has said that the lecture was delivered in St. Paul's Church, "where I had a perfect right to deliver any discourse I might think proper, to any congregation before me." While this "right" is cheerfully conceded, it is likewise true, that he was morally bound to observe the proprieties of time, place and circumstances, and to regard the feelings of Christian auditors, in "St. Paul's Church," as truly as any where else. And if the Doctor has "a right" to preach what he may "think proper," so has any other man the same right to compose and publish any strictures on that "Discourse," or a published *sketch* of it, which *he* may "think proper." Both parties are bound by the same rules—the law of Christian and social propriety.

But why review a newspaper "sketch?" Because it seemed to me, as it did to many others, that there were things in that article which non-Episcopal Christians ought to notice and condemn. Its faults called for an exposure. But why call it "Dr. Coit's Christmas Eve Sermon!" I did not name it. I found it bearing this title in print, and before the public, and I had no right to call it any thing else. It was taken up and reviewed under the name which was given to it by another, who, from profession and position, had much better means than myself to know whether the production was genuine or spurious. To be sure, Dr. Coit seems to think I should have applied to him for information, and the "courtesy of a single question" would have saved me "from an awkward and ungentlemanly predicament." This would have been an unheard-of course, except in the case of some *personal attack*. I should have felt myself in an "awkward" position, to say the least, in making a formal call on Dr. Coit, and propounding such a question as this: "Did you preach that sermon which somebody has published as yours, in "*The Daily Traveler*?" It would have been a *singular* "question," and without "courtesy." And here is the publication before the community, five weeks and two days, without a contradiction and without a disclaimer from any one. And besides, the thing itself called for a proper notice, whether it was Dr. Coit's, or some other man's. It was not the person, but the production, which is made the subject of comment. No matter who set forth the sentiments in that "*Sketch*," they were the legitimate themes of discussion. And what could be more natural, in a review, than to use the very name and title found in the IMPRINT, whether placed there by the author, or by some person who has been pleased to assume his responsibilities? I did not name this publication "Dr. Coit's Christmas Eve Sermon." It was so furnished to my hands, and I made use of it just as I found it—*public* and *uncontradicted*—as I think I had a right to do. I might have said, in every instance, where I have referred to this work, *as Dr. Coit is reported to have remarked* in a sketch which claims to be his "Christmas Eve Sermon," but the circumlocutions would have been endless. I took the thing as I found it, and called it by the name which it bore in public. If any wrong attaches to this matter, it belongs to the person who *christened* this production, and not to *me* who have only called it by its *Christian name*.

But my course has been objected to, because I continued my review after Dr. Coit had given "a promise of the lecture itself."

“That promise appeared,” says the Doctor, “*before* his third paper.” I was out of the city when this notice is said to have been given; and before I went into the country, I delivered into the hands of the editor of the *Times*, eight numbers, and the others were complete except a few references and authorities which I added afterwards. When I returned I was informed that the Lecture was promised; and as to the assertion of Dr. Coit, that “there is something more than ‘internal evidence’ to show that Dr. Beman saw it with his own eyes,” is so far from being *true*, that I have never seen it to this day. I was told of it, and believed it,—and this is all. This is one instance of the Doctor’s historical inaccuracy—of which I shall produce many hereafter—which often arises from giving too much heed to *gossip*.

But why did I not stop the publication of my numbers when the Lecture would soon be forthcoming? The papers were not *mine*,—they had been given to the editor, and he preferred to go on with their publication. This was one reason. Besides this, the “Sketch” had been thrust before the public, with high commendation, and was the advocate and teacher of a *type* of CHURCHISM very offensive to a large majority of Protestants in the city of Troy, and it seemed to me that it ought to be reviewed, and *rebuked* too. I am still of that opinion. Men who have a thought of their own—or a soul of their own—may speak out, and defend their own positions. The “Sketch” was an *entity*—a veritable, palpable, and public existence; and the *real* authorship was not a question for me to settle. That lay between the Doctor and his reporter. I respected its *published claim*, which I was bound to do,—taking care twice to announce that I confined myself to the printed “SKETCH.” The review was written and consigned to the hands of another, before any question was ever raised as to the authority of *The Traveler’s* edition. So much for the Rev. Doctor’s feverish excitement and hard language respecting the course I have pursued, in reviving the “Sketch” of his Sermon. I intend to compare these two editions hereafter.

But my mortal sins, which have kindled the Doctor into a livid flame, are yet to be noticed. They are two in number. The first is in these words: “But if we have another edition, let it be the very sermon preached; and not one got up to suit a new set of circumstances.” I do not see anything here to put a man into a violent passion. And yet it *has* done it. It was my intention to ask for the very sermon,—no more, and no less. We know that corrections are often made in discourses which were not originally designed for publication, but are afterwards unexpectedly called for; and as one of Dr. Coit’s friends had more than once stated that he was engaged in re-writing his sermon, or words to that effect, I did not think it improper to say—“let it be the very sermon preached.” I have heard a *score* of persons make the same remark. I have not said, nor have I intended to say, that Dr. Coit would publish his sermon, and then say it was the very sermon verbatim, as he preached it, when it *was not*. This would be charging him with moral obliquity. But this I have not done. It is one of the most common things in the world, when a public address, or discourse of any kind, has excited animadversion, and it is about to be printed, for one and another and every body to express the same thing I have done, in this case,—“Let us have it just as it was

spoken or delivered." And this is the first time I have known any one to lay it to heart, or indulge in abusive language on the strength of it.

But the grand climax of my offending—the deed for which Dr. Coit has consigned me to 'the wretched company I have chosen for an associate, my own dishonor,' is yet to be named. My language is this: "If Dr. Coit should publish his own edition of this sermon, you may be assured he will revise *this closing paragraph*." His own comment on *this* and the *former* remark, is the following: "Indeed, he not only hints that I *can* forge, and may forge; but that in one portion of the Lecture, I *shall* do so to a certainty." I should like to know how my language is susceptible of such a construction. "You may be assured he will revise *THIS closing paragraph*." *What* closing paragraph? Of Dr. Coit's sermon—"his own edition"? *That* I had never seen; and as disclaimers had begun to be made in every quarter respecting the "*sketch*," I supposed that "*his own edition*" might differ materially from the newspaper report. Hence my expression, which was intended to be critical, definite, and guarded—"THIS *closing paragraph*," referring solely and exclusively to the closing paragraph I had just noticed, which I said read "badly." Turn to my No. 12, and you will see what "*this closing paragraph*" is. "It confines *all* spiritual blessings—*all* the promises of God—*all* present and future good—to the Episcopal Church—whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come, *ALL are yours*; and ye are Christ's, and Christ is God's."* These are *all* appropriated *exclusively* to the Episcopal Church! "THIS closing paragraph," I did say would be *revised*, that is *altered*, or *amended*, "if Dr. Coit should publish his own edition of this sermon." On the *mode* of its amendment, I made no suggestion. Much less have I said, or *intimated*, or *intended* to say, that Dr. Coit would revise, or alter or amend *HIS closing paragraph*, and then publish it, as the identical "closing paragraph" he uttered. If the Doctor were a man to take advice, I would barely suggest to him, that he should accustom himself to read with more discrimination, before he anathematizes any

* It may be instructive to compare this closing paragraph with that of the Doctor's own edition of the Lecture, as that production is now before the public.

THE SKETCH.—"What may be the future of our church we know not. It may be that calumny and detraction is still further to exhaust itself upon us. Hope deferred may yet sicken our hearts. But the struggle must be maintained. Our duty is before us. God is above us: and there rises into view the inspired declaration of the apostle: "All things are yours; whether Paul or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come, all are yours; and ye are Christ's; and Christ is God's." Now this, while it is extremely narrow and exclusive, is straight-forward and logical, and would afford, *if true*, substantial encouragement to the Episcopal Church in her severe persecutions from her detractors. The promise quoted is applied to this body, which is suffering from her enemies. This, or something like this, Dr. Coit should have said, in order to meet the case before him. If we compare what he *has* said, with the above, we shall see that the whole is *illogical*, *inconclusive*, and proves just *nothing at all*.

THE LECTURE.—"It may be that tribulation is before us rather than quiet; humiliation, rather than triumph; mourning rather than joy." This is said expressly of the Episcopal Church. This must not be lost sight of. The Doctor adds: "Be it so, if it can be for Christ's, and the church's sake which is his body, and for which he disdained not the abasement of death itself." "It is a faithful saying, for if we be dead with Christ we shall also live with him; if we suffer, we shall also reign with

one for the language he has employed, when it may turn out that no such language has been uttered. But I shall not turn instructor in this case.

NUMBER III.

MR. FRANCIS—I shall occupy a little space to-day in defining my position in relation to the Episcopal Church; and I do this principally for two reasons—one is because Dr. Coit has rendered me quite conspicuous in this respect, and the other because he has made great efforts to cast *odium* upon me—I may say, to excite ENMITY against me—among this denomination in the Protestant Christian Church. The pamphlet of 72 pages may be consulted almost every where for the confirmation of the statements here made.

But this general reference is not sufficient for the grave purposes I have in view. The Doctor then shall furnish a text, and I will endeavor to give the exposition, and make and preach the sermon. This text may be found on the 26th and 27th pages of the above named publication. “I am not certain, however,” says Dr. Coit, “if I try to let others off as easily as I can, that I can excuse Dr. Beman himself from schismatical delinquency. He vauntingly says, ‘From whom have we separated and broken unity? Surely not from the established Church of England, nor from that voluntary church organization called Episcopal, in this country. We—the various sects—never belonged to either.’ Softly, Doctor, softly, with such tones and attitudes of defiance. What purpose so ever they may serve for others, they are most unfitting and derogatory to *you*. *You* have broken the unity of the church of your nativity, by your own unmasked denomination. *You* have separated yourself from both the churches named (considering them as mother and daughter), separated yourself widely, and lifted up your heel against them: and are this moment wielding perverted abilities to do them wrong. ‘It is said that those who have committed schism, ‘always seem to see

him. Nay, said the same fearless voice to the unfeigned believer, All things be yours, whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, i. e., whether the church, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come—all are yours, and ye are Christ’s, and Christ is God’s.”

There is a fatal loop-hole in this reasoning. The object of the preacher is to give comfort to the *suffering Episcopal Church*, as sorely pressed by her enemies. Not to the *believer* in Christ Jesus whoever he may be. And how is this work accomplished? Why, by telling us, that “*if we be dead with Christ, we shall also live with him*,”—and by reminding “*the unfeigned believer*” that all the promises of God are his.

I have yet to learn, that this can pass for *reasoning*! Paraphrased it would stand thus: *The Episcopal Church* should be comforted in all her tribulations, for *all who are dead with Christ, shall live with him, and every unfeigned BELIEVER*, has the promise of *all things*. There is nothing here *peculiar to the Episcopal Church*, which is the subject in hand. The whole force of the argument, which should be specific in its application, flats out and evaporates in the mere *generality*, that “he that believeth shall be saved.” All this is nothing to the Doctor’s purpose, unless we are to understand, that the Episcopal Church is made up of those persons especially who are “*dead with Christ*,” and are alone “*the unfeigned believers*” among men. If he did not mean this, then the close of the “Sketch” is far more logical than that of the Lecture.

schism—spots every where, and are perpetually brushing their clothes and washing their hands to remove the unseemly and admonitory stains.’ Such is Dr. Beman’s own language, very slightly modified for self-adaptation. He flung it at Episcopalians in connection with murder: he may take it back, as applicable to the murder of the church’s peace. He represents us as haunted with the spectres of schism and heresy, like a restless assassin. Our answer is that he writes like a man dissatisfied with his ecclesiastical whereabouts, ‘seeking rest but finding none.’ He can not so much as tell whether ‘in foro conscientiae’ he ought to be a Presbyterian or a Congregationalist: though the differences of the two split Presbyterianism in England, and have dichotomized it a second time on the soil where he was born. ‘Expediency,’ he says, and of course expediency with a silver clink in it, might make him either. It looks as though he was inwardly conscious of standing in a false position, *up* to which he is trying to write himself, *into* which he is trying to fight himself. ‘A man who has written a book,’ he says, ‘must try to make his positions good.’ Another of his apothegms: which I return to him, with the following improved version—a man who has made an advance backwards must try to face his accusers, if he cannot his own conscience.”

My first inquiry, in the examination of this long passage, will respect its historical accuracy—or the *professed facts* which it embodies. The Doctor affirms, ‘that I have broken the unity of the church of my *nativity*—I have separated myself from the established Church of England and the Episcopal Church in this country, considered as mother and daughter—that I have separated myself widely, and lifted up my heel against them—and that I am at this moment wielding perverted abilities to do them wrong.’ Not one of these unqualified assertions of Dr. Coit has any *truth* at its basis. They have been made at random, as he often writes. No cautious disputant would have ventured to make them. I should like to know the authority for all the Reverend Doctor has here asserted. All the information I have given him, is contained in a single phrase in my *seventh number*—“having myself been educated in the Episcopal Church.” But I have never, in any sense, represented myself as a *member* of that church. My father’s family, attended that church, when there were any services held in the town, when I was quite young. They were nominally Episcopalians. I was educated in the principles and forms of that church. When I was sixteen or seventeen years of age, my father, and perhaps some other members of the family, united with that church; but I was not *born* in that church, was not *baptized* in that church, nor *confirmed* in it, nor ever became a communicant in that church. I never professed to be a *Christian*—to experience any spiritual *change*, while I sustained any connection, however remote, with its ministrations. I was a member of college when my mind was first turned, I hope by the Spirit of God, to the great matter of personal religion. I made a profession in the Congregational Church, in Maine, then a part of Massachusetts—was baptized by a minister of Christ of that denomination—I studied theology, and was licensed, and ordained, among Congregationalists. How any man can charge me with having ‘broken the unity of the

church of ' *my NATIVITY,*' and the like, I can not well conceive. He *makes* his own facts, and then wields them with a dogmatism and effrontery which no Christian man—I care not for his denomination—can justify.

This *manner* of arraigning me for "*schism,*" certainly demands but little animadversion. It reveals itself. I asked the question in my Fifth Number,—“From whom have we separated, and broken unity?” It was a civil and respectful inquiry, and should have received a decent reply. But *no.* The Doctor pounces on me, and makes it a personal matter. His steam is up and his car in motion. These are his gentle terms: “Softly, Doctor, softly, with such tones and attitudes of defiance.” Now let any mortal man, who has eyes and ears and common discernment, read and hear what I have said on this subject, and then say what “*tones and attitudes of DEFIANCE,*” are to be discovered anywhere, except in the imagination of Dr. Coit. And of the “*tones and attitudes of defiance*” which have no existence, the Doctor says, “they are most unfitting and derogatory to *you.* *You* have broken the unity of the church of your *nativity.* *You* have separated yourself from both the churches named (considering them as mother and daughter), separated yourself widely, and lifted up your heel against them; and are this moment wielding *perverted* abilities to do them wrong.” All this is very fine, by way of accusation, but there is one defect in it—there is not a word of *truth* in it all!

As to my wrong doing towards the Episcopal Church, it amounts to no more nor less than this,—I have attacked and rebuked high-church assumption and arrogance. My letters on the “Sketch” are thus restricted and guarded. The Episcopacy of the early fathers of the English Church, before the days of Archbishop Laud,—the Episcopacy stated and defended by Archbishop Whately,—the Episcopacy illustrated by Dr. Tyng, of New York, and the Pastor of St. John’s Church of Troy, and thousands of others, I have never assailed. With three of the clergymen of the last named church, I have been on terms of friendship and intimacy, and united with them in social prayer meetings. In the town of Hampton, where I was brought up, I have preached in the Episcopal Church frequently, from year to year—more than a score of times. On one occasion I preached, at the request of the Rector, the Communion Sermon, and then partook of the Lord’s Supper—not standing as a bishop in Connecticut, mentioned by Dr. Coit in his pamphlet, graciously permitted a Congregational minister to do—nor *kneeling*, as men first learned to do to the *host* or to a bread or wafer God,—but *sitting*, as men usually partake of a supper. On other occasions I have read the Lessons for the clergyman when he was in feeble health, and on *one*, when taken suddenly ill while reading the Psalter, he handed me the book and beckoned me to stand at the desk and proceed in his place. I *did* it, and I could not see but that the whole solemnity proceeded with the same good effect, as if I had been regularly ordained by a diocesan bishop, with the laying on of “*Apostolic hands.*”

To be sure I do not believe in the Apostolic claims of Episcopacy, nor do I approve of prescribed forms of prayer, but I have no quarrel with either; and especially so long as that branch of the church is willing to take her place by the side of sister churches in the great

family of Protestant Christianity. Many of my personal friends belong to the Episcopal Church, and not a few in this city. We interchange the civilities of life, and love one another.

I must return for a moment to the charge of schism which Dr. Coit has been so unfortunate as to prefer against me. I regret that he could not discuss this subject without rendering it personal. It is a pitiable way of disposing of a great question of fact or principle. But it seems to be the Doctor's taste. Let us try him by his own rules. He professed to be converted to Christ in the Congregational Church, made a profession of religion in that church, used to attend conference meetings, and to exhort and pray extemporaneously among his brethren, and began his theological studies for the ministry in that church, and then committed the sin of *schism* by turning Episcopalian. Now here is a real case. And if we judge the Doctor by his own reasoning, which he applies to me, he did all this "of course" under the influence of "a silver clink." "Of course," says the Doctor, if a man changes his church relations, he must be induced by "silver clink." Some might be anxious to know—though I am neither a *sower* or *reaper* of gossip—whether this "SILVER *clink*" which works wonders upon a clergyman, in the Doctor's estimation, was presented by *man* or *woman*, or *BOTH*! I am truly ashamed of this slur on ministerial character and motives, which would take it as a matter "of course," that a minister of the gospel must be influenced by "a silver clink," or by "filthy lucre." It is language which savors of the pot-house or livery stable, much more than of an apostolic pulpit. But I think there can be no impropriety in returning it very respectfully to its own author.

NUMBER IV.

MR. FRANCIS—I shall devote this paper to the examination of certain mis-statements which characterize this production. I can only make a selection of a few from many. I shall give them the mild name of *errors*, because I can not entertain the thought that the Reverend author would intentionally misrepresent. A very peculiar mode of stating things—a little *changed*, a little *caricatured*, and a little *colored*, appears to be his *infirmity*, and not his crime. No man of common discernment, who has ever read his productions—"PURITANISM," or THE PAMPHLET of 72 pages, can have failed of seeing this peculiarity displayed in the broad beams of noon-day. The specimens I shall give are stated for the purpose of showing with what large allowance the Doctor must be taken as a controversial writer. The reader would fall into great mistakes, if he were unattended and unguarded by these salutary cautions. I shall take these incorrect statements in the order in which they occur in the pamphlet.

The first one may be found on the 6th page. "Dr. Beman seems to have a *penchant*, as he *admits*, for the extravagant figure, hyperbole." I have no where *admitted* any such thing. In my 10th No. I speak of inventing a new rhetorical figure for the special benefit of Dr. Coit. "I should call *my* new figure '*the impassioned hyperbole.*' And if I

should ever use it myself, no man would have a better right." I speak only of "RIGHT"—not of "*penchant*," or tendency, or leaning towards its use: for who would have "a better *right*" to appropriate an invention, than the inventor? This I call ERROR NUMBER ONE.

On the same page the Doctor says—"He travels out of his way to exhibit me, in contradistinction from my good brother, the Rector of St. John's, as an enemy to societies for the distribution of the holy scriptures." I have never made any such representation as is here described. I have not *hinted* at any such thing. I never intended to breathe such an intimation. Let any one read my 3d No. and he will see—and see clearly, that most of this assertion, and all of its *offensive* part, is a mere assumption, without a shadow even to support it. I have merely referred to the "respected pastor of St. John's Church in this city," as one of those co-operative Christian ministers of the Episcopal Church, who has not been carried headlong into error, by his mingling with other denominations in doing good. Of Dr. Coit I have said nothing of the kind he represents. Indeed, in this connection, I have said nothing, except so far as I have examined the harmlessness of the liberal and co-operative theory of Christian action. If the Doctor is one of those liberal and fraternal Episcopal clergymen, who, like Dr. Tyng and the late Dr. Milnor, act with the American Bible Society and some other great national organizations, as he would seem to intinate by some other things he has stated in connection with St. John's Church, I do most truly rejoice in the fact. But I shall notice this matter again. My traveling out of the way to exhibit Dr. Coit "*as an enemy of societies for the distribution of the holy scriptures*," I set down as Dr. Coit's SECON DERROR.

On the same page, (6th) the Doctor has made the following statement of me: "He says, in one of his papers, that he has 'no sensitiveness of a denominational character.' By which I naturally suppose he means, that he cares not a farthing for Presbyterianism as such." Did the Doctor "*naturally suppose*" that this was my meaning, after reading the whole passage? I hope so, for he *says* he did. And if this is a fact, that he did "*naturally suppose*" that this was my meaning, then he has a *strange nature*, or he can "*naturally suppose*" a strange thing! But let me present the passage as I wrote it. "But let me say, I have no sensitiveness of a denominational character, on account of this, or any other reference made to this platform, or to the church to which I belong. I hold neither the *one* nor the *other* to be *infallible*; and shall ever deem it kind in the Doctor, or any one else; to name any thing which seems to be wrong in our faith or practice. Any Christian, or any denomination that can not accord to any fair opponent this privilege, assumes a position, and manifests a haughtiness, which are very little Christ-like." Now hear Dr. Coit's exposition: "By which I naturally suppose he means, that he cares not a farthing for Presbyterianism as such.' Such a construction of such a passage in a boy *ten years* old, in Dr. Busby's school, would have cost him a sound *birching*. And yet Dr. Coit did very "*naturally suppose*"—that is, imagine, or believe, this was my true meaning. I take his declaration and set it down as his THIRD ERROR.

I refer your readers, in the next place, to a mis-statement in *Note A*.

“Among other mischievous perversions of my sentiments,” says Dr. Coit, “this passage”—the text—“was pounced upon to prove that I formally represented the Episcopal Church as occupying the place of the ancient Jewish Church, and others as occupying the ground of the Samaritan schismatics.” Here is a great mistake. I have not “*formally represented*” any such thing. I have said, “If the text was intended to be *suggestive*, I suppose the Jews are the Episcopal Church—the Samaritans, a sort of mongrel race—symbolize other denominations.” I have said again, “We are now prepared to hear him say—‘The Jews did right,’ &c. I go on to state what we might naturally *expect*, but not what Dr. Coit actually said—no, not even according to the “Sketch.” I have stated again, “the *fact* that the Episcopal Church *imitates* the old Jews, is fully acknowledged by the Doctor.” This was supported by an extract from the SKETCH. I meant of course according to his reported and published sermon—for I was reviewing this, and nothing else. I took the “*sketch*” as I found it, and conceded the claim which it had publicly made, and which no one had denied, and which I believed I was bound to do. But if any one will examine my second number, he will see that, so far from saying Dr. Coit has “*formally represented*” the Episcopal Church as occupying the place of the ancient Jewish Church, &c.,”—as he charges me—that I have expressly denied it, and accused him, that is according to the “*sketch*” under review, of using bad logic for not doing it. My language is this: “If the Doctor had carried out the analogies of the text, his reasoning would have been far more logical and conclusive than it now is. Any man who will read the whole of the first paragraph of No. 2, will see that I have expressly denied what the Doctor says I have affirmed. “The next moment,” says Dr. Coit, “I find it put into my own mouth as mine.” I have done no such thing. I intended to do no such thing. I merely stated what we were somewhat prepared to *hear* him say”—and not what he actually said. The Doctor must have mistaken the *former* for the *latter*, or he could never have fallen into such an error, or asserted what he has done in Note A. Dr. Coit may be a *great* reader, but he must be a *careless* reader, or he would not commit such mistakes, and especially in animadverting upon an opponent. This I record as ERROR NUMBER FOUR.

On 49th page of the pamphlet of 72 pages, the author says,—“Albeit he threatens me with a stoppage of breath, if I speak my mind a little too fully on *his* Trojanic manor.” And then, as if it were not enough to state this miserable figment of his own brain, in plain English, we must have it repeated in French, and associated with the Doctor’s great “RED DRAGON,” Calvin. “Such a stoppage (etouffement) was to the letter, that very infliction with which Calvin was in the habit of menacing his opponents.” There is a puerility about all this, with its affected attempt at smartness—to say nothing of its resting upon a mere mis-statement or fabrication—that must sicken every lover of simplicity and good taste. If Dr. Coit can not show something in my published numbers of which I am ignorant, I truly fear some readers will call his statement something worse than a *mis-take*,—first told in our language, and then repeated in another. I call it ERROR NUMBER FIVE.

On the 51st page of "The Rev. Dr. T. W. Coit's" little book, we have the following mis-statement: "No wonder he is so in love with the impassioned hyperbole. He solemnly declares that no man has a better right than himself to mount this rhetoric on stilts." This is Dr. Coit's account of what I have *solemnly declared*. The reader will please to compare it with what I have said. I had pleasantly suggested a new figure of speech for the accommodation of those who "can not well help indulging in the language of extravagance." And for Dr. Coit especially. All I say in relation to myself, is contained in this very brief and simple sentence: "And if I should ever use it myself, no man would have a better right." Now, please to look at this one sentence, as it comes from the Doctor's hands: "No wonder he is so in love with the impassioned hyperbole." I have hinted at no *such* "love." "He solemnly declares, (says the Doctor), that no man has a better right than himself to mount this rhetoric on stilts." This little sentence is full of great mistakes. I "solemnly" declare nothing. "That no man has a better right to mount this rhetoric on stilts." I have said nothing of mounting "this rhetoric on stilts." The Doctor is a great producer. He has made all this. The whole of his description contains but one true *thought*, or matter of fact, drawn from what I have written,—that I had as good "a right" to employ my own newly invented figure, as any man. The rest is all his. I give him credit for it all.

But I may here say, that what was a casual thought with me, has now become a settled conviction. We need this new figure. Let any one read what I said in my 10th No., and then Dr. Coit's version of it, and he must see that without great allowance for the "hyperbole"—and a little of "the *impassioned*" in it too—it is impossible to avoid the charge of mis-statement—some would say misrepresentation. Everything is caricatured—and nothing is stated simply as it is. Some men have these peculiarities. They are always in the air. They rest upon its bosom,—but are never still. They look down from their soarings upon the subjected earth far in the distance. Nothing seems to them as it does to men who stand on the surface. We must make all due allowance for these things, and this will temper what would otherwise degenerate into harshness. This allowance I make, and call this ERROR NUMBER SIX.

NUMBER V.

MR. FRANCIS—The task of pointing out the mis-statements of Dr. Coit is not yet finished. This paper will probably embody all that I shall think proper to present, at least in this formal manner. Others may come up in some incidental forms in future parts of this discussion. On page 52 of the little book, Dr. Coit says, "When that happens, we may enjoy the singular privilege of hearing Dr. B. in an Episcopal pulpit; when if he gives us an echo of the supralapsarian preaching, which he heard with such rapture in the English establishment, we shall not quarrel with him, provided he does not insist (Calvin-like) that we may not contradict him." Here is another blow at the *Old Dragon*! "The singular privilege" of standing in an

Episcopal pulpit I have enjoyed many a time, and preached to attentive audiences. And the interchange of ministerial labors between Presbyterian and Episcopal clergymen, might take place now, as the same thing harmoniously occurs between Presbyterian and Baptist and Methodist preachers, if the kind of Episcopacy should revisit that church which I have commended in the 7th No. of my review, and to which Dr. Coit refers. And all this might take place, and any and all of these ministers of God might enjoy this "singular privilege" without *becoming* 'DEACONS,' as Dr. Coit would have us—that is without 'leaving the word of God to *serve tables.*' But these remarks are only incidental, and aside from the main point. If a man, however, would meet Dr. Coit, he must dodge about here and there, and go where he is, or where he may happen to be for the time being. The incorrect statement to which I refer respects certain preaching which I said in one of my letters, I had heard in England. My account of the matter is this. [See No. 7.] "And I can truly say, that the most ultra-Calvinism—what is called supralapsarian Calvinism—or hyper-Calvinism—which I heard preached in England, was announced and defended in Episcopal pulpits." Dr. Coit's reference is in these words: "if he gives us an echo of the supralapsarian preaching which he heard *with such rapture* in the English Establishment," &c. Who authorized Dr. Coit to add a clause which essentially alters the meaning of my statement, and commits me to a form of doctrine I have not commended, and did not intend to characterize, either as correct or incorrect, as may be seen by the subsequent sentence. "But I do not intend to discuss doctrines here at all." "The preaching which he heard *with such rapture.*" This Dr. Coit has made for his own use and purpose. By "ultra-Calvinism," "supralapsarian Calvinism," "hyper-Calvinism," I intended to characterize a form of doctrine, which is not received by Presbyterians, in this country, Old School or New. I have known but one man on this side of the waters, who has maintained the same positions to which I referred. I was simply stating a fact in relation to certain preachers in the English Church; and Dr. Coit could not reply to it without making it a *personal* matter, and placing me in a false position. And, in fact, when did he ever do such a thing, in *any* controversy? This is ERROR NUMBER SEVEN.

I notice another incorrect statement in a note on the same page. Dr. Coit is speaking of a "sketch" of one of my sermons, given in a Troy newspaper. "In it Dr. B. is represented as sturdily denying that he is a Presbyterian, *jure divino.* Taking this as a postulate, I naturally infer that he is a Presbyterian, *jure humano*; and claims no authority beyond that given him by a vote of his congregation." Let me inform your readers what I did say, according to the "SKETCH"—which Dr. Coit is quite welcome to quote—for he can not be implicitly confided in, in his references and quotations, as we have already seen. This is my language: "While *I am a Presbyterian*—not a *jure divino* Presbyterian," &c.

What is there here which can justify Dr. Coit in his representation of this matter? I simply declare that I *AM* a *Presbyterian*, and I employ the usual terms for the purpose of showing what *kind* of a Presbyterian I am. And see how this is dressed up and decorated by the

Doctor. I am represented, he says, in the "sketch" as "sturdily denying that I am a Presbyterian, *jure divino*." The sketch represents no such thing. The Doctor has *invented* it. It does not intimate that I "*sturdily*" deny any thing. It represents me as making the simplest declaration possible. Nor does the "sketch" say, as Dr. Coit does, that I am not a Presbyterian, "*jure divino*." Its language is, "I am not a 'jure divino' Presbyterian." Every body knows, and Dr. Coit quite as well as others, the ecclesiastical use of these terms. They are almost as familiar as the alphabet. A *jure divino* Papist—a *jure divino* Presbyterian—a *jure divino* Congregationalist, are all phrases in familiar use, and well understood. Each one of these, claims that his own type or form of church government, is so taught of God in the holy scriptures, to the exclusion of all others, that there can be no lawful church organization but this—there can be no valid ministry, no sacraments, no promises of God's presence and grace here, or of his endless favor hereafter, but in connection with such an ecclesiastical polity. While I *am* a Presbyterian, I am not such a Presbyterian as is here defined. That is I am not a *jure divino* Presbyterian. This is just what the sketch represents; but what the Doctor has altered, so as to render it susceptible of a very different meaning. He says, "Dr. B. is represented as sturdily denying that he is a Presbyterian, *jure divino*." By changing my qualifying term, *jure divino*, and then cutting it off from the word *Presbyterian*, the meaning is changed, and the way is prepared for an inference as unjust as it is unauthorized by the words of the "sketch," which were no doubt before his eyes. "Taking this as a postulate"—not what I am represented to have said, but what Dr. Coit has created for himself—he goes on to say, "I naturally infer, that he is a Presbyterian, *jure humano*; and claims no authority beyond that given by a vote of his congregation." The Doctor can very "naturally suppose" and very "naturally infer" very strange things. He first shapes my language to his own liking, and then very "naturally infers" what my words do not imply, and what *he well* knows I did not intend to express. And this is the way my opponent can very "naturally infer" what suits his purpose. My "congregation"—and the CHURCH connected with my "congregation"—for Dr. Coit does not seem to know that we have any CHURCH—will no doubt feel grateful to him for the high distinction he has conferred upon them by making them the authors of my commission to preach the gospel. I know many readers will not believe that the above is a mere mistake in Dr. Coit; and will think me *very* TAME, when I set this down as ERROR NUMBER EIGHT.

In connection with what I have here said of myself as a Presbyterian—"not a *jure divino* Presbyterian," but a liberal and fraternal Presbyterian, I may very properly allude once more to a kindred subject which I have noticed in another connection and in a different category. It relates to Presbyterianism and Congregationalism. "He can not so much as tell whether, in foro conscientiæ, he ought to be a Presbyterian or Congregationalist; though the differences of the two split Presbyterianism in twain in England, and have dichotomized it"—the word is the Doctor's, not mine—"a second time on the soil where he was born. 'Expediency,' he says, and of course with a silver clink in it, might make him either." This "silver clink," which

the Doctor seems to intimate sounds so sweetly in ministerial ears, and which must present the strongest, if not the only motive, to induce a servant of God to change his denomination, has been disposed of. It belongs to the vocabulary of the infidel and the worldling. As to the other parts of this quotation, we can judge of its character more correctly by comparing it with my own language, upon which it seems to be a kind of comment. A "sketch" of my discourse, which I am willing to father, so far as this point is concerned, has this statement. It is a second inference in closing up a long discussion. "We see a leading feature of the PRIMITIVE CHURCH. It embodies the principle of self-government. It must have been Congregational or Presbyterian. They differ only in the mode of carrying out the same principle. I prefer the latter, but the principle is the same. In the first place, the name has a strong scriptural origin, 'PRESBYTEROS'; secondly, it corresponds more exactly with our government, which is not a pure democracy, but a representative democracy." What is there here to authorize the Doctor's assertions? Just nothing at all. After considering the structure of the *Primitive Church*, by the lights of scripture, I arrive at the conclusion that its government was of a *popular* character, and not a *prelatical*,—that is: it was *Presbyterian* or *Congregational*; and it did not comport with the design of my inquiry to discuss the questions pending between these two forms of government. Of this inference which I drew after an examination of many facts and precepts of scripture, Dr. Coit says on the 24th page of his pamphlet, "Dr. Beman himself, the moment he begins to talk of 'The structure of the Primitive Church' dogmatically pronounces it Presbyterian, or Congregational; though not very sharp-sighted about such matters, he does not seem to know which." This is in Dr. Coit's usual manner. It is very positive, but not very accurate. "The moment he begins to talk"—happened to be nearly *one hour* after I began,—and instead of "dogmatically" *pronouncing anything*, I very quietly inferred, from the previous discussion, that the Primitive Church had a popular basis,—it was Congregational or Presbyterian, and not Episcopal or prelatical. This was the object I had in view, and I did not feel myself called upon to institute, at that time, any special inquiry on the points in discussion between them. For this, Dr. Coit, in his flippant style, says I am "not very sharp-sighted in such matters." As to what I have said, that "I should have no scruples in being a Congregationalist, if circumstances should seem to call for it, or render it expedient"—everybody knows that the Congregational and Presbyterian churches of this country are considered so much a spiritual identity or unit, that the ministers of the one church become the ministers of the other, without renouncing anything of an essential character which is old, or embracing anything of the same character which is new. In removing from one part of the country to another, this very slight change in denomination may be proper, or expedient; and all this may be done without the charms of "a silver clink" however it may be in some other cases, with which Dr. Coit may be better acquainted than myself. The partial and disingenuous statements to which I have referred, I call ERROR NUMBER NINE.

I have marked several other incorrect and erroneous assertions

which I intended to notice, but I shall wave them for the present, believing that there are enough for one class of objections. I have called them *errors*—selecting the mildest name—while many will pronounce a much heavier verdict upon them. I leave them with the Doctor and his own reflections.

NUMBER VI.

MR. FRANCIS—I propose to notice in this paper, certain false issues made by Dr. Coit, and some very strange and inconclusive specimens of reasoning, in the book I have undertaken to examine. To point them out “in extenso,” would be endless, for of all the productions I have ever examined, this presents the most perfect *medley*. I have no doubt it may pass with some for a very profound work, merely because more than one half of it is not understood. I speak not here of its Latin, Greek, and French, with which it is loaded down to suffocation, but of what should be its plain English. But I must not generalize nor describe—my business must be to dissect, and then analyze.

After the announcement of the text: “For the Jews have no dealings with the Samaritans,” the preacher seems to have little or nothing to do with it, unless it is indeed intended as intimated in my first number on the “Sketch,” to be *suggestive*. The object of the sermon is to repel the charge of *exclusiveness*. The Episcopal Church is assailed with this charge. The Doctor’s language is the following:

“We, it is said, are striking parallels to the language which has been chosen as a text. We look upon ourselves, as the Jews of old did, as the sole favorites of heaven—as the sole true church—and upon those around us, as the Samaritans, with whom, in religious concerns, most certainly, it is best to have no dealings. The objection is stated, I trust, strongly and fully enough, to satisfy our most captious opponents.”

Does the Doctor, in plain and explicit terms, deny this allegation of “captious opponents?” Certainly not. In the very next sentence after the extract given above, he says: “And if so, and this is what is meant by our *ultra exclusiveness*, that we put ourselves foremost in respect to what we believe to be the truth, concerning God’s Church, God’s word, and God’s worship—then we simply do that, which every sect around us does, and are no more guilty than they.

Now if I understand language, in its plain, ordinary use—if I can trace a simple process of reasoning—then here is a virtual acknowledgment, and a vindication of the very thing charged. The language is a little changed but the idea itself is kept before the mind. Who put themselves forward, in the days of Christ, in respect to what they believe to be the truth, concerning God’s Church, God’s word, and God’s worship—the *Jews* or the *Samaritans*? I answered the *Jews*. Who does this now? While Dr. Coit acknowledges that the Episcopal Church *does* this—he adds, “we simply do that, which every sect around us does, and are no more guilty than they.” “We put

ourselves foremost," &c. Nor does the Doctor deny, in any shape, that the Episcopal Church, in religious matters, refuses to have any dealings with other Christian churches. The reporter of the "sketch," in my judgment, caught the Doctor's *thought*, if he had any, in the opening part of this lecture. The sentiment is covered up a little by a change of descriptive terms, but it stands revealed in sunbeams on the 10th page of this pamphlet. If this is not intended to be the latent, if not the open teaching of the text, then I do not see the use of having a text.

If the Doctor had intended flatly to deny, that these words, in any sense, described the Episcopal Church, and defined her position, it would have been an easy task to accomplish. He would have had only to say, we claim just what we are willing to concede to other evangelical churches of the Lord Jesus; and we have as much inter-communication with them—as much Christian co-operation, as any other denominations have with one another. This would have been to the purpose. This, if it could be established, would have effectually repelled the charge of *exclusiveness*, which is the avowed object of the lecture. But no. Such declarations could not be reconciled with facts. And hence it is, that he goes on to inform us that the Presbyterian, and the Baptist, and the Methodist, and the Quaker make the same assumptions, and act on the same principles. If this were all true, it would prove but little, as I have undertaken to show in my letters on the "sketch." It would only prove that the Episcopalians are no worse than their neighbors, so far as exclusiveness is concerned.

But let me here say, without wasting words, that the main point has been lost sight of, and a new and false issue formed. "The Jews have no dealings with the Samaritans." This was *exclusiveness*. Is there anything like this in the Episcopal Church? The Doctor evades this question and does not meet it at all. He does not tell us how sweetly the Episcopal Church co-operates in one blessed confraternity with other Christian denominations. He states no such thing. He could not state it with truth. But what does he give us in its place? Let me present an extract which will bring the matter clearly before us.

"Either the sects believe this; one and all, and each one for, and of itself; or it is condemned out of its own lips, as a mere schism, if not a rank heresy, and that without any excuse whatever.

"Then they do believe it, one and all, and each one for, and of itself. And, my brethren, we believe only and simply the same thing. We have no manner of doubt, *any more than they have*, that our form of Christianity is that form of it which existed in the days of our Lord and his apostles. We believe, *as they do*, that if our Lord himself were to return on earth, he would recognize us as those who professed and practised Christianity most nearly as he left it. And the result of the whole is, that we believe, just as *the sects* do, and each and all of them, that ours is the best and purest form of Christianity: and that which will most safely and easily transfer us from the church on earth to the church of the first born whose names are written in heaven. And if this is *exclusiveness*, and there be anything criminal in it, then we look fearlessly round upon every sect which upbraids

us, and say the one that is without sin among you, let that one cast the first stone."

This is a false issue, and the reasoning has no application to the case in controversy. Let me make this assertion good. I will throw my argument in the form of a dialogue between Dr. Coit and myself. Let it be a matter of free and honorable discussion. I will put my own questions, and Dr. Coit shall answer from his own printed discourse. This is giving him a fair chance, for that discourse was penned for the express purpose of repelling the charge of EXCLUSIVENESS. I then charge upon the Episcopal Church what the text affirms of the Jews: "They have no dealings with the Samaritans." You are like them, *exclusive*. But, says the Doctor, we do only what all *the sects* do. We think we have the best form of Christianity, and so do they. "And if this is *exclusiveness*, and there be anything criminal in it," they are as deeply involved as we are. This is the sum of the Doctor's argument. Now let me say, this is not the point at issue. The Episcopal Church and all "*the sects*" have an inherent right to choose their own religious system, and adopt it, and carry out its principles. But it does not follow, that they act correctly, and exemplify the spirit of Christ and his gospel, when they refuse to have "dealings" in religious matters with one another. The Doctor's illustrations drawn from other denominations, utterly fail in the most vital point. No one complains of the Episcopal Church, because its members seek their own organization, adopt and use their own forms, and maintain their own denominational peculiarities. Other churches do the same. In this respect, all Christian communities claim and exercise the same rights. If Dr. Coit supposes that this is the ground upon which the charge of *exclusiveness* rests, he has fallen into a great error. His own text might set him right in this particular. The *exclusiveness* complained of, consists in withdrawing from the great Christian family in social action, and in religious matters having no dealings with them. Can Dr. Coit say that the Episcopal Church is no more exclusive in this respect than others? Certainly not. Who has preached in St. Paul's Church, but an Episcopalian, since it was consecrated to the service of God? No one. Now this is the thing complained of, and Dr. Coit must certainly know it, and yet he has ventured to amuse us with the fact that all other Christian denominations claim and exercise the same right of a separate church organization that Episcopals do, and consequently they are equally chargeable with the guilt of exclusiveness. But let it be remembered here, that before the Doctor can arrive at his conclusion, and expect any thinking man to adopt it, he must be able to say—what he will never affirm—that other Christians and ministers are just as narrow and sectarian in their *religious action*, as Christians and ministers of the Episcopal Church. This is the only point at issue.

This is the Doctor's first argument to prove that the Episcopal Church is not *exclusive*,—other denominations all claim the right to their respective, separate ecclesiastical organizations. I do not wonder that the Doctor has said, on the 12th page: "Yet, after all, some will say, and very pertinently, this is a poor way to prove yourselves innocent, to show that you are no guiltier than others." And especially may such an admission be made, when the thing charged upon

other denominations, and asserted by the Doctor to be true, has no resemblance to the fault charged upon Episcopalians—that is separate and sectarian action, in all religious matters.

Nor is the Doctor any more fortunate in his second argument. He now proposes to come a little closer to his subject, and to settle its character by a definition: “What, then, is exclusiveness? Does it consist or lie in the opinions of our minds, or the feelings of our hearts?” The true answer is, in neither. And so Dr. Coit would have made the answer, if he had turned his eye, for one moment, upon his text. In what did the exclusiveness of the Jews, upon which this whole discussion is founded, consist? In their “opinions,” or “*feelings*”? The text answers in *neither*, for it was an exclusiveness of *action*. This any eye can see at a single glance. “For the Jews have no *dealings* with the Samaritans.” It was a *practical* exclusiveness. And this is just what is meant by those who allege that the Episcopal sect or denomination assume the position of the old Jews. They do not mean to complain so much of the doctrinal “opinions” which are held, or “the feelings” they indulge, but they fix on what may be, in some measure—perhaps, in a great measure, the development of “opinions,” and “feelings”—they fix on *acts*,—their unsocial and sectarian Christianity. “They separate themselves.” Whatever there may be in the text applicable to the Doctor’s theme—and he must have supposed there was *something*, or he would not have selected it—relates to this one point exclusively. It is a great virtue in a preacher to stick to his text. But I must pause here, and resume the same subject in my next.

NUMBER VII.

MR. FRANCIS—The theory of the LECTURE and the mode of reasoning by which its positions are sustained, are still before us. The Doctor’s second argument to prove that the Episcopal Church is not *exclusive* I barely named, but left its examination in an unfinished state. I now resume it. He spends some time in combatting a theory that I have never heard stated gravely by any one, namely, that *exclusiveness* consists merely in “opinions”—and in order to establish the negative of this question, he lays the Socinian, the Deist, the Atheist, and the Pantheist, all under contribution; and after drawing a sad picture, he asks: “To avoid the sin of *exclusiveness*, will you call such a man your master?” meaning the Pantheist, “*the prince of non-exclusiveness*.” There was no need of combatting this thought, for no one has ever entertained it. I must believe that the Doctor understands that the text presents an instance of exclusiveness, and it reads—“For the Jews have no *dealings* with the Samaritans.” If he had not supposed that these words are intended to define or describe the *Jews* as *exclusives* he would not have selected it for the basis of his present discussion: and if this passage had intended to represent *exclusiveness* as consisting in *opinions* and graduated, in its degree, by the quantity of opinions, ‘more or less,’ which Dr. Coit thinks his opponents believe, it should have read, ‘The Jews held no *opinions* in common with the Samaritans.’ After sweeping away this theory, which nobody holds,

he tells us "that *exclusiveness* is not a thing to be predicated of *opinions* but of *feelings*." This does not follow. It is not necessary that it should be predicated of either. If the text has any significance in it—any application to the subject he is discussing—if the sermon and text are not entirely dissevered, *as sermon and text often are*—then the words of inspiration on which he was speaking, might have corrected his error, and set him right, on this point. It reads—"The Jews have no *dealings* with the Samaritans;" not "The Jews have WRONG FEELINGS towards the Samaritans." This would have been the text for Dr. Coit's lecture. And, then, when pressed by the charge of EXCLUSIVENESS, he could have replied, as he has done in effect, in this second argument—we are not exclusive, for while we have "*no dealings*" with "the sects," we cherish *no improper FEELINGS* towards them. If there is a greater modern absurdity in reasoning, I have not met with it.

The Rev. Doctor seems to be aware that there is something unsound in his position, when he represents *exclusiveness* as predicable of "FEELINGS," and immediately—even in the very next sentence—displaces the term "*exclusiveness*," and employs that of "*charity*." And, thenceforth, during most of the discourse; he goes on to discuss the subject of *charity*, and to show that the Episcopal Church is as *charitable* as any of her neighbors, belonging to the various "sects." The words "*charity*" and "*charitable*" occur some fifteen or sixteen times as the antithesis of *exclusiveness* and *exclusive*; and *exclusiveness* and its derivatives, are employed but four or five times. This may be very convenient, for it permits a man to fly from one position to another, without ever being at a loss for something to say, or without a loop-hole by which he may make his escape, if sorely pressed by an adversary. He is employed in the discussion of two distinct subjects—one occupies the first five pages of his lecture, and the other the last *nine*. The first is *exclusiveness*; and the second is *charity*, which is made its opposite, or antithesis. The argument he first employs to show that the Episcopal Church is not chargeable with *exclusiveness*, is that *all others* have their organizations and peculiarities which they deem important as well as the Episcopalians. This is not the point at all. All have, and all may exercise, their rights: and having done so, some may be *exclusive* and some *non-exclusive*, with respect to co-operative Christian action. This point—and, in fact, the *only* point—the Doctor appears never to have looked at. Did he avoid it *intentionally*, or does he not *see clearly*?

And then when we are told exactly what "EXCLUSIVENESS" in his view is, he immediately abandons the subject under discussion, and devotes the remaining portion of his lecture—the greater part of it—to the delineations of "*charity*." And now the great effort is to show—not that the Episcopal Church is *non-exclusive*, but that she is *charitable*. This is a new subject. The objection brought against the Episcopal Church, by her "most captious opponents," as the Doctor himself teaches, is virtually embodied in his text: "The Jews have no *dealings* with the Samaritans. Henceforward, in order to accommodate itself to the lecture, it should read: "The Jews have no" *charity* "for the Samaritans." This is the position the Doctor has controverted. "This might have been true of the Jews, but 'our most captious opponents' can not apply it to us. We are charitable—we

abound in charity." And the remaining part of the lecture is devoted to this one theme—the pervading charity of the Episcopal Church. This is a strange evasion in a SERMON!

Let me lay before your readers a synopsis of this argument to prove a position which does not belong to the inquiry. The allegation made by these "captious opponents" is that Episcopalians are *exclusive*, in religious action, as the ancient Jews were, who had no *dealings* with the Samaritans. No, says the Doctor, we are peculiar for our CHARITY. Who does not see that this is not meeting, but *evading* the point? Why did he not march up to the line, and give us a plain yea, or nay, and then enter upon proofs. And do you ask what he should have said, in order to meet the whole charge fully? I reply, he should have said, in so many words, 'We do not occupy the place of the Jews, in any respect—we do not profess any such thing—we do not refuse intercourse and co-operation with any evangelical Christians, belong to what church they may—our ministers interchange with pious and good men of various denominations—we preach in their pulpits, and their clergymen preach in ours—we unite with them in the great catholic enterprises of Christendom, as truly and as cordially as any other people, and no church is less exclusive than ours.' This would have been meeting the question without *blinking* it. But the Doctor knows, and we all know, and the world knows, that these *affirmatives* can not be uttered with truth. They may be, or at least *many* of them, cordially responded to by a small, but very worthy portion of that church, with whom I have sustained the most pleasant relations—but the church itself—the great body of that church, can not say that this is their course and practice.

And these things being so, what then should have been the Doctor's reply? The answer can be furnished without difficulty,—and one, too, which must commend itself to every unsophisticated mind. This is the substance of it, if not the form: "If this is what you mean by *exclusiveness*, then we *are* exclusive. The Jews had no *dealings* with the Samaritans—and especially they had no intercourse or communion in religious efforts and activities, and so it is with us. They had their reasons for their course, and we have for ours." And then the reasons should have been frankly stated to justify a fact, which can not be denied. What these are I can not give in detail, as I have never seen them fully drawn out by the advocates of this kind of exclusiveness. Some of them may be picked up here and there, in the writings of high-churchmen. I will not state them here, as I shall devote one paper to the exclusive and arrogant claims of Episcopacy, in the course of this discussion, which openly avow the very thing which Dr. Coit has attempted in his lecture to disprove. In the meantime, I must follow him in the thread of his argument,—though that thread is often a little tangled.

The reader must not forget the point which is before us. It is to disprove the charge of exclusiveness, very unreasonably and wickedly brought against the Episcopal Church. And this is to be done by showing how *charitable* she is. I give one specimen of Dr. Coit's reasoning by which he would establish a theory that justifies the Episcopal Church in shutting herself up within her own pale and communion, so far as religious action and co-operation are concerned,

and that proves her non-exclusiveness in these very acts of *exclusion*. It is the theory of charity,—for he has now adopted a new term which he uses as synonymous with *non-exclusiveness*:

“And does not all this show, as plainly as words can show, that *charity* has to do with my heart and not my head, with my feelings and not my creed, with my treatment of the motives of others and not with my treatment of their sentiments? Rely upon it, brethren, this is a true view of a common, but a very commonly mistaken subject. Charity consists not in the believing more, or in the believing less; but in holding what we do believe with tolerance and pity and hope and patience, and universally with good will towards those who differ from us, whether on the one side or on the other. Calvin, e. g., believed in the doctrine of predestination, in its most absolute and formidable aspect. Yet his heart relented as he wrote down his testimony in behalf of a doctrine, which in his view, involved whole nations and their posterity in remediless destruction; and he said the decree was one unquestionably horrible. So his feelings dissented from his mind, and he pitied while he doomed. And, if so, he held his opinion, however terrible, in charity; and brethren it were better to be Calvin, and hold even to predestination charitably, than to be called a Saint, and yet hate him for his mere opinions.”

Now let me ask some man wiser than myself, what possible connection all this has with Dr. Coit's subject as announced, I confess rather obscurely, in his exordium? I have referred to it more than once already, but as I propose to examine the structure of this argument, it will not be amiss to call attention to it once more. “The Jews,” says the Doctor's text, “have no dealings with the Samaritans.” The “most captious opponents” of Episcopacy, he intimates, bring the same charge, and says the Episcopalians have no *religious dealings* with other Christians, and this is *exclusiveness*,—it is *the exclusiveness* complained of. Apply the reasoning drawn out in the long passage I have quoted, for the purpose of repelling this charge of *practical* exclusiveness, and see how it will read: “We are not *exclusive*, because ‘*charity*’ has to do with my heart, and not with my head,—with my feelings, not my creed.” If the Doctor had adhered to his proposition first announced, and had not abandoned the discussion of his subject—which is “*exclusiveness*,” the term *non-exclusiveness* should have occupied the place of *charity*, which has been foisted into the lecture contrary to all the laws of logic and rhetoric. The reason of this, is a matter of opinion, or conjecture. Most persons who read the lecture, with care, will probably think that this new word was a very kind friend in a time of need.

I will apply another test. The object of Dr. Coit is to repel the charge of *exclusiveness*. This he has told us. Let us then come back to his starting point, and keep up the use of his original terms, and see how his argument will read: EXCLUSIVENESS “has to do with my heart, and not my head, my feelings, not my creed.” NON-EXCLUSIVENESS “consists not in the believing more, or in the believing less; but in holding what we do believe, with tolerance, and pity, and hope, and patience.” This would appear ludicrous. Exclusiveness and non-exclusiveness belong neither to the head nor the heart directly, though they may have their origin in either, or both; but they char-

acterize our course of conduct towards others, and in religious matters our course of conduct, whether fraternal and co-operative, or the opposite, towards other denominations. But the Doctor may say he is now discussing a new subject—*charity*. And has it no connection with the subject announced as the theme of the lecture? Is it a mere *episode* introduced in order to fill up? He is certainly attempting to prove that the Episcopal Church is large in her *charity*, and for the sole purpose, too, of proving that she is *non-exclusive*. This is a false issue, not even ingeniously practiced. He has employed a *fallacy* here, which a tyro in logic can easily detect, and which a true logician must heartily condemn.

NUMBER VIII.

MR. FRANCIS—I add a few words to my former remarks on the singular argument—I may say the main argument—employed by Dr. Coit to repel the charge of exclusiveness. The Episcopal Church is *charitable*, and can not therefore, be *exclusive*. I will here, for brevity's sake, admit that he has established the point that his branch of the Christian church is distinguished for CHARITY—though some of his arguments are somewhat peculiar—how does this affect the exclusiveness of *her conduct* in relation to other Christians? For, remember, this is the question pending. All the charity in the broad world—all the kind feelings which may glow in the bosom of this church—all her bowels of compassion, which yearn over those who are in dark and deep error, and are “without her pale” and without BISHOPS, can not prove her *non-exclusiveness*, if other Christians and ministers of God—men of fair and unspotted fame—men of sound theological views, of devoted piety, of untiring labors, of distinguished usefulness, and whose life-long toils and self-denials have been attended with the smiles of heaven, are treated, in everything which concerns Christian courtesies, as “heathen men and publicans.” The point has not been reached at all by this *charity argument*, though we admit all the facts which it assumes. Charity which warms the heart should come out and express itself in all the acts of fraternal deportment. Christians who love one another, or *profess* to do it, should give the evidence of this grace, by those acts of friendly co-operation by which one may edify another, and by which the great spiritual family of God may influence others to good deeds, and bring the world to the obedience of Christ. 1 John iii, 18.

The theory of Dr. Coit is something like this: We are not exclusive, because we are charitable. We love our “half-brethren” dearly, but we exclude them from our pulpits, and can not unite with them in the ordinary enterprises of Christian benevolence. They may be Christians. Our kindly affections would fain hope they are, and that by “uncovenanted mercy” they may, *some* of them at least, reach heaven. But they have neither ministers nor churches. To be sure, we *exclude them* from all that is peculiar to church-action, and we *exclude ourselves* from them in the same things—but this is not *exclusiveness*, because we love them very tenderly—in one word, the Episcopal Church has LARGE CHARITY! I am not certain that an *Episcopalian* even can be duped by such reasoning—I am quite sure no one else can be.

The attempt of Dr. Coit to prove that the Episcopal Church is not chargeable with *exclusiveness*, is a signal failure. No man of logical powers can resist this conviction, if he will read it critically. I commend it to the public. I hope it may be read, that men may see what a lame attempt is here made to disprove and set aside *an existing fact*—an every-day and notorious fact—which stares every body in the face, by mere theorizing upon a very different subject. I will now give your readers good authority for what I say. The Episcopal Church is *exclusive*—very little, if any less so than the Romish—by the testimony of its own advocates. It is exclusive in *sentiment*, and this sentiment is carried out in *action*, and that church becomes, as a natural consequence, *exclusive* in her daily deportment towards the ministers and members of other churches. These “Jews have no dealings with the Samaritans”—by their own showing.

Rev. Mr. Wetmore, a former clergyman of the Episcopal Church in Connecticut, says of the Congregational churches, that “they must necessarily be esteemed abettors and approvers of *schism, disorders and usurpation* ;” and that “whatever they may call themselves, and whatever show they may make of piety and devotion in their own ways,” they “ought to be esteemed, in respect to the mystical body of Christ, only as excrescences or tumors in the body natural, or perhaps as *fungosities* in an ulcerated tumor, the eating away of which, by whatever means, tends not to the hurt but to the soundness of the body.” I hope this sentence will be read *twice*. It will pay. It is a precious specimen, illustrating the sweet charity of an Episcopal clergyman. And this is not a solitary instance. It may be seen in high places. Bishop Brownell talks of “incongruous sects”—of “Dissenters.” The “Church Almanac,” which is published by authority, calls the Protestant Episcopal Church in this country, “THE CHURCH OF THE UNITED STATES,”—plainly intimating that there is no other Church of God here. This is the very same assumption made by the Pope of Rome, in his letter to the President of the United States, sent by the hands of the infamous Bedini! Bishop Brownell, as he looks over the state of Connecticut, planted thick with Christian churches, and blessed with flourishing Christian institutions of every kind, and distinguished for its educated and devoted ministry, says, “The Protestant Episcopal Church appears as an oasis in the desert.” The author of an Episcopal tract says he “can not regard *the confused mass of Protestantism* as anything else but a human contrivance, the weakness and folly of man.” This same Episcopal Presbyter, with great consistency, says, “the Romish Church must be regarded as a portion of the Catholic Church, since she possesses the apostolic ministry; her sacraments, though vitiated, are valid.” And this same presbyter asks—“As to Protestant *dissenters*, how can *they* be a portion of the true body of Christ, when they lack the true foundations of a church? At the same time, we are free to acknowledge that they exhibit fruits of piety in their lives. * * We doubt not they *may* be saved. * * So we believe the *heathen* may be saved.” Palmer, who is quite a favorite among his brethren, says of other denominations, “They and their generations are as the HEATHEN. * * We are not warranted in affirming absolutely that they may be saved.” The Oxford Tracts teach that “the Presbyterian ministers have

assumed a power which was never given to them." "A person not commissioned from the bishop may use the words of baptism, and sprinkle or bathe—he may break bread and pour out wine, and *pretend* to give the Lord's Supper, but it can afford no comfort to any to receive it at his hands, because there is no warrant from Christ to lead communicants to suppose that while he does so here on earth, they will be partakers of the Savior's heavenly body and blood." "As for the person himself, who takes upon himself without warrant to minister in holy things, he is all the while treading in the footsteps of Korah, Dathan and Abiram, whose awful punishment you read of in the book of Numbers."

"A Doctrinal Catechism of the Church of England," contains the following questions and answers:

"Who appoints dissenting teachers?"

"*Ans.* They either wickedly appoint each other, or are not appointed at all, and so in either case their assuming the office is very wicked.

"But are not dissenting teachers thought to be very good men?"

"*Ans.* They are often thought to be such, and so were Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, till God showed them to be very wicked.

"But may we not hear them preach?"

"*Ans.* No; for God says depart from the tents of these wicked men."

Rev. Palmer Dyer, late of Whitehall, says: "No religious society or communion, of whatever denomination or character, is a CHURCH unless it be Episcopal." "We can not be brought into the holy covenant, except in an Episcopal church; or by the agency of an Episcopal ministry. Those who profess to be ministers of the gospel without having received Episcopal ordination, possess no more ministerial authority than any private Christian." "Their supposed commission is a nullity"—"it involves the guilt of schism and rebellion." Again, "We can have no fellowship with non-Episcopal sects; nor can pretend to receive Christian sacraments from them; they have no real sacraments to give." But surely this is enough for *one* man,—and one, too, who stripped of his Episcopal robes, there was very little left of him!

Dr. Dodwell, as stated by Smyth, says: "None but BISHOPS can unite us to the Father and the Son. Whence it will follow, that whoever is *disunited* from the visible communion of the church on earth, and PARTICULARLY *from the visible communion of the BISHOPS*, must consequently be disunited from the whole visible Catholic church on earth, and not only so, but from the invisible communion of the holy angels and saints in heaven, and what is yet more, from Christ and God himself. It is one of the most dreadful aggravations of the condition of the damned, that they are banished from the presence of the Lord, and the glory of his power. The *same* is their condition, also, who are DISUNITED FROM CHRIST, by being *disunited from his visible representative.*"

Dr. Hook says: "The *only* ministrations to which he (Christ) has promised his presence, are those of bishops, who are *successors* to the first commissioned apostles, and to the other clergy acting under THEIR *sanction*, and by THEIR *authority.*"*

* See Dr. Hall on the Puritans.

The celebrated Dr. Hicks, in the preface to his "Answer to the Rights of the Christian Church," uses the following language respecting the Church of Scotland: "Such a church I think altogether as unworthy of the name of a church, as a band of rebels in any country, who have overthrown the civil constitution of it, would be of the name of a kingdom, state or republic. Because such a pretended church is not only a variation from the Catholic Apostolic Church, but a sworn destructive confederacy against it; even the abomination of desolation in the house or kingdom of God. Of which their pastors are not ministers, but by principle most malicious enemies; not pastors, but wolves of the flock"—p. 200. And yet the "Act of Union" declares the Church of Scotland to profess "the true Protestant religion." This is certainly a fine specimen of *non-exclusiveness* and CHARITY too. I would commend it to the special notice of Dr. Coit, and express the hope that it may occupy the place of a footnote in the next edition of his pamphlet. It may be of service to "theological students," and especially in warming their sweet charities toward their "HALF-brethren!"

When such statements as these are publicly made; and widely diffused, from the pulpit, and through the press, by those who claim to be the only divinely commissioned ministry of heaven, is it strange that the inferences of which Dr. Coit complains, should be drawn by all reflecting minds? He says, "Nevertheless, the calumny flies *round and round*, that if any Christian communion is pre-eminently exclusive, we are that one; unless, perhaps, the Romish Church may be slightly in advance of us—not much however." Again, "we are believed to be—nothing but Romanists in disguise." The fact is, such Episcopal teachings as I have noticed above, has given birth to this suspicion. The echo, which, in the Doctor's language, "*flies round and round*," is so far from being a "CALUMNY," that it would seem to most men to be a legitimate and logical sequence of the positions of these Episcopal writers. If there is any "calumny" afloat, THEY have set it in motion.

In view of these claims, I would ask, if anything in the whole records of Romanism can be found more assumptive, more arrogant, more exclusive than these? If so, let us have it. And yet these are the claims of a church, which according to Dr. Coit, is distinguished for its *charity*, and is, consequently, not chargeable with *exclusiveness*. And this is the church, too, which carries out, in its social demeanor, in all religious matters, this avowed sectarian narrowness, and yet it is so *charitable* that it is not in the least tinged with EXCLUSIVENESS! Have good old English words lost their meaning?—or have some men dabbled so much in other languages, that they have lost the use of *their own*?—or have they received a prescriptive right from above to exalt themselves, and to look down with haughtiness upon others, and still call themselves charitable, and humble, and modest?—and then express their surprise and wonder if any one refuses to say *amen*? Is this the gospel? Is it Christ-like? Shall this spirit be installed in a PROTESTANT Church? And, especially, shall it become the dominant spirit of our happy republic, which has already cast off so many of the heirloom bigotries both of church and state, which have long and grievously afflicted the old world?

NUMBER IX.

MR. FRANCIS—The sixth and seventh numbers of my present series were devoted to the business of pointing out some of the false issues stated, and the inconclusive reasonings pursued by Dr. Coit, in his "Christmas Eve Lecture." As these were confined to one subject—repelling the charge of *exclusiveness*—it seemed proper for me to follow these positions and arguments by which an effort is made to disprove the allegation, with a few statements from Episcopal authors, which your readers will find in my last paper. These authorities—and I have given hardly one in a thousand which might be furnished—make a very strange appearance by the side of Dr. Coit's fine theory of Episcopal *charity and non-exclusiveness*. They stare each other in the face most ominously. I like Dr. Coit's *theory*, if it were exemplified in *practice*. But if the sentiments and feelings which I have noticed in my former number, are the sweet droppings of Christian charity, as they distill from Episcopal lips and pens, the less we have of them the better it will be for society, and the more amiable and lovely will that church appear in the eyes of all calm and dispassionate judges. There is a spirit in man, which will canvass such matters—there is a moral sense in the social body which must be respected—a majesty in public sentiment, in Christian communities, which can not be outraged, without a speedy retribution.

It will not do for men claiming to be the ministers of God, so far to forget themselves as to represent some of the best men in the nation as "abettors and approvers of *schism, disorders and usurpation*"—to characterize their "piety and devotion" as a mere "*show*"—to describe them as "excrescences or tumors in the body natural"—as "*fungosities* in an ulcerated tumor, the eating away of which by whatever means," is to be desired as the instrument of "soundness." It can not meet with the approbation of wise and good men to have church dignitaries tell us, that the "oasis in the desert," in these United States, is "the Episcopal Church" alone—that "the confused mass of Protestantism" is a "human contrivance"—that "the Romish Church" is "a portion of the Catholic Church," and that "Protestant dissenters" are no part of "the true body of Christ"—that "they *may* be saved"—because "the HEATHEN may"—that "they and their generations are as the HEATHEN"—that "we can not affirm absolutely that they *may* be saved"—that "they are as unworthy of the name of a church" as "a band of rebels" would be of "the name of a state"—that "their *pastors* are most *malicious enemies*—not pastors, but *wolves* of the flock"—that "they wickedly appoint each other"—that it is not lawful to hear them preach—for God says, "depart from the tents of these wicked men." It is an assumption which, among good and honest men, must recoil on those who have the temerity to make it, to declare, that persons who are not in "the visible communion of the bishops," are "disunited from the whole visible Catholic Church on earth," and "from the invisible communion of the holy angels and saints in heaven—and what is yet more, from Christ and God himself"—and that those "who are *disunited from Christ*, by being dis-

nited from his visible representative," the BISHOP, are doomed to "the most dreadful aggravations of the condition of the damned, that they are banished from the presence of the Lord, and the glory of his power." And, as if all this were not enough, we must have insult added to injury, by being gravely assured, that all this is done in the spirit of charity and non-exclusiveness—and the thirteenth chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians is read to us as an inspired illustration of the sayings and doings of this meek-spirited and tender-hearted church. This, in the language of Dr. Coit, is "holding what we do believe, with *tolerance* and *pity* and *hope* and *patience*, and universally with *good will* towards those who differ from us, whether on the one side or on the other." I am sorry to be constrained to say these things; but men who write for the public must not take it for granted that their fellow men are all dupes or idiots.

I now resume the task of pointing out a few more false positions and incorrect reasonings in the pamphlet, besides those contained in the lecture. One of the strangest specimens of argumentation I recollect to have seen of late, may be found in Note 6, pp. 25, 26. It is headed "*The word sects.*" The Doctor thinks the word is a very innocent one, and that it should give no offence, if it is applied as he has used it or as the Episcopalians generally appropriate it. But will the Doctor gravely say, that nothing is *meant* by the distinctions constantly made by himself and his brethren, which we meet with every day, touching this point? The almost invariable language is "the *church*" and "the *sects*"—"the *DISSENTERS*"—"the *INCONGRUOUS sects*"—"the *thousand and one SECTS.*" If no assumption on the one hand, or slur on the other, is intended, it is passing strange that the language is not sometimes varied. Why do not these very charitable and non-exclusive gentlemen sometimes, for the sake of avoiding dull uniformity, and to show that they do not mean anything in the application of a very innocent *word*, say the Methodist, the Baptist, and the Presbyterian CHURCHES, and the *Episcopal SECT*? If they are so simple, and artless, and without design in their use of the word in question, it is almost a miracle in style and language, that they have never, even by some accident—by some slip of the tongue or pen—been jostled aside from this stereotyped phraseology. We have one illustration of the *unity* of "THE CHURCH" in this fact. It has always *happened* that they have said "*the church*" and "*the sects,*" and many Christians have often felt that it was a special act of clemency, if some opprobrious epithet has not been prefixed to the term "SECTS."

But Dr. Coit's reasoning on this matter is very novel, and strikes me as worthy of a place among modern curiosities. Let me subjoin it: "To my recollections of boyhood, this new mania of some for the word 'church,' is singularly amusing. Why, I can easily recollect the time, when to call an un-Episcopal house of worship a church, would give mortal offence." This statement is certainly not less "singularly amusing" to me, than "this new mania" is to the Doctor's "*recollections of boyhood*"—though I have no philosophy which teaches me how one's "*recollections of boyhood*" can be *amused*. But it seems the Doctor's *are*. We all know that man—a thinking being, may be amused—and the "*recollections of his boyhood*" may so oc-

cur to his mind as to amuse him ; but how to go to work to amuse these "*recollections*," would drive even Punch to his wits' ends.

But this is not the main point. The inquiry respects the use of the term church ;" and whether this term should be restricted, as Episcopal writers are wont to restrict it, to the collective body of professing Christians of *their own* denomination, or whether it should be applied to other denominations also? And how has Dr. Coit disposed of this question? Why by discussing a very different one, to wit: whether a non-Episcopal place of worship should be called a "church," or a "*meeting-house*?" This is truly *marvelous*. The question does not relate to a "meeting house" any more than it does to a Jewish synagogue or a Mahomedan mosque. Dr. Coit must have known this. I will not dishonor his intellect so much as to express a doubt of it. What has the name of a *place of worship* to do with the question which the Doctor professes to discuss? From his reasoning—if it may be called reasoning—we should be led to suppose that the persons who have insisted on calling their *places of worship, meeting houses*, had likewise repudiated the use of the term "*church*," as the proper name of the collective body of professed believers. But this was never done. One would suppose that they had, from Dr. Coit's "*recollections of boyhood*," which have been so "*singularly*" *amused* of late. To render the reasoning adopted in Note C, applicable to the only question pending here,—whether Episcopalians have an exclusive title to the term "*church*," as descriptive of an organized body of Christians—"the piquant debate" which the Doctor "*actually heard*," among the old geological formations, in the "*transition state*," should have been directed to a different point. The question should have been stated in this manner,—should the body of *believers*, not the *place of worship*, be called "THE CHURCH?" And the *old "fossils"* should have taken the negative; and then the Doctor's "*recollections of boyhood*" would have been very instructive. But the question, it seems, respected the house of worship. Dr. Coit's argument, when drawn out, and applied to the case in hand, as I had presented it in one of my former numbers, would read on this wise: There was a time when some men were so scrupulous in the use of the word "*church*," that they would not have it applied to the place of religious convocation or worship, and therefore these men must have experienced a great change, if they are now willing to apply it to the body of *believers*,—a thing which they always did, and most scrupulously insisted on doing. To give any force, or point, or common sense to Dr. Coit's argument, as applicable to the case under discussion, as drawn from the names of Episcopal and non-Episcopal houses of worship—the bodies of believers—men and women, not Episcopally organized, according to these old prejudices, should be called "*MEETING-HOUSES*," and not *churches*; and to avoid this dreaded name, which they always arrogated to themselves, and scrupulously adhered to, they may be called by a kind of compromise, as we Episcopalians call them, "*THE SECTS*." This is a fair view of Dr. Coit's argument drawn from the "*solemn debate*" which he "*actually heard*," not on the propriety of calling an organized body of Christians, a "*CHURCH*," but whether this term should be applied to a place of worship. He has one subject before him, which he was bound to meet, or take the consequence,—and discusses an-

other. The word "CHURCH," which occurs in the inquiry, suggests a mode of escape from the naked point to be met; and he strides the roof, or climbs the steeple, and sails off through the air, to parts unknown, in a crusade against the prejudices of the old Puritans against applying the term "*church*" to an edifice used for worship. Whether the Doctor can see that this is a mere evasion, or not, I can not say,—but I think most men can. One might well imagine, on reading Note C, that the "recollections of boyhood," had become so vivid and overpowering, that the rules of logic which were studied in riper youth, and should be practiced in still maturer manhood, had become entirely obliterated by the process.

If Dr. Coit would say anything to the purpose respecting the use of the word *church*, as it occurs in this controversy, he must show that there is a "new mania" in our day, in the use of this term as descriptive of a body of *believers*. This he can not do. This false issue is dodging the whole question. Places of worship—whether they should be called "CHURCHES," or "MEETING-HOUSES," have nothing to do with the inquiry. The point—the only point is,—shall the Episcopal sect or denomination arrogate and appropriate this word to themselves, or should it be applied to others in common with them? If the Doctor can give us any facts which have amused his "recollections of boyhood," or his recollections of manhood, which show that non-Episcopal BELIEVERS have refused to apply the term "CHURCH" to themselves as organized bodies, or Christian communities, these facts will be in point. As to the debate about "*meeting-houses*," it can not mislead or deceive any but very shallow minds.

NUMBER X.

MR. FRANCIS—I shall now proceed to give your readers a few more specimens of false issues, contained in Dr. Coit's pamphlet of 72 pages, and incorrect and inconclusive reasoning, founded on the same. Take one in note D., p. 36. A long passage must be quoted in order to show the fallacy as it is, and expose it as it deserves. The following is Dr. Coit's:

"That is, my neighbor over the way, will not be content, that I should exercise my family government, in a way which suits myself, without his supervision, but unless I will acknowledge *his* family government to be as good as mine, he will issue a *pronunciamento* against my unsocial bigotry; and that, too, though I let him alone, and allow him to be high, or low, or broad, or, if he prefer, nothingarian. I express my opinions about family government, frankly and fully, and act upon them without the fear of mortal clay before my eyes. But, alas, I in this way indirectly condemn him! Well, and what if I do? The issue is undeniable. As Luther said at the Diet of Worms, 'God help me, Amen.' For, as to swallowing down my opinions, or altering or disparaging my own rules, to please him, no law of heaven or earth, that I know of, demands the sacrifice."

The simile here employed, does not give a true statement of the case. To lay aside a part of this figurative argument or illustration—

I reply, that no one objects to the exercise of family government by the Episcopal Church, in her own way—no other Christian church wishes to assume any “supervision” of her domestic economy—no other denomination requires her to *acknowledge* its “family government to be just as good as her own”—that is in *her* estimation—no one would wish to interfere with the expression of her opinions about family government, “frankly and freely:” but there are many other things which are the legitimate subjects of complaint. I will name some of them, that your readers may not be led astray by these incorrect positions. When this individual, representing the Episcopalian who is so tenacious about “family government,” denies that those “over the way,” who do not conform to his *beau ideal* of a domestic organization, are not FAMILIES at all, but are unauthorized, promiscuous, and unlawful associations, and that their children are *illegitimate*, and that the HEADS of these self-constituted clans or assemblages, brought together without the sanction of any law of heaven, are all usurpers, and have no right to exercise family government in any form or manner:—I say when we are told such things, in language which can not be misunderstood, we are hardly satisfied, to be assured by this very modest, gentle, courteous individual who lives on the other side of the way—“I let you alone, and allow you to be high, or low, or broad, or, if you prefer, nothingarian”—But *I* can have no intercourse with you of any kind, or encourage *my* children to associate with *yours*, unless you will adopt *my* system of “family government.” This is the true state of the case. This is accommodating Dr. Coit’s simile to the circumstances to be illustrated. But his own description is not sustained by existing facts. It is a virtual evasion of the main points in controversy. The position of the high-church Episcopal, I am sorry to say, is such as I have sketched it above; and, in this respect, it assumes the same ground occupied by the Church of Rome. These assumptions may fill the world with bigots, but never with humble Christians. My opponent may sneer at all this—but I do most frankly say, if the Episcopal Church, as a body, adopt these high pretensions, and act upon them, the sooner evangelical Christians of all other churches, know the fact, the better, that they may fully understand their relations to their neighbors, and shape their course accordingly.

I notice another false issue stated by Dr. Coit, respecting my exposition of Ephesians iv, 3, and other verses in the paragraph—p. 40, 41. His language is this: “It is idle to bring in here the last argument with which we are confronted, when we offer a *definite* and *tangible* basis for union, and press us with the *indefinite* and *intangible* subject of unity of feeling as a sufficient catholicon for breaches of concord.”

“Dr. Beman is not so well read in Scripture as he believes himself, when he puts forward this argument, and refers for his authority to the fourth chapter of the Epistle to the Ephesians. The unity of the spirit alluded to in the third verse, is not what he and many careless readers suppose, i. e. unity in good feeling, or unity in mere affection.”

The above statement, both with regard to my position and arguments, as usual with Dr. Coit, is wide of the mark. I have proposed *no theory*, as “a catholicon for breaches of concord.” I have never

been haunted with his imaginary unity in one universal framework of the visible church ; and hence I have not busied myself in attempts to discover a "catholicon" to prevent its "breaches." The history of this matter may be learned from No. 4 of my first series. Dr. Coit—according to the "sketch," and the same is true of the lecture—referred to Ephesians iv, 5,—in order to prove that the Christian church is one in its visible organization—"one Lord, one faith, one baptism." I state in my comment on this passage, that we all believe this ; but we do not believe this one Lord, one faith, one baptism, is confined to one church organization. I then refer to the context to show that Paul did not, in this passage, intend to teach the principle of what is called the great catholic unity. My remarks are before the public. The Doctor has met my exposition of this passage by saying, "Dr. Beman is not so well read in Scripture as he believes himself." This point I shall not debate with the Rev. gentleman, for it is not the one at issue. But when he represents me as 'referring' to "the fourth chapter of the Epistle to the Ephesians," as "authority" to prove that "unanimity of feeling" is a "sufficient catholicon for breaches of concord," I must file in my dissent, by a respectful denial of any such position. I never thought of discussing, in that connection, what is, or what is not, "a basis of union," in the great catholic organization of a church : for I believe in no such thing ! It is the invention of Rome—or rather the germinating spirit of that ecclesiastical assumption—and itself borrowed from Pagan institutions, and especially political institutions ; and I am sorry, that it is the heirloom inheritance of any Protestant churches, and especially in a land of republican freedom. My object in referring to Ephesians, was merely and exclusively to show that the passage does not prove the "UNITY" for which Dr. Coit cites it. I have said, "The context settles what Paul meant by this Christian ONENESS." "It is unity of the spirit, and not the unity of a church organization." Farther than this I have not discussed this subject. I have only denied that the passage in question proves the existence of such a unity.

The difference between my statement and Dr. Coit's account or representation of it, may be very easily shown. *He* had referred to the passage in question, in order to prove the unity of framework in the church ; my only object was to show, that Ephesians iv, 5,—as quoted by him, does not establish this notion,—that is, unity of *organization*. I examine the context for the purpose of establishing this view. I state no formal theory. I refer to this passage for no such purpose. My object is to show, that the apostle, in this passage, contrary to Dr. Coit's use of it, is exhorting the members of the Ephesian Church—that individual church—to walk together in the sweet exercise of all the Christian graces,—and that he enforces this delightful, domestic Christian harmony, by reminding them of the fact that they all had "one Lord, one faith, one baptism." Dr. Coit represents me as stating the theory, that "unanimity of feeling" is "a sufficient catholicon for breaches of concord," and then as referring to Ephesians fourth chapter, as proof of my position. If he had read my remarks carefully before he attempted to answer them, he would have seen that I referred to this passage of Scrip-

ture—not to prove *any* theory about Catholic unity, but to set aside, and disprove Dr. Coit's use of it, and thus show that the Apostle, in this individual passage, has quite a different purpose in view. I have stated one thing,—Dr. Coit represents me as stating another. My remarks become quite a different substance or essence, after passing through his alembic. On a re-examination of my remarks on Paul's meaning in the fourth chapter to the Ephesians, I am confirmed in my impressions already expressed. Let any man read the passage, and judge for himself,—for I am not aware that we have any “uniform consent of the fathers,” on this point. Indeed, this passage is so clearly expressed, and its import so fully revealed of God, that we hardly need a more lucid *human* revelation, in order to simplify that which omniscience has contrived for the instruction of men. Any person of plain common sense, who has no theory to maintain and ride, as a HOBBY, can not hesitate for a moment, as to the Apostle's object and meaning.

Nor does it change the reasoning of the Apostle, if we adopt Dr. Coit's notion of the word *spirit*. Say it is the Spirit of God. “The unity of the spirit,” then, must mean that unity taught and produced by the Holy Spirit. It is an experimental affair, as appears in all descriptive terms and phrases employed by the inspired writer. It is the “unity of the spirit in the bond of peace.” And yet the whole exhortation applies, as before, to the gracious affections which should be cultivated, and the humble Christian demeanor, which should be evinced by the Ephesian converts, in their church relationship towards each other. But as “Dr. Beman is not so well read in Scriptures as he believes himself”—we may consult other authorities.

Dr. Macknight's Commentary, on the passage, is this: “Carefully endeavoring to preserve the *unity* which should subsist among persons animated by the same spirit.” Dr. Scott—*Episcopalian*—applies the exhortation to Paul's Ephesian brethren, and says: “Thus they ought studiously and diligently to follow after peace and harmony with each other, according to the teaching and influence of the Holy Spirit.” Poole says: “Either unity of mind, or spiritual unity, as being wrought by the spirit.” Henry says: “It is the unity of the spirit”—“The seat of Christian unity is in the heart or spirit”—“This unity of heart and affection may be said to be of the Spirit of God; it is wrought by him.”

But Dr. Coit may set us all down together, in one solid mass of ignorance, and say, in his unrivalled flippancy, “Dr. Beman and these men are not so well read in Scripture as they believe themselves to be”—and I suppose this would settle the case, with an authority nearly equal to that of “the uniform consent of the fathers.” No more need be said. It may be, that most men think they know more of the Scriptures than they actually do. But if we should take the position Dr. Coit has in dealing with “THE SECTS”—“EACH AND ALL OF THEM,” and say with him, “The one that is without sin among you”—in this particular—“let that one cast the first stone;” we might be sure of one thing. We should be in no danger of suffering death by a stone from the hand of “THE REV. DR. T. W. COIT.”

NUMBER XI.

MR. FRANCIS—I have already consumed much time in pointing out incorrect statements of the matters at issue, and inconclusive arguments, contained in Dr. Coit's pamphlet; and I have marked several others of the same description, which I intended to present, but the instances I have named, are enough. They give character to this singular publication. There is hardly a fair and manly statement of any point in debate; and as to the reasoning, it is often evasive, sometimes puerile, and, not infrequently, full of flings and personalities, with attempts at *smartness*, which are generally failures, rather than palpable hits! But I will not consider the style of this little book here; but I may do it hereafter.

In my 4th No. on "*The Pamphlet*," I noticed an incorrect statement made by Dr. Coit, respecting a remark of mine relative to the Pastor of St. John's Church; and I promised to refer to this matter again. I must quote the whole passage in order to be perfectly understood: "He travels out of his way to exhibit me, in contradistinction from my good brother, the Rector of St. John's, as an enemy to societies for the distribution of the Holy Scriptures—representing that brother, as condescending to preach on the anniversary of such a society; while surrounded by multitudes belonging to other denominations, and the whole scene as a foreshadowing of heaven. Now—*incredible dictu*—myself and my assistant were both of us present on that ante-celestial occasion, and conducted divine service, while my accuser was absent. A blessed picture, he most lovingly calls it; but, alas, not a ray of light from his amiable countenance irradiated its beauty."

I need not repeat what I have said respecting the charge that I represented Dr. Coit, "as an enemy to societies for the distribution of the Holy Scriptures." It is a fabrication of his own, from beginning to end.—Look at No. 4 of the present series, compared with No. 3 of the first. It was a mere mistake of the Doctor's of course—but he is rather famous for such mistakes. But I have already disposed of this matter, and if Dr. Coit has the keen moral sense which most men cherish, he must feel rebuked when he reviews this most singular statement.

But I have called up this matter here for a different purpose. Dr. Coit says, I represent the Pastor of St. John's Church, "as condescending to preach on the anniversary of such a society." "As *con-*
descending to preach?" I never thought of such a thing. I never supposed it a condescension, even for an *Episcopal* minister, to preach in favor of the Bible; and its distribution. I have never been so wedded to *tradition*, as to entertain such a thought! But, perhaps, the condescension consisted in doing this while surrounded by other denominations. The Doctor seems to lay peculiar stress on the fact that he and his assistant were both present on that occasion, while I was absent. I can not see what object the Doctor had in view in

mentioning this fact, in the connection in which it occurs, unless, it was to *intimate*, at least, how ready and cordial he is, in his co-operation with the National Bible Society and its auxiliaries, while the case may be somewhat doubtful in relation to *myself*. There are *Dr. Coit* and his ASSISTANT—see how devoted they are to this great co-operative charity—while Dr. Beman stands aloof! And this gave the Doctor an opportunity of letting off one of his flippant remarks. And both of these facts—I mean the presence of the Rector of St. Paul's and his assistant, and my absence—are merely accidental things, which prove nothing. A very scrupulous writer would not have introduced them in this connection, because the connection in which they are presented, is adapted to deceive and mislead.

An attempt has been made before, by an anonymous writer, styling himself an "Episcopalian," to glean capital from these facts, and I can not more effectually meet the whole case, than by giving, in connection with these remarks, what I had once written, in reply to his article, before I had determined not to answer any strictures which were unaccompanied by a name. The whole case, as presented by Dr. Coit and this nameless writer, will be fully met by this communication. And if a case of *non-exclusiveness* is made out in favor of Dr. Coit and his assistant, and the Episcopal Church in general, by these statements, I shall most heartily rejoice in it. The facts have been stated, no doubt, for this purpose. Let your readers see how they look after they are candidly examined.

The following is the communication referred to, and which appeared in the *Times*, some weeks since:

DR. BEMAN VS. DR. COIT.—*Mr. Francis*: I would ask leave to call the attention of the readers of Dr. Beman's articles to the fact that the last meeting of the Bible Society in this city, an association alluded to by him as distinguished by the co-operation of Christians of all denominations, was held in an Episcopal church, was presided over by an Episcopalian. The sermon was preached by one Episcopal clergyman in place of another Episcopal clergyman, who was prevented from being present by a misunderstanding as to the time of holding the meeting. That the whole of the preliminary religious services were conducted by Dr. Coit and his assistant, while Dr. Beman and his assistant were both—absent. EPISCOPALIAN.

MR. FRANCIS—A few words only are needed in reply to this writer. His statements, I believe, are correct, but his implied *inference*, if he has any object in view, is of an opposite character.

The Bible meeting referred to *was* "held in an Episcopal Church,"—it "was presided over by an Episcopalian"—but he was not one of the "EXCLUSIVES,"—"the sermon was preached by an Episcopal clergyman"—but he is one of the liberal and co-operative class,—and the "other Episcopal clergyman who was prevented from being present," is a large-spirited and fearless advocate of the great national benevolent societies, and has had the whole Episcopal hierarchy of the country, with here and there an exception, down upon him, for the last fifteen or twenty years, for his boldness, zeal and eloquence in their support. If Dr. Tyng *had* been present, and spoken

as I have heard him speak, and as he once spoke before our county society, in this city,—and not an Episcopal clergyman among his auditors,—his “little finger” of rebuke against high-church exclusiveness, would have been thicker than my “loins,” in anything I have uttered on this subject, in my remarks on Dr. Coit’s sermon. An “*Episcopalian*” well knew all I have stated above; and knowing all these modifying circumstances, it appears a little strange to me that he should publish these facts as indicating the liberality of the Episcopal Church, as a BODY. They are the exceptions, and apply only to a small *minority*; and this worthy minority have been especially commended for their anti-sectarian liberality in my remarks. I would respectfully invite the attention of this gentleman to my 3d No. So far, then, your correspondent has accomplished nothing. He has stated only what every body knows and acknowledges. But the *fallacy* by which he may have imposed upon *himself*, but certainly not upon all of his *readers*, is this: He adduces facts to show that a very *small part* of the Episcopal Church is liberal, fraternal, and co-operative—a point which I have not only most cheerfully acknowledged, but labored to establish—and from his very limited and almost solitary facts he would have us infer that this is the *character of the whole church as a body*. The foundation is not large enough for the superstructure. It is like building a magnificent temple upon a pebble stone!

As to what an “*Episcopalian*” has said of “the presence of Dr. Coit and his assistant,” and “the absence of myself and my colleague”—when examined, it will amount to about the same I have stated above—that is, to *nothing*. I was absent from the city and the county, and was compelled to deny myself the pleasure of attending the meeting. Mr. Booth can answer for himself. But an “*Episcopalian*” does not *believe*—whatever he may insinuate by his pen—that either of us was absent from want of attachment to the Bible society. And as to the other gentlemen, is it at all probable they would have attended this Bible meeting, if it had been held in a Methodist or Presbyterian Church? If so, it would have been “a new thing under the sun.” The church where these reverend gentlemen officiate—with a few honorable and honored exceptions—has always stood aloof from this association—and its *ministers* too. In the last named, I believe there have been no exceptions. I could state some strong facts on this point, but I do not wish to “provoke” any one except it be “unto love and to good works.” While St. John’s Church, and its pastors, with one or two exceptions, have co-operated with great cordiality in the labors of this society, we may learn the position of St. Paul’s, from the following facts: In 1853, this church gave 0·00; 1854, 0·00; 1855, 20·40; 1856, 18·00. I find no fault, but an “*Episcopalian*” has drawn out these facts.

Without a breach of charity, we may believe that it was EPISCOPACY, and not the *Bible society*, which allured the two clergymen named by your correspondent, into that meeting. Those who live till another anniversary, will see how things will shape themselves then. If Dr. Beman and his colleague had been present, would they have been invited to participate in “the preliminary exercises” of a society to which *they* belong, with Dr. Coit and his assistant, who sustain no

connection with the same? Will "EPISCOPALIAN" please to answer? Here would be a test of that liberality and co-operation which he wishes to establish by the facts he has stated—not one of which has a feather's weight by way of argument.

NUMBER XII.

MR. FRANCIS—I am sorry to have to join issue once more, with Dr. Coit in relation to John Calvin—but simple justice to the memory of one of the brightest stars of the reformation, and a stern regard to the facts of history compel me. I find the lecture holds language, respecting this great and good man, far more objectionable than the "sketch." It is more false to history. Dr. Coit says—not his *reporter*—that Calvin "burned Servetus at the stake." And if the former sentence contains anything like clearness and common sense, we might suppose that he did it because he could not force upon him the doctrine of predestination. This is the only opinion of Calvin that is named. "Calvin," says he, "was not to blame for a mere belief in the absolute decree of fating predestination; but he was to blame, most grievously and inexcusably, for forcing his *own opinions* upon another." He immediately adds, "He might have believed in predestination harmlessly; but when he assailed *heresy* with fire, and burned Servetus at the stake, it was idle for him to call himself a Protestant." The natural and obvious construction of the above is, that Calvin attempted to *force predestination* upon Servetus, and, failing in his attempt, "*he burned him at the stake.*" This same impression seems to have been made upon the mind of the Doctor's reporter; or, at least, he has expressed himself in language well adapted to make this impression on the mind of the reader. The "sketch" says, "But Calvin when he undertook to *enforce his opinions with high-handed power*, lost even this claim to the name of Protestant. In bringing Servetus to the stake, he was guilty of the most palpable inconsistency." But perhaps the Doctor did not mean this, for he is not remarkable for consecutive thought, or clearness and perspicuity of diction. If he did not, it is not easy to see what predestination has to do with the subject.

But I am to test a question of fact. Dr. Coit says, "Calvin burned Servetus at the stake." This I *deny*. And now for the Doctor's proofs, for I think I may hold him bound to make good his assertion, which is that "*he burned Servetus at the stake.*" He relies on Dyer, and yet even Dyer does not go as far as this. And if he did, his authority is not of the highest kind. I do not rest his assertion on my own judgment and opinion alone. The *North British Review*, speaking of Dyer's Life of Calvin, says, "It has added little to what we formerly knew of the great French reformer, for the volume is little more than a REDUCTION, somewhat skilfully executed, though in the style of a special pleader." The *Biblical Repository* says of Mr. Dyer, "We will not assert that he intended to take up his position by the side of such men as Balsac and Audin, but this much we may say, that every candid reader will rise from the perusal of the book

with a decided conviction that its author has a most cordial dislike of the reformer, whose history he has undertaken to relate, and that he often writes against the system of doctrine and discipline associated with that reformer's name, *with the violence of a man* who does not understand it." Again, "Mr. Dyer's work has not one redeeming quality to save it from the fate which has overtaken so many others breathing the same spirit." And this is Dr. Coit's great authority. One position Mr. Dyer labors to establish, namely, that Calvin held sentiments peculiarly atrocious and bloody, even for the age in which he lived; and the case of poor Servetus is seized upon in order to sustain this allegation. The author of the pamphlet of seventy-two pages seems fully to sympathize with Mr. Dyer in the opinions to which I have alluded. But nothing could be farther from the truth. The keen and discriminating reader can detect another, and a very different element underlying this superstructure, and all its furniture and decorations; it is a bitter antagonism to the doctrinal sympathies of Calvin. Such persons never fail to give him a side blow on this score. Mr. Dyer is full of this spirit, and it comes out. And *our* Doctor's mind runs in the same channel. He can not witness the martyrdom of Servetus without giving a cut at "*fating* predestination"—though it might be difficult to say what *particular* kind of predestination is here meant. Is it a different kind from that contained in the 17th article of the Anglican Church? I am not aware that Calvin held any different form or type of this doctrine from the one there set forth. Its statement, and its philosophy, seem to be the same.

But in assigning the *cause* of fact, I have slightly wandered from the fact itself, which I wish to render prominent. It is this, that Calvin is represented by Mr. Dyer as the fiercest persecutor of his day, and that he must be condemned even by the light which gilded that age. There is not a shadow of proof to sustain this position. Indeed, it is so far from being true, that Calvin stood pre-eminent among the reformers, and in the very affair of Servetus—unhappy as his participation in it, is now confessed by every one to be, he received the unqualified approbation of the best men in Europe. I do not justify him—no man living justifies him now. Nor have I betrayed any of that spirit which Dr. Coit has attributed to me in Note F, in his usually elegant and classic language, when he says, "I very well know how coy and *touchy* some are" on this subject. I endeavored in my 6th No. to correct an erroneous statement, according to the "sketch," which he had made respecting the agency of Calvin in the death of Servetus. The Doctor now says, on the 48th page of his pamphlet, "I simply appealed to Calvin's treatment of Servetus to show that he was exclusive. That is the most he can make of the Lecture, cling as he will to a newspaper report, for which I am no more responsible than the child unborn." Now it happens that the Lecture is worse than the "sketch," in the statement to which I referred—nor was that statement in relation to Calvin's *exclusiveness*. Of this I said nothing. But I did object to the charge brought against him in relation to the death of Servetus. Even the "sketch" attributed to him an agency which he never exercised. The language is this: "In bringing Servetus to the stake, he was guilty of the most palpable inconsistency." His "*inconsis-*

tency" in having any thing to do with that affair, I have not denied. But that Calvin brought him to the stake I have denied—and I must continue to deny it. But there is no necessity of clinging to the "sketch," for the Lecture is far bolder in its statement than the reporter. It asserts that "he" (Calvin) "burned Servetus at the stake." It is of this allegation, and not the charge that Calvin was *exclusive*, that I complain. But this is not the point now.

I have said, that Calvin was cordially sustained in the course he pursued, in this case, by all or nearly all of the reformed churches. This is all I wish to establish now. I beg Dr. Coit not to think I am apologizing for *any* agency of Calvin in this matter,—much less *approving* of it. I know your unsophisticated readers will not imagine any such thing: for I am merely giving the testimonies of that age.

Bullinger, the reformer of Zurich, says, "I do not see how it was possible to have spared Servetus, that most obstinate man, the very hydra of heresy." We can see how he might have been spared—why he *ought* to have been spared—with the softening light of centuries upon us: but could Bullinger of *that* age? Peter Martyr expresses the opinion, that it was the duty of the magistrates and princes to serve God by punishing heretics and blasphemers." Melancthon, who was the gentlest spirit among the reformers,—the mildest and most benignant star in this almost super-human constellation of worthies, says: "I affirm that your magistrates have acted justly in putting to death a blasphemer, after a regular adjudication." Archbishop Cranmer maintained, that 'Servetus ought to have suffered death.' Bishop Hall says of that transaction, that "Calvin well approved himself to God's church." Scott in his *Continuation of Milner*, vol. III., says: "So far was the church of England and her chief divines from countenancing that unbecoming and absurd treatment, with which the name of this eminent Protestant is now so frequently dishonored, that it would be no difficult matter to prove that there is not a parallel instance on record of any single individual being equally and so universally venerated, for the *union* of *wisdom* and *piety*, both in England, and by a large body of the foreign churches, as John Calvin." (See *Christian Observer*, vol. II p. 142, 143.) Bishop Andrews remarks: "He was an illustrious person, and never to be mentioned without a preface of the highest honor." Bishop Jewell, who did not sympathize with Mr. Dyer, either in doctrine or high-churchism, calls Calvin "a Reverend father and worthy ornament of the church of God." Bishop Stillingfleet speaks of the reformer as "that excellent servant of God." Richard Hooker says: "For my own part I think Calvin incomparably the wisest man the French church did enjoy since the time it enjoyed him." Baxter knew "no man since the Apostles' days whom he valued and honored more than Calvin." Featly calls him "that bright burning taper of Geneva." Montesquieu declared that "the Genevese should bless the birthday of Calvin." Arminius, who differed very widely from Calvin in theological views, says: "Next to the perusal of the Scriptures, which I earnestly inculcate, I expect my pupils to peruse Calvin's Commentaries." A late writer has well remarked, in commenting on these just tributes to the character of

Calvin, "Men had not then learned to credit and retail the slanders of *malignity*, and the assaults of *ignorance*, against this venerable man."

But Calvin, says Dr. Coit, "*burned Servetus at the stake.*" And this declaration he made before, probably more than a thousand persons; and, perhaps, not one in fifty of them, know anything more than the *outlines* of this transaction. And did '*he burn Servetus at the stake?*' The Doctor has been searching the pages of that most unreliable biographer, Dyer, to sustain him in this bold assertion, and he has but feebly made out his case. Such an allegation can not be proved. Calvin took a part in the prosecution, and so did other reformers. They made a common cause in the matter. I do not say that they did right, or evinced the spirit of the gospel. Far from it. But they acted according to the usages of the churches—Romish and Reformed—and the laws of the land, in full force at that day. It was a sin. But it was the sin of the age, rather than the sin of *any* individual, or of any *class* of men.

In my former letter on Calvin, I aimed not to overstate any circumstances which go to his exculpation. I felt then, and I am still more confirmed, on a re-examination of the subject, that I said less than I ought to have done—less than the facts of the case justify, in his vindication. There is one work on Calvin which Mr. Dyer says he could not obtain, and which Dr. Coit in his copious shower—I may say, *deluge* of quotations, has not mentioned. I refer to M. RILLET, published in 1844. He shows that 'Calvin was by no means the almost pope of Geneva, at that time, as Mr. Dyer pretends.' Rillet is not a Calvinist; but he has gone into the investigation of this matter with the candor of a noble and spirited man, and with the impartiality of a judge. As to the final action of the council he says, that "Calvin was not only *not* the instigator, but he was not even *consulted.*" *

* * "Calvin and his colleagues in vain put forth all their efforts to change the nature of the punishment of Servetus." This author says—"The *judicial usage* triumphed over the request of Calvin." He closes by this judicious remark which must commend itself to every candid man: "Viewed by our consciences, which *the faults of the past have enlightened*, the sentence is odious,—according to law it is just." (*See Bib. Rep. Art., Life of Calvin*)

I add an extract from Calvin's French works as cited by LA CHAPPELLE: "I will not deny that he was made prisoner by my application. But after he was convicted of his heresies, every one knows, that I did not in the least insist that he should be punished by death. And as to the truth of what I say, not only all good men will bear me witness, but I defy all malicious men to say it is not so." And yet Dr. Coit says, *Calvin* "burned Servetus at the stake." M. La Roche says, "Calvin never came into court, but when he was condemned." The able reviewer to whom I have already referred of Dyer's life of Calvin, has very pertinently remarked, "no one in these days pretends to vindicate the conduct of Calvin, but to hold him up as a special object of indignation, while unjust in any one, is notorious injustice in a *member* of the church of which CRANMER *was one of the fathers and founders.*"

No one can deny that Cranmer consigned to death four persons for heresy and blasphemy, and two of these were women. In the case

of Joan Boucher, the influence of the archbishop had to be called in for the purpose of persuading the royal boy Edward VI, to sign the warrant, and when he did it he protested against the act, and declared with tears, that the guilt, if any in the case, "*should rest on his advisers.*"

Mr. Dyer's book comes before the public too late in the day to do much injury; and Dr. Coit's quotations from it will probably be equally ineffectual. The *North British Review* forcibly describes the change which has taken place in the opinions of men respecting this truly great and good man. "And now none but the bitterly hostile, or the profoundly ignorant, can be found to vituperate, as of old—to re-echo, in short, the language of the courtly dames of his day, whose licentiousness he curbed, and who were wont, hysterically to exclaim, 'Do not speak to us of Calvin—he is a MONSTER.' All which is respectfully commended to those whom it may especially concern. I am quite obliged to Dr. Coit for calling special attention, once and again, to a geographical inaccuracy, or the *misprint* in a name, which crept into my number *six*, during my absence from the city. I probably knew something of Vienne in France before Dr. Coit was born, or certainly before he departed from his *first faith*, turned a religious sumerset, and began to treat Calvin as "the chief of sinners," and with a bitterness not common even among high-churchmen. I shall not forget to repay the Doctor for these little acts of kindness so *sweetly* rendered by him, by pointing out some *small mistakes* in the pamphlet of 72 pages, which are not errors of the compositor.

NUMBER XIII.

MR. FRANCIS—The object of this paper is to trace the connection of John Calvin with the Book of Common Prayer. As is usual with Dr. Coit, he has entirely mistaken my object in referring to Calvin and Knox, as having an agency in originating some of the forms of the Episcopal Church. "So much," says he, "for Dr. Beman's efforts to endeavor to prove Calvin and John Knox, *quasi* Episcopalians." And, then, as if he had made a grand revelation to me and to the world, he says, "Calvin was less of one and Knox more of one, than he ever knew before." I thank you, Doctor. If any man—I mean any man of common *discernment*—will read over what I have said on this point, he will see that I had no such thing as this in view. My sole object was to state that Calvin and Knox—two staunch PREDESTINARIANS—a class of theologians whom Dr. Coit seems to dread with a sort of instinctive horror—were contributors to the Book of Common Prayer; and that Dr. Coit should treat such men kindly. But the Doctor is a man of one idea, and he mounts his hobby and off he rides. And he makes the wonderful discovery that John Knox "was Episcopally ordained." This *sanctifies* HIM. Whatever he did, in relation to the Prayer Book, was canonical, and of course to be approved. In relation to Calvin, Dr. Coit denies that he had any participation in the work of forming the Book of Common Prayer. I said this was "well known;" to which the Doctor replies, that "this is not VERY well

known, except as a downright mistake." The accurate Mr. Procter asserts roundly and properly, "No part, however, of our formularies can be traced to his (Calvin's) influence."

The position I have before taken on this subject, and which Dr. Coit "*roundly*," if not "*properly*," denies, I still believe may be fully substantiated. The proof is two-fold,—the authorities acknowledging the fact, and the comparison of the forms in question with the original of Calvin.

Archbishop Lawrence, in his "attempt to illustrate those articles of the Church of England, which the Calvinists improperly consider as Calvinistical"—has the following: "A performance of this kind he (Calvin) originally prepared in French, and seems to have first used when he taught at Strasburgh. This he afterwards translated into Latin, with emendations, and published at Geneva, as the form of that church, in the year 1545. (See his *Opuscula*, p. 39.) Another translation of the same work was printed at London in 1551, by Valerandus Pollanus, his successor at Strasburgh, then a refugee in England. Now it is certain that our own Liturgy, as it first appeared in 1549, bore not the most distant resemblance to this novel production. In 1552, however, when the same was revised and republished, the introductory sentences, exhortation, confession, and absolution, then added at the beginning of our Daily Prayer, were in some degree taken from it, yet not from Calvin's own translation, but from that of Pollanus, which was printed in England at the very period when the Book of Common Prayer was under revision." (*Lawrence, Bampton Lectures*, p. 208.)

Let it here be particularly noticed, that Lawrence here lays stress—as Dr. Coit seems disposed to do—upon the fact, that the compilers of the Common Prayer Book, were indebted to the translation of the Strasburgh Liturgy made by Pollanus, and not that translation of it, with amendments, which Calvin had published at Geneva. But these gentlemen are quite willing to overlook an important particular—that the original of both of these translations was the STRASBURGH LITURGY, which was incontrovertibly the work of Calvin; and indeed there is good evidence that the translation of Pollanus was the more faithful of the two,—that is more conformable to the *original work prepared by Calvin*—as he was unable to carry out at Geneva, some of those practices which he had adopted at Strasburgh—(for example, the ABSOLUTION, which he says he was "over-easy in yielding.")

Dr. Coit says, "It is possible, as Mr. Procter admits, that some hints were taken from the Liturgy of Valerandus Pollanus; but him Calvin" * * * * * "denounced" * "as '*a devil*;' and so there is no great likelihood that he would have stood sponsor for any of his diabolical tinkering on the English Liturgy." Two insinuations are here made which are entirely false, as to matters of fact. Whether from ignorance, or under some other influence, I can not say. I would charitably hope the former. The first is that Pollanus was not at the time when he translated Calvin's Liturgy upon friendly terms with its author, and that the "HINTS" taken by the compilers of the Prayer Book, were suggested by something in the translation that was not in Calvin's *original*. As to the former of these intimations, it is sufficiently refuted by a letter extant, addressed by Pollanus to his ven

erable master, and written in the very year of the publication of his translated liturgy. This letter of most courteous and amicable tenor, is signed, "*Your ever most ATTACHED PUPIL.* As to the other point, it is enough to say, that Procter himself—who only quotes Lawrence on the subject—states expressly that the translation of Pollanus "was in its original shape, the above, named French work of Calvin."— (*Procter on the Book of Common Prayer, p. 41.*)

Dr. Coit has quoted "the accurate Mr. Procter," as asserting "*roundly and properly,*" that "no part, however, of our Formularies can be traced to his (Calvin's) influence." It is greatly to be regretted that Dr. Coit is not as "*accurate*" as his learned authority, in quotation at least. He is so far from representing Mr. Procter's meaning, that he conveys an idea precisely the opposite of that which he designs. In section VII of his appendix to chapter II, of his work, noticing the "Foreigners supposed to have influenced the language" of the Prayer Book, this author mentions the attempt of Calvin, by letters to the Protector Somerset and others, to give what he conceived to be a proper direction to the preparation of that Book. In these direct attempts, Procter states that he was unsuccessful—which, however is far from evident. But in the very next section, he proceeds to show that the liturgy which Calvin had prepared for the church at Strasburgh, was in 1551 translated and published in London by Pollanus, and that this book "has been supposed to have furnished hints to the revisions of the Book of Common Prayer, in some additions which were made in 1552 to our ancient services." (*Procter p. 41.*) So far, then, from asserting "*roundly and properly,*" as Dr. Coit would attempt to show, that Calvin had no part in the preparation of the Book of Common Prayer, Mr. Procter reluctantly, as became a churchman of the highest pretensions, accords to Calvin, through Pollanus, his faithful translator, the credit of suggesting these additions. This is precisely the agency I intended to ascribe to Calvin. I never supposed that Calvin was personally employed, to use Dr. Coit's figure—in "tinkerings on the English Liturgy." It was from the Strasburgh Ritual, that I asserted the additions in question were derived.

I am well aware that commentators on the Prayer Book are very cautious in acknowledgments to the foreign Reformers. But in addition to the authorities given above, I will introduce the testimony of the "Parker Society," in its edition of the "Private prayers put forth by authority in the reign of Queen Elizabeth." Cambridge, 1851. In a note to a "confession of our sins," p. 488, I find this language: "Compare with this the first confession in Knox's Book of Common Orders. Both, however, are mere translations from the "*Confessio Pecatorum* at the beginning of the Latin version of Calvin's *French Liturgy*. Great interest attaches to that Latin Confession, since from its position, as well as from its wording, it manifestly gave occasion to the General Confession of our own Prayer Book."

I have ventured to give these authorities, Dr. Coit's solemn warnings to the contrary notwithstanding. "There will be no use," he says, "in Dr. Beman's quoting authors against this statement, as he threatens to do, if it were questioned. I have myself the original and transcendent authority (Calvin's own book), in no less than three

different forms, in the Phenix, in Daniel's Codex Liturgicus, and in the parallel Middleburgh Liturgy, preserved by Peter Hall in his *Recliquiæ*." It is hardly worth the trouble to follow Dr. Coit in all his aberrations; but I may say of these three works, only Daniel's Codex professes to give Calvin's Liturgy. The Phenix contains only the Frankfort ritual, and the Middleburgh Liturgy is a combination of Knox's Prayers with the forms of the Church of Holland. But we must pardon this in the Doctor, as it seems his method of giving us a catalogue of his library.

Again, says Dr. Coit, "in 1555, as Fuller proves"—now Fuller gives *no proof* at all—"he"—Calvin—"is first made acquainted with it"—the Prayer Book—"in a Latin translation of it sent to him by Knox," &c. Now it so happens that as early as 1548, Miles Coverdale had translated into Latin, and sent to Calvin, the order of Holy Communion which Edward VI had caused to be published, and which with the exception of the ten commandments and responses subsequently added from Calvin's own Liturgy, was very nearly what it was in 1552.* Calvin, therefore, was kept informed, very diligently by the English reformers, as to what they were doing. He was not, as Dr. Coit endeavors to show, ignorant of the character of that Liturgy into which his contributions were introduced.

I am well aware that I have bestowed undue attention on this subject, which after all is of no great importance to any one. It is not a matter of life and death, whether John Calvin contributed, direct or indirectly, to the Church Prayer Book, as it now stands; but I stated the fact as it presented itself in the pages of history. I think I have vindicated that fact, notwithstanding the furious manner in which Dr. Coit has assailed both the fact and myself. I invite candid, thinking men, to compare the statements which I have here made with the *positive, dogmatic and violent* language of the pamphlet, pp. 50, 51, 52, and judge for themselves. And I ask Episcopalians, as well as others to do it.

NUMBER XIV.

MR. FRANCIS—The Doctor has given us in Note D, headed "*Schism*," a most singular compound, covering eighteen pages, with about the same number of foot-notes and references, which I shall notice somewhat briefly. The personalities, the puerilities, the labored attempts at wit and smartness, and "the cut and thrust" manner of the entire article, I will not subject to an examination, any farther than that which I have already bestowed upon them. Take this note all in all, with its citations of almost all kinds of books, on almost all sorts of subjects, and its interlardings of Latin, and its dashing about from one subject to another, in most adventurous and daring exploits—without even "method in its madness"—and it comes as near to my idea of *chaos* as any thing I have ever seen, in our well-

* The letter of Miles Coverdale to Calvin, in the "Original Letters," Parker Society, p. 31. Compare the service referred to, as given in Cardwell's *Two Liturgies of Edward VI*, p. 427.

formed, beautifully finished, and what should be, our well-educated world. We have heard of Pandora's Box—and here it is, with its lid off, and its heterogeneous contents flying in every direction! I should like to find the first person, man or woman—except Dr. Coit and myself—who has read this portion of the pamphlet through—I mean notes and all.

If the Doctor designed this as a grave and argumentative reply to my remarks on "*Schism*," and especially as chargeable upon the established Church of England, I feel bound, in all candor and honesty, to say, that I deem it a signal failure. Indeed it would not be hazarding much to affirm, that some of the positions here taken, fasten that charge upon the Anglican Church, on the Doctor's own principles—and fasten it there forever, beyond the possibility of her exculpation. But I will not anticipate. This conclusion will be more naturally reached, and more forcibly established when we arrive at it in due process of investigation.

I must totally dissent from the rule of faith, or standard of truth, which Dr. Coit, if I comprehend his positions, would have us adopt. It is "the voice of the church" as uttered by the Council of Nice. This is his own language, page 30: "It seems to me worth while to make another effort, for the discovery of the standard in question, and in prosecuting such an effort I know of no better guide than a reference to the first opportunity which the Church Catholic ('the Holy Church throughout all the world') took to speak by a catholic or universal voice. That period was the period of the Council of Nice, A. D. 325." If the question be asked, what is the object of this inquiry?—the answer is found in the preceding sentence. It is, "to settle upon some STANDARD of appeal for fixing and bounding the Bible's signification." This is the Doctor's own language.

Here, then, we have a very singular *position* for a Protestant theologian to assume. Here is a minister of Christ in search of a "standard of appeal for fixing and bounding the Bible's signification"—an uninspired text, furnished by fallible men for the purpose of trying the infallible oracles of God. It is an "*appeal*" from "*the Bible*" to some human "*standard*." It is absurd upon the face of it, for it is to make the revelation of God unintelligible and imperfect, till it is permitted to speak by the authority of some ecclesiastical organ. It is magnifying man's voice above God's. It is an attempt to *mend* what God proposed to make *perfect*, and in reference to which he has forbidden all additions and subtractions, on pains and penalties which take hold on the future world. This is not Protestantism, according to the usual understanding of the matter. The Bible is the ulterior appeal. But to *appeal* from this book to the decisions of a council, is 'rejecting the commandment of God for the traditions of men.' No human authority must be permitted to over-ride the revelations of the Holy Spirit.

But if we have no "standard" but the BIBLE, we can have no "basis for a catholic union." This is Dr. Coit's ground. Men, in the free exercise of their own powers, and answerable to their own consciences and to God, and on their personal responsibility, will put their own constructions upon the revelation which is placed in their hands. Be it so. The Bible was designed for a book of popular

reading and popular instruction. "Search the Scriptures," was addressed to the people at large. At Berea, the people—the *masses*—who heard even the inspired Paul preach—"searched the Scriptures daily, whether those things were so." But this, forsooth, was long before "the Holy Church throughout all the world," had set aside the word of God by her authoritative and infallible exposition of it. But now we have a brighter star to guide us. The decrees of the Council of Nice have superceded the Bible. To this doctrine, I entirely dissent. It is at war with the whole system of revelation.

But why take the Council of Nice? The Christian Church had no better means of understanding the revealed will of God then, than we have *now*. Indeed, their position was less favorable than ours. They were surrounded with pagan influences of every kind,—their philosophy, their civil institutions, the prejudices of education, and, with many who had been but recently converted, strong heathen associations and sympathies, all contributed to render them peculiarly unfit to become the expounders of the word of God for future ages. The present generation of Christians are in a far better position for a full and fair understanding of the word of God, as presented in the Scriptures, than any of the early generations after the gift of inspiration had ceased from the church. Corruptions of the most fearful and portentous character had begun their work of deterioration, even before the Apostles had finished their course and rested from their labors. We have "the beginning of the end," before that period. Paul tells us,—“For the mystery of iniquity doth already work.” And if any plain, simple-hearted Christian would know what this is, he can ascertain, without the assistance of the Council of Nice, by reading the 2. Thes. 2 chapter. God will teach him there, and not *man*. John tells us, that “the spirit of the anti-Christ was already in the world.” (1. John iv, 3.)

But the great charm of the Council of Nice, in Dr. Coit's estimation, seems to be, that it maintains the doctrine of the Trinity and the divine rights of Episcopacy. "These two great points," he says, "are enough as a basis of Catholic union." Bishop Griswold—"that pattern of Christian meekness and charity," and Bishop Wainright, that man of "bright-eyed vivacity," are the authorities for this doctrine. Dr. Coit is not for "letting everything else go as unimportant"; but "these two great points are enough as a basis of catholic union."

Is this the doctrine, and this the sympathy of the Episcopal Church? Is this the ground occupied by that Church in England and in the United States? Is the authority of Bishop Griswold, and Bishop Wainright, and Dr. Coit, received as final on this subject? Do our Episcopalians in Troy subscribe to this doctrine? I have heard no disclaimer—no dissent, as yet. So be it them. And what follows? Why, unity is established by one single masterly stroke of Dr. Coit's pen, with all the corrupt and persecuting Churches of the East. The Greek Church which persecuted, and imprisoned, and finally banished Dr. King, for preaching the simple Gospel of Christ, and bearing testimony against idolatry, in Athens, the same church in Russia which prohibits the circulation of the Bible, the Armenian Church, which pays adoration to pictures, and which excommunicates, and often

murders the man or woman who embraces the truth as presented by our American missionaries, and even the Papal Church—are all in the great catholic unity, and must be welcomed as brethren in the one acknowledged, true, apostolic church,—for they all hold the doctrine of the Trinity, and what is equally vital to the existence of a visible church, *they all have BISHOPS!* I have heard of the avowal of such sentiments before—among the Puseyites of England, for instance; but I did not suppose that any organization bearing the Christian name, was so far gone in this country as to profess them. But my business is not expostulation. If any man chooses to occupy this ground, or any churches go in mass into such absurdities—they are free to do it. My business now is to define their logical positions.

On the Doctor's own showing, there can be no reason why the Romanists and the Episcopalians should not unite their communions at once. There might be some difficulties in England, connected with a state religion and with politics,—but not in this country. Both of these churches hold the “*two great points*,” which Dr. Coit pronounces sufficient, “*as a basis of catholic union*.” And if these are “*enough*,” as he declares, it would be unchristian to demand more. “*ENOUGH*” is all that God or man should ask.

But this is not the worst of the Doctor's predicament, in which his own declarations involve him. It is not only the duty of the Episcopal Church to go back into the Romish, with which they broke unity without any sufficient cause,—for that church ever held fast to the “*two great points*,” which Dr. Coit says, “*are enough as a basis of catholic union*,” but they were guilty of manifest “*schism*,” for the act of separation. It was not a quarrel about the *Trinity*, nor about *Bishops*,—they were both equally orthodox, on these points. The final rupture, which severed the Anglican limb from the grand trunk of universal catholic unity, was about the divorce of King Henry VIII., and a new marriage with Anne Boleyn, which he greatly desired. These facts are too well known to be dwelt upon. To carry out his purpose, the king assumed the power of a new Pope, arrogated to himself nearly the same high prerogatives which had been exercised by the old one in Rome, and formed a Church independent of that to which he and his subjects properly belonged. And it was not because Rome had renounced the *Trinity* or *Bishops*. They were as orthodox, on “*these two great points*” now, as in 325.

Here was schism. This schismatic church was cut off, and excommunicated; and the same power that made them was pleased to unmake them. This conclusion follows legitimately from Dr. Coit's premises. Referring to A. D. 325—he says: “*So the church was then one, confessedly one, fully one.*” * * * “*Well, and in what great features was the whole church one church, and one communion of saints? One in all its extent, and one in the bonds which tied its parts together?*” And in answer to these questions, he tells us—“*in the doctrine of the Trinity*”—and there “*was not then a Christian upon earth who was not an Episcopalian.*”*

* The rise of Diocesan Episcopacy was gradual. There is not a trace of it in the first century, either in the Scriptures, or anywhere else. In the New Testament a Bishop (Episcopus), or a Presbyter (Presbuteros), is the same official personage. A church deriving its name from this officer might be called either *Episcopal* or *Presbyte-*

Let us so understand it, for the present. But who broke this delightful unity founded on these two great principles? A small English minority in the great Catholic Church. They were treated as a *schism*, and excommunicated,—and there they stand at this day. I mean, according to the high-church doctrine. Those who reject the notion of apostolic succession and catholic unity, have no trouble on these points. It is the inherent, conservative right of any Christian people to separate from a corrupt church, and associate on pure gospel principles, for the worship of God, and the glory of his name. But I must close here,—reserving for my next a few testimonies on ancient Episcopacy, which will greatly change the complexion of what Dr. Coit has stated on this subject.

NUMBER XV.

MR. FRANCIS—I have a few authorities to exhibit, touching the early prevalence of Episcopacy, which must materially affect Dr. Coit's conclusions on this subject. And yet I shall not attempt to discuss, *in extenso*, such a matter in a brief newspaper article. Referring to the period of the Council of Nice, Dr. Coit says, "Now if the Christian church was then a Trinitarian Church much more was it an Episcopalian Church; *for there was not then a Christian upon earth who was not an Episcopalian*. Even the heretics, who questioned the church's doctrine, did not then dream of questioning the church's discipline as Episcopal. This was so incontestably apostolic, that the first men, (*save one*,) the very first men, who thought seriously of dispensing with it, were the continental reformers of the sixteenth century. For this I appeal to Mr. Gibbon, as acute an observer as any body, and as an impartial testifier, since he did not care a groat for any church. Mr. Gibbon even admits that Episcopacy was introduced into Asia, in the life time of St. John, and is recognized in one of his inspired compositions. He only doubts about its introduction into Corinth and Rome, during the first century, because an *uninspired* authority does not warrant the fact to him. But leaving this portion of time, with such a doubt hanging over it as would be, at least *ought* to be, no doubt to a Christian believer, he comes freely and unhesitatingly to the broad and comprehensive conclusion: "After we have passed

rian. But a *diocesan* bishop who claims to be *an apostle*, was not known in the church, after the death of the *true* apostles, till some time in the second century. A church deriving its name from *such* a bishop, should not be called *Episcopal*, but by some name derived from "APOSTOLOS"—such as *Apostolian*, denoting that it is a church under the government of APOSTLES. This form of government was thoroughly developed in the fourth century, and its various stages can be as distinctly traced from the popular form of government, in the primitive church, by the congregation and their *Presbyters*, or *Scriptural Bishops*, as the subsequent growth of this first corruption of Christianity, or *Diocesan Episcopacy*, can be traced to that consolidated denomination which constitutes *Romanism*. The Christian fathers, properly understood, confirm this view. Modern ecclesiastical historians who have devoted their lives to these investigations—such men as Mosheim, Neander, Planck, D'Aubine—confirm this view. Guizot, in his history of Christian civilization, takes the same view of the subject. I would present extended authorities, but my limits will not permit. I may do it in some other form *hereafter*.

the difficulties of the first century, we find the Episcopal government *universally* established till it was interrupted by the republican genius of the Swiss and German reformers.

The statements contained in this extract, are made with the Doctor's usual accuracy. The wholesale declaration, that in A. D. 325, there was '*not a Christian on earth who was not an Episcopalian,*' rests upon the Doctor's own authority. A man who can receive this as an article of his creed, must have large credulity. That the church, before this period had lost much of its primitive simplicity, there can be no doubt; and one of the powerful causes of this deterioration was its debasing connection with civil government. Assumptions by the clergy had commenced, long before this period, and the leaven had begun to work which eventually leavened the whole lump, and produced that corruption in the church, in the midst of which its primitive simplicity was converted into worldly pomp, and nearly lost. The causes of this may be easily traced by an unbiased reader of history. The lordly assumptions of the clergy—affecting power and splendor among men, were among the most efficient. To build up an imposing hierarchy which should overawe the nations and govern the people and their rulers, was a primary and paramount object; and how well this scheme succeeded, long ages of oppression and bitterness can testify. Diocesan bishops manufactured out of what was once plain and unpretending *Presbyters*, was the first step in this downward process of piety. But I can not pursue this thought now.

Dr. Coit appeals to Mr. Gibbon, whom he deems "as an acute an observer as anybody," and yet there are two things quite observable in this reference which go very far in neutralizing this high authority. One is, he only admits the introduction of Episcopacy "in ASIA, in the life time of John," nor does he give very satisfactory authority for this; and the other is, that he doubts the fact in relation to "Corinth and Rome." But this latter fact—though Mr. Gibbon was "*as an acute an observer as anybody*"—does not make any abatement of the Doctor's zeal. The authority of Gibbon is good, so far as it suits the purpose of our writer, and when it does not, he can readily assign a reason why he did not record events more correctly. Gibbon's doubts, in relation to "Corinth and Rome," *ought* to be no doubts to "a Christian believer." The "broad and comprehensive conclusions" to which Dr. Coit says Mr. Gibbon comes "*freely and unhesitatingly*"—that "after we have passed the difficulties of the first century, we find the Episcopal government *universally* established, till it was interrupted by the republican genius of the Swiss and German reformers," must be taken with some qualification with regard to time. "THE DIFFICULTIES *of the first century*" are formidable indeed to Episcopacy, and such as can never be surmounted. In the New Testament, *bishop* and *presbyter* apply to the same office and the same person. This Episcopals do not deny. And yet Dr. Coit, regardless of this generally admitted fact, places them in direct contradistinction from each other, and says he has clung to the succession "as traceable through *bishops* rather than *presbyters*. He should have said, 'through APOSTLES, rather than *bishops* or *presbyters*.' (See Pamphlet, p. 61.)

More than "the first century" must be passed before you "find Episcopal government *universally* established"; though it was early established in connection with monarchy, because it is in some sense a counterpart to it. Mr. Gibbon never hit upon a better explanation of a fact—or, as Dr. Coit says, "touched the *core of the case*" more effectually, than when he represents this "Episcopal government" as first interrupted by the republican genius of the Swiss and German reformers. Monarchy and prelacy had, for ages, even from the corruptions of the third century, gone hand in hand, and crushed out what of *liberty*, religious and civil, had been planted and nourished in the apostolic church. Episcopacy in the church and despotism in the state, were "interrupted" and rebuked by the republican genius of the Swiss and German reformers. And these are not the only instances in which such associations have existed, and deeply affected the minds of men, and given shape to their actions. Charles I., who, according to Dr. Coit, "fortunately had been bred a *theologian*" gave to some of his noblemen this grave opinion, that Episcopalians were good monarchists, but Presbyterians were apt to be republicans. I give the *sentiment*, not the *words*.* And whoever will critically peruse the history of the American Revolution, will see how strongly these same sympathies were evinced in that struggle. We know what parts of the country, and what religious bodies, furnished the great mass of *Tories*. The fact that Mr. Gibbon records respecting "the Swiss and German reformers," and in which Dr. Coit says, "has touched the very core of the case," is by no means a new thing under the sun.

But I have other matters on my hand now. The unity of the church which Dr. Coit claims of the Nicene age, has no trace in the first two centuries. Mosheim and Neander agree, that "each individual church had a *bishop* or *presbyter* of its own, assumed to itself the form and rights of a little distinct republic or commonwealth; and with regard to its internal concern was wholly regulated by a code of laws, that if they did not originate with, had at least received the sanction of the people constituting such church." Nor did the rise of Episcopacy at once obliterate this independence. Cyprian maintains, that "every bishop may make laws for his own church." "At first," says Dr. Barrow, "every church was settled apart under its own bishop and presbyters, so as independently and separately to manage its own concerns. Each was governed by its own head, and had its own laws." (*See Treatise on Pope's Supremacy.*) Riddle says all churches were independent of each other, but were united by the bonds of holy charity, sympathy and friendship." (*Chro. Beg., 2d Cent.*) Archbishop Whately has this remark, in his "*Kingdom of Christ*,"—"Though there was one Lord, one faith, one baptism, for all of these, yet they were each a distinct, independent community

*In writing to Lord Jermyn, Lord Culpepper, and Mr. Ashburnham, he says: "Show me any precedent wherever *Presbyterial* government and *regal* was together, without perpetual rebellions; which was the cause which necessitated the king, my father, to change that government in Scotland. * * * * "And it can not be otherwise; for the ground of their doctrine is *anti-monarchial*. I will say, without hyperbole, that there was not a wiser man since Solomon, than he who said, 'No bishop, no king.'"

on earth, united by the common principles on which they were founded by their mutual agreement, affection and respect; but not having any one recognized head on earth, or acknowledging any sovereignty of one of those societies over others. Each bishop originally presided over one entire church." The bishop was then, not a *Diocesan*, but a *Parochial clergyman*! Two or more of these primitive bishops were placed over the very same church, which is utterly at variance with Diocesan Episcopacy. "Epiphanius tells us, that Peter and Paul were both bishops of Rome at once: by which it is plain he took the title of bishop in another sense than now it is used; for now, and so for a long time upward, two bishops can no more possess one see, than two hedge-sparrows dwell in one bush. St. Peter's time was a little too early for bishops to rise." (*Hale's Works*, vol. 1, p. 110.)

The testimony of Clarkson, himself an Episcopalian, may be read with profit by some of our modern exclusives. "Hereby, also, some mistakes about Episcopal *ordinations*, of ill consequence, may be rectified. A bishop, in the best ages of Christianity, was no other than the pastor of a single church. A pastor of a single congregation is now as truly a bishop. They were duly ordained in those ages, who were set apart for the work of the ministry by the pastor of a single church, with the concurrence of some assistants. * * * They that will have no ordinations but such as are performed by one who has many churches under him, maintain a novelty never known or dreamt of in the ancient churches, while their state was tolerable. They may as well say the ancient church had never a bishop, (if their interest did not hinder all the reason they make use of in this case would lead them to it,) as deny that a reformed pastor has no power to ordain, because he is not a bishop. He has Episcopal ordination, even such as the canons require, being set apart by two or three pastors at least, who are as truly *diocesans* as the *ancient bishops*, for some whole ages."* And this is an Episcopalian! I wish we had many such in Troy. I wish St. Paul's Church had hundreds of such in her communion.

But I must cut short these citations. Volumes might be filled with extracts from the most reliable authors—Episcopalians as well as others—showing that the claims of prelacy are not supported by Scripture,—that *bishops* and *presbyters* are one and the same, in official rank,—that the early English reformers, held no high-church and exclusive notions, as to church polity,—that the ground occupied by Dr. Coit is the same first defined and defended by Dr. Bancroft in 1588—maintaining the *divine right* of BISHOPS, which is twin sister to the *divine right* of KINGS,—the same assumptive dogma set up and reasserted, some fifty years afterwards, by Laud and his party, and which is now the distinctive claim of the high-church Episcopalian, in this country and in England,—and which has been disavowed, in every age, by large numbers of evangelical Christians in that church, and especially in the days of the reformation. This is the Episcopacy I have already commended, and for which I have received, in the pamphlet of 72 pages, only sneers and abuse. But I will venture once more to pronounce my unqualified approbation of it, as a sister

* Primitive Episcopacy, pp. 182, 183. London, 1688.

Protestant Church, and take the consequence. For its high-church antagonism I have no sympathy. There is nothing noble or ennobling in it. It contracts the views, it makes men clannish, it shrivels up every fibre of the soul, it makes capacious minds narrow and small minds less. It exalts a mere external mode, or form, or ritual observance, into the place of "the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy and faith." It makes men exclusive and haughty towards those who hope for redemption through the same atoning blood,—qualities which are always unlovely, but never so much so as when exercised towards those who are beset by the same tribulations, and who are contending for the same victory.

NUMBER XVI.

MR. FRANCIS—I have several things of a miscellaneous character to settle with this pamphlet, and I have done. The *matter* of this production is not wanting in novelty, considering the professed object for which it was written, namely: to answer a few plain, and, as I believe, merited strictures on what professed to be Dr. Coit's "Christmas Eve Sermon." But the *manner* of this little book, is more remarkable than its matter. I would not descend to notice the minor faults of expression, style and grammar, were it not for peculiar and imperative reasons. But such exist in this case. The pamphlet sets up high claims, makes an unusual and pompous show of learning, and speaks of my ignorance and obtuseness, with a spirit of pertness which would do credit to that swaggering impersonation, commonly known among us, as "YOUNG AMERICA." Besides all these, it is currently reported that the friends of this little book, and the confidential advisers of its author, have been so delighted with its profound scholarship, that they have hailed it as the great production of the day. Considering the high praise which has been accorded to this very extraordinary pamphlet, by persons no doubt fully qualified, in their own estimation, to graduate its merits, it may not be improper to look a little more critically into its structure, than might otherwise be done; and especially as the Rev. author has not been very chaste or sparing in the epithets, and appellations, and descriptive terms, he has been pleased to bestow on me. Not that I intend to return railing for railing, but merely to criticise his pamphlet.

He thinks I am "*an object of mirthful pity*"—that I am guilty of hatching broods of "*ludicrous errors*"—that I am "*not very sharp-sighted*"—that I am chargeable with many "*blunders*"—that I am a man of "*ponderous logic*"—and that I fall into many "*ridiculous errors.*" Now I shall give no opinion respecting Dr. Coit, but shall speak freely of his little publication. This I have a right to do. This a very respectable portion of the community expect me to do.

This pamphlet is a pompous and boastful production. No man can read it without being impressed with this thought. The author would have the public know, that he was not incited to such a *great work* as this, by so *small an object* as myself. He has higher ends to accomplish. "So I have done what I should not have done for Dr. Beman's

sake, or a thousand more like him; and perhaps STUDENTS OF THEOLOGY, if no others, will not be sorry to keep my pamphlet for reference.”—(See *P. S.*, p. 7). It is to be hoped, for the honor of the future ministry in the Episcopal Church, that this production is not recommended to “*students of theology*,” for its spirit, or style, or literary merits of any description. As a book advertisement, and especially as a printed catalogue of the author’s own library, it may have its uses, for we are informed, in many and varied phrases, how well stocked the Doctor is in these respects. “I possess an *editio princeps* of this rare volume”—p. 24. “The writings of all these men are on my book shelves, and I am not drawing upon my fancy for my conclusion”—p. 26. And these, and such like things, are so frequently reiterated, that we can hardly suppress the thought, even with the largest charity which we can summon to our aid, that these are appeals to minds of a certain calibre, to show how learned the author is. This trumpet has been blown through our streets in triumph—not by the profoundest minds I confess—till it seems to me proper to show the intrinsic value of the capital on which the whole operation is conducted.

The author of this pamphlet is remarkable for wielding little scraps of Latin. Indeed he is so full of this, that he can hardly be said to write the English language. Almost every page is marred by this miserable affectation and pedantry. His style is often a kind of mongrel, and so constant is this process of intermixture, that it is sometimes difficult to say whether it is English interlarded with Latin, or Latin still more interlarded with English. The pamphlet rarely ever lets off a smart and clever thing, but we have for the capsheaf, as the farmers would say, a Latin phrase or proverb, in order to impart to it a kind of finish, and protect it from the elements! There is no evidence of scholarship in all this, though there may be some show of it. Read Daniel Webster, Henry Clay, Fisher Ames, Washington Irving, or any other writer of cultivated mind and pure classical taste, and you detect no such proclivities. Their largest thoughts have found eloquent utterance in simple Saxon English. And whenever you find any one expanding and bursting out, on all occasions, into Latin, Greek, French and German *commonplaces*, you may be sure that it is not because of the largeness of the conception, but of the smallness of the capacity which gives birth to it. I could give your readers examples of this vitiated taste, to their heart’s content, from page after page,—such as “*rectus in curia*”—“*incredibile dictor*”—“*etoufment*”—“*ignorantia facti excusat*”—“*point d’appuis*” (as the French say)—“*bonne bouche*”—“*henoticon*”—“*deligite homines, interficite errores*”—“*similis simili gaudet*”—“*mandato superiorum*”—“*in flagrante delicto*”—“*litera scripta manet*”—and last, not least, one of the Doctor’s own coining, “*More Bemanico*.” These have been taken almost promiscuously, in turning over the pages of this pamphlet, one after another. In short, for many more of the same description, see this production anywhere and everywhere. This is one of its characteristic features. The work is almost a little Latin scrap book. There is a *peacock strut* of pedantry about it,—a gaudy feather of affectation displayed in all its positions and language, which I have never before seen so fully developed in any one production. The motives to all this must remain a matter of mere conjecture, unless

the Doctor will give us some revelation on the subject. The pamphlet could not have been made for mere English readers. What proportion of St. Paul's congregation can read that production through and understand it? Or was it designed to create a profound sensation from its obscurity and incomprehensibility? Or—if we may multiply our conjectures—was it got up for the use of the Episcopal clergy, and especially to show them what a learned man they have in their church? I only ask for information.

Besides these Latin and Greek and French affectations, which a very small proportion of the Doctor's admirers, and especially his fair admirers, can understand, and which they wonder at only because they do *not* understand them,—the style of this pamphlet is quite peculiar. It is not what would be called, in the world of letters, *original*,—and yet it is in some sense original. There certainly was never such a one before. No English word can describe it. Nor am I certain, that I should be any more successful in my attempts at delineation, if I were to take refuge in the grave and stately Latin, or in the more subtle and versatile Greek. I shall not name the peculiarities to which I refer, but content myself with examples for illustration. The originalities of this production are often stiff and awkward. Instead of referring to the original Greek, as any other scholar would do, the Doctor, in quoting Paul says, on page 7th—"as his own Greek has it"—and then Peter is referred to in the same manner,—“as *his* own Greek has it.” The whole passage, taken in connection, presents one of the finest specimens of what may be called the *ragged style*, anywhere to be found in the books. “The servant of the Lord must not strive, as an Apostle says, i. e. (as his own Greek has it,) *fight*. (11 Tim., ii, 24.) But he may, as another Apostle even enjoins, stand upon the defensive; or as *his* own Greek has it, be always ready for an apology—using the word apology in its ancient, and not in its modern sense—as a manly and fearless act of self-justification.” (1 Peter, iii, 15.)

On the 10th page we have such expressions as these,—“error in *some* degree or *other*,” and, on the next we are presented with this picture,—“Either the sects believe this, one and all, and each one for, and of itself; or, it is condemned out of its own lips, as a mere schism, if not a rank heresy, and that without any excuse whatever.” “It” must refer back to “*sects*,”—and the whole sentence is a perfect jumble. I say nothing of its *elegance*, aside from its grammatical inaccuracies. And again, “Then they do believe it, one and all, and each one for, and of itself.” And this in a printed sermon! I need hardly say to your juvenile readers, that this is considerably below, in manliness of conception and dignity of style, the ordinary exercises of our district schools. I ask no man to concur with me in opinion; I wish every one to judge “of it for, and of himself.” On the 4th page, we have this language: “I need hardly tell you that multitudes make a different *version* of this subject, and predicate charity of opinions.” There is neither *precision*, nor *propriety*, in the employment of the word “*version*,” here. The Doctor meant merely to say, “multitudes take a different *view* of this subject. There is not a single definition of the word “*version*,” that will justify him in his use of it in this place. Webster has the following: “*Version*, a turning; a

change or transformation. 2. Change of direction. 3. The act of translating. 4. Translation." The phrase, "*a different version of a subject,*" is without authority. On the next page we meet with this inelegant and jagged sentence: "I can not hope for his safety, *in, or by,* these errors, but *out of, and away from* them." On the 21st, "Nevertheless the calumny *flies round and round.*" This is a new conception of rumor, or common fame. It has generally been described by poets and orators as spreading itself abroad—diffusing itself—as traveling with great celerity, and increasing in magnitude as it moves onward. But here it is presented to us under a new image. It "*flies round and round,*" like the periphery of a wheel or a smoke-jack, and making no progress. It is always in motion, and yet is always in the same place. It would seem that this "calumny" against the Episcopal Church is of a peculiar kind—not *progressive,* but *rotary.* It only "*flies round and round,*"—probably keeping within the circle of "*the sects.*" On the same page, the preacher tells us, "But I must tear myself from this subject, brethren, though I have not said all, *nor half of ALL,* which was revolved in my solitary, shall I say mournful thoughts." The two epithets here employed, "solitary" and "mournful," are incongruous, as applied to "thoughts." We may speak of '*mournful thoughts,*'—but "*solitary*" describes the condition of the person or agent who thinks. *He* may be "solitary," and his "thoughts" may be "mournful." But to call one's "thoughts *solitary,*" is either to talk nonsense, or to affirm that these thoughts are so *few* and *scattered,* that they are hardly neighbors to each other—whose visits are

"Like those of angels, short, and far between."

Page 27th, we have a very remarkable sentence. Says the Doctor, "It looks as though he was (were?) inwardly conscious of standing in a false position, *up* to which he is trying to write himself, *into* which he is trying to fight himself." The poetry of this can not be questioned. It might easily be turned into rhyme, but I will not attempt it, for fear my doggerel would mar the Doctor's sublimity. But the *philosophy* of this description is not quite as clear as its *poetry.* Here is a man in a queer predicament. He is "standing" in a certain "position;" and while standing there, he is trying to write himself *up* to it,—for he has not yet got where he *actually stands.* Or, "he is trying to fight himself" "*into*" the "false position" which he already *occupies.* Why, this Dr. Beman must be beside himself either to "write" or "fight" when, according to Dr. Coit, he already occupies the "position" he is *writing* and *fighting* for. There is certainly a screw loose somewhere; and it is for the public to say where. How clear is the Doctor's thought rendered by the introduction of a little ray of light from the French language, on the 38th page of the pamphlet? "So long as the Nicene basis was the *point d'appuis,* (as the French say,) the great councils were respected everywhere." Clear as fog to most readers, and in fact to most of the Doctor's own congregation. "Amen, Thomas Grantham, Amen," as we read on the 39th page.

But passing over a world of matter pertaining to the style and manner of this pamphlet, I would refer to one example more, which may be found on the 62d page. I "am sorry to find," says our Rev-

erend author, "the Doctor an imitator of the Archbishop's faults, but by no means" "of his talent. If you supply the words which are necessarily understood, it will read thus,—I "am sorry to find the Doctor an imitator of the Archbishop's faults, but by no means" *unimitator* "of his talent." Now here is something new in mental science,—a new experiment upon the human powers. A man "*imitating the talent*" of another, or if you please castigated because he does not "*imitate his talent.*" Let this be applied, for a moment, and see how it will read. This new mental act of *imitating* another's "TALENT," may be amusing not only "to one's recollections of boyhood," but "to his recollections" of manhood also. One man "imitates the talent" of Daniel Webster, another "imitates the talent" of Walter Scott, and the future "students in theology" in the Episcopal Church, it may be expected, will imitate the "talent" of Dr. Coit. This is all new to me, and doubtless to your readers. I have heard of imitating the voice, the gesture, the general manner, and the moral qualities of great men, but never before of "imitating the talent" or genius of another. But I must pause here.

NUMBER XVII.

MR. FRANCIS—I have a few more dealings with this production, on the score of its literary merits, to adjust, and I close this whole matter. With all his parade of learning, displayed in many gorgeous colors, borrowed from four languages, it may be a matter of surprise to some, that the Doctor's GRAMMAR is very defective. I shall state a few instances, not intending by any means to exhaust the subject. On the 6th page we have "*who*" for WHOM: "of nobody cares *who*." By inspecting the sentence, it will be seen that "*who*" must be governed by "*of*." "The literary peccadillos," "nobody cares" of *whom*. "Of *who*" "reads badly." This literary "PECCADILLO" occurs very unfortunately in this place, and in these circumstances. On the same page the Doctor says, "In the thickest of it," &c. "In the *thickest*" of what? And *echo* answers from the former part of the sentence, a "*predicament*." Read the sentence. "A man who puts himself into such a *predicament*, and says in the *thickest* of it, it is a courteous rule," &c. Now here is a "*predicament*," and Dr. Coit is in the "*thickest* of it." On the 11th page we have two verbs in a wrong tense. "He *would* recognize us as those who *professed* and *practiced* Christianity," &c. To correspond with "*would* recognize," it should be, "profess and practice" Christianity. It is not a thing *past*, but *present*. On the 12th page, the expression, "*too like* to that," needs no comment. On the 13th, in the declaration—"which nature *cries* aloud," a neuter or intransitive verb is laid under the necessity of governing an objective case—rather a hard burden. This oppression might have been avoided by saying, "*which* nature *proclaims* aloud." I reckon the Doctor meant this. On the 15th page we have the following: "Charity consisteth not 'in *the* believing more, or in *the* believing less; but in holding what we do believe," &c. Here are two blunders in grammar, to one correct expression. And it appears to be a mere hap-

hazard affair, that the different branches of the sentence are constructed as they are. The writer appears to be guided by no rule. Why did not the Doctor say, "Charity consists not in *believing more*, or *in believing less*; but in holding what we do believe," &c. Or if he was bent on using the article, why did he not say, "Charity consists not in *the believing of more*, or in *the believing of less*; but in *the holding of what we do believe*," &c. There is probably not an English grammar in existence, but contains a rule to this effect. If the participle is used without the *article*, it retains the governing power of the verb; but if the definite article is prefixed, it is changed to a noun and loses its verbal power, and requires the proposition to govern the objective which follows. (*See Kirkham's Grammar, p. 189; Greenleaf, p. 34; Ingersoll, p. 198.*) "The writings of all these men are on my *book shelves*"—except when I use them for the purpose of understanding my own language. (*See Pamphlet, p. 26, Note D, § 1.*) On the same page I have cited above, 15th, we have the strange expression—"a hypocrite *to God*," which I do not entirely understand. Whether it simply means, "a hypocrite," or some peculiar *kind* of "*hypocrite*," or "a *hypocrite*," with a rhetorical decoration attached to the term, I will not venture to affirm. On page 25, we read the following: "Even the Unitarians were once smitten with the common proclivity, and in the person of Dr. Priestley, struggled most lustily to prove the fathers, every one of them, a Unitarian." It should be '*Unitarians*,' because the closing word is in *opposition* with "*fathers*," which is the leading subject of the sentence. The phrase, "every one of them," is *exegetical* or *expository*, and is intended to give greater particularity and force to the declaration. It may be transposed, or entirely removed from the sentence, and the meaning remain the same. They '*struggled lustily to prove the fathers, Unitarians*'—"every one of them." In a foot-note, on page 28th, our author says, "Dr. Beman in one of his printed publications," &c. What sort of a "publication" must that be which is not even "printed"?

It must be a *written* publication, or perhaps an *oral* publication. I have heard of a treatise or production being "*printed*" and not *published*—but never before of being *published*, and not *printed*. But I find we must live and learn. On the 37th page we have this barbarism in grammar: "The sturdy polemic *had rather* made a mistake in his logic, than in his charity * * * and so *had we*." On the 60th page the Doctor says, "I *had much rather* laugh over them," &c. And on the same, "I *had rather have* Episcopalians attacked," &c. On the 62d page, "I have not said, I *had rather be* a Roman Catholic," &c. And again on the 63d—"she *had rather ruin* that one church," &c. This must be a very favorite expression with Dr. Coit, for we have it six times repeated, on four pages. Is *rather* a verb? Certainly not. Taken as an adverb of comparison, or preference, as it undoubtedly is, how would these sentences of the Doctor's read? The sturdy polemic '*had make a mistake, RATHER*'—'*so had we make a mistake rather*'—'*I had laugh much rather*'—'*I had have* Episcopalians attacked, *rather*'—"*I have not said*," '*I had be* a Roman Catholic, *rather*'—'*she had ruin* that one church, *RATHER*'! In all these read *would*, and the difficulty is removed. If the Doctor had known that this is a colloquial corruption, in which "*had*" has usurped the place of *would*, the

timely aid of this latter *auxiliary* verb, would have made a decided improvement in his grammar. This error has arisen from the contracted expression, *I'd rather—would rather*. And strange to tell, on one of the pages where two of these outrages upon the English language are to be found, the 60th—he discourses very coolly and philosophically about my “BLUNDERS” and *ridiculous errors*.” “Physician, heal thyself,” is a good proverb, for it is divine; but it may not be wise always to use it, for some men may be past cure. On the 61st page we have the expression, “this charge is one of the *commonest* tricks”—and on the 65—“Now nothing is *commoner* than for a Jesuit,” &c. These adjectives, in their present shape, are not only in bad taste, but they violate an ordinary rule in forming the comparative and superlative degrees of qualifying words. On the 67th page, we have this expression—“the *animus* of his disposition.” The word “*animus*,” as adopted into our language from the Latin, is used by writers on mental science and theology, for *purpose, intention, object, end*, and even *DISPOSITION*—so that the phrase, “the *animus* of his disposition,” is both *tautological* and *incongruous*. It is saying the *purpose, mind, or intention* of his “*disposition*.” The Doctor closes his pamphlet of 72 pages, with a barbarous inaccuracy in language; “Such a man is unworthy further notice.” Take away the qualifying word—“further”—and the sentence stares more hideously upon us—“Such a man is unworthy * * notice.” The preposition *of*, is greatly needed here. A man may be unworthy of notice, or unworthy of further notice.

But there is an expression on the 53d page, which has puzzled me more than almost anything in this little book. I suppose it was meant for Latin. The phrase is “*ipse dixits*.” “*Ipe dixit*,” I can understand. It is a man’s naked assertion—his mere “say-so.” But this “*dixits*,” I do not comprehend. Set me down as a man of no learning, if you please,—but I confess the truth,—this word is beyond my powers to grasp and comprehend. It was originally a Latin verb, in the *third* person, singular number, and agrees with the pronoun “*ipse*,” being of the same number and person. But here it is transubstantiated into a noun of the plural number, by receiving the addition of the letter *s*, and this super-addition has formed an English noun, in the plural, out of a Latin verb in the singular. This is torture inflicted on two languages—the one *dead* and the other *living*. A parallel case, in English, may easily be furnished, or rather constructed. A divine requirement or injunction is often expressed by this phrase,—“*A thus saith the Lord*.” If a writer or speaker, who wished to express this thought, in the plural, were to say, “*A thus saiths the Lord*,” he would give us the *English twin sister* of Dr. Coit’s Latin “*ipse dixits*.” Such compounds of Latin and English,—of verbs and nouns,—of nonsense and barbarisms, I can not analyze or explain, but must refer them to “The Rev. Dr. T. W. Coit,” for solution.

This pamphlet is remarkable for its big words: such as *cognominate, grandiosely, atrabeliousness, linguistic, dichotomised*, and a multitude of the same stamp, which savor of a spirit of childish affectation. But I will not crowd your pages with a catalogue.

Attempts at wit and smartness abound in this production; but they

generally prove a downright failure. I have noticed some of these already—such as his merry charge on me for *schism*, and the sweet chime of the “silver clink.” In these smart things, which the Doctor is fond of saying, there is often a *lack of wit*, in one material point: in his haste to perpetrate his jest, and transfix his adversary with his sharp-pointed spear, he does not always see how easily, and with what power, his own weapon may be turned, with a manifest and humiliating retribution, upon its own author. I may mention one instance more of this sweeping manner,—of this random shooting. Dr. Coit does not relish Macauley, and makes himself quite merry because I have referred to him with that respect which he merits, and which his world-wide fame must amply justify. “However,” says he, “the Doctor is in love with Macauley; and so I will give him one of Macauley’s bitter-sweet *entremets* with which he sometimes adorns his historical dinner-table. If the Doctor will swallow *his* half without wincing, I will promise to get mine down with what gusto I can.” This is Dr. Coit. And then follows his quotation from Macauley. “The training of the high-church ended in the reign of the Puritans; and the training of the Puritans in the reign of the harlots.” I do not often accept of challenges; but this is given with so good a grace, and with so much apparent sincerity, and with so manifest a desire to enter upon the experiment, that I am quite inclined to accede to the proposal. I *am* willing to swallow my portion of the “bitter-sweet *entremets*”—THE PURITANS—with all their imperfections and eccentricities; and then I will stand by, and look on, and witness the Doctor’s powers of deglutition, while he ‘gets down with what gusto he can,’ the two high-church reigns, that of Charles First, with all his tyrannies, and Charles Second, with all his “HARLOTS.” The first Charles is Dr. Coit’s “educated theologian,” and the second Charles lived a staunch high-churchman, and died a shrieved Roman Catholic. “The reign of the *harlots*” was unquestionably one of the most infamous and unmitigated high-church reigns that ever cursed poor old England; and yet these court ladies, constituting the power *behind* the throne, and *above* the throne, were communicants in the true Church of God, and, in the estimation of many, the only Church of God on earth. They were united to Christ by the tie of the BISHOP, the only bond of spiritual union. I should not have named these *ladies* in this controversy, but as Dr. Coit has introduced them, I am quite happy to dispose of them according to his wishes. Let him get down *his* portion, with a “gusto” all his own,—the two high-church reigns, *with the “harlots,”* admired and dominant in the last; and I hope he will have a good time of it!

The Doctor’s efforts at wit, in his attempts to prove me a Jesuit, are the lamest part of this production. A few such efforts would ruin any man who is not possessed of more than ordinary reputation. If his own friends are not mortified by such infantile exhibitions, it must be because of their unusual powers of endurance, under inflictions, when canonically administered. Take this whole description—“TWADDLE,” I would call it, if there were any such English word,—and we need just such a word to characterize just such an inanity,—I say take this *thing*, all in all, and it would furnish an appropriate APPENDIX

to an ILLUSTRATED EDITION of Mrs. Caudle's Curtain Lectures. It has a striking resemblance to that work. Its unexpected change of subject—its rapid shifting of scenes—its surprising flights from one thing to another,—one word, or one subject, suggesting twenty new ones,—all mark the identity in the genius of the two productions.

I had intended to compare the literary merits of Dr. Coit's lecture with the "sketch," which has been denounced by many in unmeasured terms. But time and space forbid. I shall merely glance at the subject. Bating a few juvenile soarings, and sundry errors of the press, it compares very favorably with the lecture. The trains of thought pursued in the two, are generally the same. *The style* of the "sketch" is far better, in almost every quality, than that of the lecture. A few sentences are exceptions to this remark. This is not my opinion alone. I have heard several gentlemen express the same opinion,—and some of these are among our best educated and most gifted citizens. I shall give one example only for the illustration of what I have said:

Lecture, page 15th, "And does not all this show, as plainly as words can show, that charity has to do with my heart, and not my head, with my feelings and not my creed, with my treatment of the motives of others, and not with my treatment of their sentiments? Rely upon it, brethren, this is a true view of a common, but a very commonly mistaken subject. Charity consists not in the believing more, or in the believing less; but in holding what we do believe, with tolerance and pity and hope and patience, and universally with good will, towards those who differ from us, whether on the one side or on the other. Calvin, *e. g.*, believed in the doctrine of predestination, in its most absolute and formidable aspect. Yet his heart relented, as he wrote down his testimony in behalf of a doctrine, which, in his view, involved whole nations and their posterity in remediless destruction; and he said the decree was one unquestionably horrible. So his feelings dissented from his mind, and he pitied while he doomed. And, if so, he held his opinion, however terrible, in charity, and, brethren, it were better to be Calvin, and hold even to predestination charitably, than to be called a saint, and yet hate him for his mere opinion.

Calvin was not to blame for a mere belief in the absolute decree of fating predestination; but he was to blame, most grievously and inexcusably, for forcing his own opinions upon another. He might have believed in predestination, harmlessly; but when he assailed heresy with fire, and burned Servetus at the stake, it was idle for him to call himself a Protestant, for he was no longer a protester against Rome's highest claim—the right to enforce her dogmas by civil power, and temporal pains and punishments."

With this compare the corresponding passage from the "*Sketch*:"

"This view of the case, my brethren, naturally leads us to the consideration of the question—What is uncharitableness and illiberality when applied to opinions and ideas? Uncharitableness, we are bold to say, has no reference to the maintenance or rejection of certain principles or opinions; but relates wholly to *the manner in which they are maintained or rejected*. We are not then to be assailed simply for maintaining the distinctive principles of our church, provided we do

so in due subjection to the law of charity. We are bound to take a charitable view of the motives and conduct of those whom we believe to be in error. But to follow or approve what we believe to be essential error, would be to make ourselves traitors to our own consciences, to Christ, and to his church. A man may not be to blame for the maintenance of errors. They may be the result of education, ignorance, mental obtuseness, or other providential causes. It does not follow, however, that we are bound to pare down and adulterate the essentials of doctrine, discipline and worship, that we may not be excluded from the standard of orthodoxy. The law of Christian charity does not demand it. On the contrary, while we judge the motives and conduct of others, with all the kindness and leniency which the law of Christian charity demands, every consideration of truth, loyalty and consistency, prompts us to the maintenance of those principles and doctrines which we believe to be essential to the integrity of the Christian faith and the Christian church.

It is thus made clear, my brethren, that charity may not be predicated of the *head*, but of the *heart*. The maintenance of positive opinions does not, therefore, necessarily crush out the exercise of charity.

Calvin, the great leader and light of modern predestination, pitied the fate of the reprobate, while he maintained the inexorable decree which sealed his miserable destiny! His own heart, as it were, revolted at the horrible consequences of a theory which his intellect maintained and approved. But Calvin, when he undertook to enforce his opinions by high-handed power, lost even this claim to the name of Protestant. In bringing Servetus to the stake he was guilty of the most palpable inconsistency. The peculiar instruments of Roman inquisitorial power became the chosen implements for the promulgation of his own ideas and opinions."

I hazard nothing, in saying that the latter, in literary execution—in conception, style, and manliness of thought, is far superior to the former. But we are a people of free thought,—let every man form his own judgment. There are other passages, in which the "sketch" appears, on comparison, to still greater advantage. It is not my business to give advice in such matters, but if it were, I would recommend the Doctor to engage this reporter whenever he wishes to publish a sermon.

Dr. Coit often indulges in a species of rhetoric which ill becomes his profession; I mean that which borrows its power from familiar appeals to God. It is what I call *profane* rhetoric. We have an instance on the 10th page. In expostulating with one of another denomination, he inquires whether he considers "it a matter of *mere form*, to use the common phraseology—a thing of indifference—whether one adopt, or not, *his* peculiarities of doctrine, discipline or worship." And he then breaks out in these uncalled-for strains: "If so, *in the awful name of God* I ask him, how dare he call himself by a distinct name, place himself in a separate communion, and call that a Christian Church?" On the 29th page, in a *cool argument*, he exclaims, "God forbid." On the 30th we have, "*God forbid*," again, "that I should ever discourage anything so blessed and sacred." On the 43d, the Doctor remarks,—and the appeal is made *to me*—and he

always seems a little excited when he *drives directly at me*,—"If he can propose a more tried basis for church unity, and the prevention of schism, a more promising *henoticon*, in God's name, let us have it without delay.' In the note on page 46, this same infirmity leaks out without his seeming to know it, as is often the case with those who are in the habit of using *hard* words. "Strong enough they were, *heaven knows*," &c. All these are not only in bad taste, but they are not quite in keeping with that simplicity of utterance which Jesus Christ has enjoined upon men.*

The mind of our author, is a very peculiar one. It is active, but not vigorous—excitable, but lacks sustaining power—grasping but erratic—aiming at much, and attaining but little—circumscribed in its scope and indefinite in its finished executions, even within its own limited sphere. The Doctor is not without *learning*, or rather without READING; but he does not, in accordance with his oft repeated petition, "inwardly digest" what he has read. His mind is in a kind of ill-arranged store room—or lumber loft, well filled with other men's thoughts and opinions,—indeed crammed so full, that the door is no sooner opened, than all sorts of materials, labeled with *the manufacturers' names* are seen pressing forward for egress, and often without much regard to the current demand, or the definite uses to which they shall be applied. Hence the parti-colored tissue of every thing he writes. Hence we often have, in the same paragraph, and, sometimes, in the same sentence, all the varieties of the rainbow, without the brilliancy of its colors, or their rich and gorgeous blendings. His conceptions are like the memory of Casso, in the Play, when he has just emerged from a *particular* state,—“I remember,” says he, “a mass of things, but nothing distinctly.” And so it may be said of the Doctor's mental visions or pictures—he *sees* “a mass of things, but nothing distinctly.” His creations of mind are overshadowed by fog, and mist, and darkness, as were the uninformed and unfinished materials of our world, before that memorable crisis, when God stood forth in his majesty, and said, “Let there be light, and there was light.”

* I have spoken of this pamphlet with as little severity as is compatible with its literary defects and blemishes, and with much less than it would have received from the hands of any terse and critical reviewer in any respectable PERIODICAL in this country or England. And yet the author tells us that the production is “some *ten or eleven years* old,” and that “it has been delivered on *different occasions*, and in *places* widely distant from each other.”

How any man of ordinary talents—though he had never seen the inside of a college—could keep such a literary production on hand so many years, and could *read* and *preach* it repeatedly, without detecting its glaring errors, is an inexplicable mystery. And then it must have been, with its author, rather a FAVORITE, as “it has been delivered on different occasions, in places widely distant from each other.” If this is an *extraordinary* sermon, it would be “*singularly amusing*,” to borrow the Doctor's language, to any man's “*recollections*,” to read or hear an *ordinary* one!