

THE
BIBLICAL REPERTORY
AND
THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

EDITED BY AN
ASSOCIATION OF GENTLEMEN IN PRINCETON,
AND ITS VICINITY.

JANUARY 1830

Philadelphia :

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY
JAMES KAY, JUN & CO LIBRARY, NEAR FIFTH STREET.

SOLE AGENTS BY
TOWNE & D. W. HOLLAND, 253 MARKET ST.

Price \$3 a year, in advance.

1830.

THE
BIBLICAL REPERTORY, AND THEOLOGICAL
REVIEW.

FOR JANUARY 1830.

REVIEW ON THE SCRIPTURE DOCTRINE OF
THE SECOND ADVENT.

The Second Advent; or, the Glorious Epiphany of our Lord Jesus Christ. Being an attempt to elucidate, in Chronological Order, the Prophecies both of the Old and New Testament which relate to that Event. By the Rev. John Fry, B.A. Rector of Desford, in Leicestershire. London, 2 vols, 8vo, 1822.

[The conductors of the Biblical Repertory and Theological Review do not desire to make the work the vehicle exclusively of their own opinions, but are desirous of extending to their correspondents the liberty of advocating their own sentiments, reserving to themselves the right of deciding how far the opinions advanced can, with propriety, through their instrumentality, be presented to the public. They are, therefore, not to be considered as adopting the views presented by the author of the article on the Second Advent. As the subject, however, is one of interest, and has long been a matter of public discussion in England, it is probable our readers will be glad to see an exhibition of the

neither sinful nor holy. All such are those which, *in the nature and necessity of the case, are in order and have a tendency to holiness.* These exercises and actions are not holy, for they are in order to holiness. Neither are they sinful, for what is sinful cannot have a *tendency* to holiness. They are *necessary, indispensable,* and that is their vindication. They are the true means of repentance. To say that there are no means of repentance; that nothing can be done before, and in order to repentance, which is not sin; is to condemn not the sinner's doings only, but, to a certain extent, those also of the minister of the gospel. He ought not to call sinners together to hear the word, for they cannot come together but in sin. He ought not to require doubting men to examine the evidences of christianity, for that is requiring them to sin. He ought not to urge consideration on his hearers, for that too is rebellion: He cannot proceed a step in his work, as a messenger of God to sinful men, without making himself, on this supposition, the minister of sin. But he is not so in fact. The things which men must do in order to meet and hear him, and accept the overtures of the divine mercy, are not sinful, because they are absolutely indispensable. Men *must* do these things or remain and die in sin.—Nor are ministers only inculcated. God himself calls on perishing men to hearken to the gracious voice which, through the sacred ministry, speaketh to them from heaven, and to frame their doings to turn unto Him; and does He necessitate men to sin as preliminary to their repentance?

PROFESSOR STUART'S POSTSCRIPT TO HIS LETTER TO THE EDITORS OF THE BIBLICAL REPERTORY.

An edition of Professor Stuart's Letter to the Editors of this Journal, published in our last number, has recently been published, to which is attached a Postscript of sixteen pages.

We deem it necessary to make a few remarks, in order to remove from Professor Stuart's own mind, and from the minds

of our readers, an impression which we think injurious. At the commencement of the Postscript, a complaint is made in the following terms, viz :

“The above letter was written, and forwarded to the Editors of the Biblical Repertory, for publication before the close of last September. After waiting a considerable time beyond the period when the Repertory was expected to make its appearance, it was at length received, and the foregoing letter was found to be accompanied by thirty-seven pages of ‘Remarks’ upon it, purporting to be made by the Editors.”

“That the Editors of any work have a right to control the manner of its appearance, and to select the matter which it shall contain, is in the abstract a very plain principle, and one which I should be among the last to question. But after inviting discussion on a point of deep interest to the religious public, and having given in very strong terms their own views respecting it, that they should refuse to publish a reply which held up to view a different side of the question, and in such a way as to let it take its course in the same manner as the original review had done, the friends of the American Education Society, could hardly have expected.”

With regard to the delay in the publication of the strictures here complained of, we would say that the work was hurried through the press with all possible expedition. The time of publication, for more than a year past, has not been the first, but from the middle to the close of the month on which the number is due. Professor Stuart's article was received; we think, about the 28th of September, and the number was out a little more than three weeks after that time. There was no delay occasioned by preparing the reply; it was ready before the printing of the other article was finished. We were kept waiting for one of the previous articles, which was the real and only reason why the number appeared a day later than usual. If the number did not reach Andover about the first of November, any delay beyond that time is to be attributed to the fact, that the great mail passing through this place is often so heavy that pamphlets cannot be forwarded immediately.

As to inviting a discussion of the merits of the American Education Society in the Repertory, we would say that an invitation was not otherwise given, than that the Editors, at the request of a gentleman connected with that society, consented to publish a reply to the review in the July number.

To the complaint that we did not permit the letter of Professor Stuart to take its course and have its full effect,

unobstructed by any remarks in reply, we answer, that we thought we were doing as much as could reasonably be expected of the conductors of any work, in giving up more than forty pages to an article which tended to present the conductors themselves in a most unfavourable light before their readers, which contained severe censures on the course they had taken, and heavy charges of misrepresentation and unfairness. We felt bound, in duty to ourselves and to the cause, not to permit these representations to go forth with an implied assent on our part to their correctness.

The spirit of the article which Professor Stuart received, was, as he readily admits, as mild as could be expected. We had, therefore, reason to hope that the objections to the American Education Society would be met and answered in a corresponding manner. The strictures, however, charged us with ignorance, misrepresentation, exciting sectarian jealousies, filling the mouths of infidels with arguments, &c. They were written in such a manner, that it became as necessary to resist the spirit, as to controvert the reasonings. We feel ourselves called upon to make this remark, because Professor Stuart gives, as one of his reasons for declining a continuance of the discussion, the severity of the reply to his first communication. If we have transcended the limits of a proper resistance to the spirit manifested in the strictures, we are willing to make every becoming acknowledgment: but as far as we have yet learned, the impression made by the two articles, is generally in favour of the comparative mildness of the reply.

As to the fact that the remarks of the Editors were published in the same number with the strictures, we observe, that the character of the strictures constrained us to take this course, which we considered as perfectly consistent with established usage in such cases. In the third number of the *Christian Spectator*, we find a letter, addressed to the Editor of that work, criticising the spirit of the articles on the subject in discussion between Dr Taylor and Mr Harvey, and followed by remarks intended and adapted to meet the objections of the writer of the letter.

Before leaving this unpleasant part of the subject, we wish to make a single remark on an additional reason assigned by Professor Stuart for declining to continue the discussion, viz:

“That he has given his name to the public, and thus stands directly and avowedly responsible for all that he says: but the reviewer and

the writer who comes forward in the name of the Editors, have declined doing this, and consequently have shunned to meet the discussion on equal terms of responsibility."

We doubt not Professor Stuart had satisfactory reasons for giving his name to the public, and while we readily admit, that to do so is "evidence of his sincerity and of his full persuasion that his cause can be honestly supported," we can see other reasons than "caution" why the name of the writer on the other side was not publicly avowed. The articles in the *Repertory*, as in other periodical works, are anonymous, and as Professor Stuart's letter was originally signed "A Friend to the A. E. Society," we were not authorized to know the writer until two-thirds of the reply was written, and part of it in the printer's hands; and it could not reasonably be expected that we should then change the whole form of expression and address. And, indeed, if the name had been originally given in the communication, it could not materially have changed the purport of our remarks. Whatever be our respect for the character of that gentleman, and it is truly great, we could, in such a discussion, have known him only as he appeared in the letter before us. We may also add, it was our wish that the important subject discussed, might be impartially examined and decided, according to its real merits, by the christian public, unswayed by the influence and authority of names*.

We duly appreciate the fourth reason for not pursuing the subject, expressed in these terms, viz :

"That, having been long in the habit of the most brotherly and confidential intercourse with some of the gentlemen whom I suppose to be among the Editors of the *Biblical Repertory*, and cherishing towards them the most unfeigned respect, confidence and fraternal affection, it would be a sacrifice, to which nothing but the most imperious duty would force me, to trespass on their affection and confidence by dispute."

The Editors to whom reference is here made most sincerely and cordially reciprocate these kind sentiments, and beg leave to assure Professor Stuart, that no one concerned in conducting this *Journal* cherishes towards him any other

* If, however, it would be any gratification to the friends of the American Education Society to know who is personally responsible for the articles in question, we are authorized to name the Rev. Dr Carnahan, President of the College of New Jersey.—*Ed. Bib. Rep.*

sentiments than those of high respect, with a sincere desire that his valuable labours, in the high department in which Divine Providence has placed him, may be long continued.

In the reply, contained in the Postscript, to our arguments on the merits of the question, it gives us unfeigned pleasure to find nothing in the manner or spirit to which we object, although we do not assent to the conclusiveness of the reasoning.

For reasons assigned, the writer does not undertake to reply to all our remarks in the last number; and as we wish to be as brief as possible, we shall in this respect follow his example, touching only those points which appear to us material.

In pages 34 and 35, the writer of the Postscript endeavours to show the insufficiency of our objections to the minuteness of the details in the quarterly returns, and gives several reasons with a view to prove that our objections have no weight. We shall not follow the writer in all his remarks on this subject. It appears to us that the whole matter depends on this single point, the necessity of these minute reports, in order to prevent the abuse of sacred funds. We supposed it was not necessary, on the principles of the American Education Society, and we ventured to suggest a method of avoiding the pain which the beneficiaries feel in the operation of this system. And we are assured that our expedient will not answer. Now, we say, if it is necessary, and admits of no remedy, the objection which we thought not very important, when first proposed, becomes truly formidable. The organization of the society is such as requires a measure to be rigorously enforced which wounds the feelings of young men. This necessity results from making all the young men who need aid, in the most distant parts of our vast territory, dependent on one man or one body of men: if the society were organized in a different way, equal security might be attained against the misapplication of the funds, and those evils of which we complain avoided.

In page 35 of the Postscript, it seems to be intimated that a compliance with these quarterly returns is a test of piety, and that to refuse such compliance is a proof of the want of piety.

“If” says the writer “piety has led the nine hundred young men in question to submit to the accountability required by the American Education Society, then what has led others to refuse such sub-

mission? Some other principle, it would seem, which must be different from piety. But is it a better one? Either the nine hundred young men must be wanting as to a praise-worthy degree of delicacy and ingenuousness, or the others are wanting in piety."

We will not agree to take either horn of this dilemma. We think it is easy to account for this difference of conduct, without asserting that one class wants delicacy, or the other piety. We have elsewhere assigned the reason why the nine hundred submitted without any impeachment of their delicacy: and we now say, other young men, equally pious, may not submit, because they think the requisition unnecessary and unreasonable.

In the argument before us, it seems to be assumed as certain that the reluctance which men generally feel to make known their wants and dependence on the aid of others, is in all cases sinful and inconsistent with piety. In the sentence already quoted, the writer says in substance, "the principle which induces some young men to refuse submission to the disclosures required by the American Education Society, must be something different from piety:" and in the following sentence he says:

"I would ask whether the pride, independence and unwillingness to feel obligation which are natural to the human heart, are to be palliated, I might even say justified and encouraged, by being saluted as ingenuousness and delicacy and noble-mindedness?" Page 35.

Now, if the sensation of pain which usually accompanies the disclosure of our wants be in all cases sinful, then the entire want of any such feelings must be the perfection of virtue. If the existence of the feeling described be pride, then the want of it is humility. And the man who is not ashamed to beg, who is totally indifferent on what terms he receives his subsistence, is more to be commended than the one whom nothing less than imperious necessity can induce to disclose his wants. We have supposed that to avoid unnecessarily wounding the feelings of those who are in need, was one object in giving that divine injunction, "When thou doest alms, let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth." There are persons, and those not the most destitute of piety, who may be more pained by the manner of giving them assistance than if they were left without aid. We hope it is not the object of the American Education Society to break down all feelings of this kind. A system which our fathers resisted unto blood, enjoined voluntary austerities, probably with a view to destroy that pride and independence

which are natural to the human heart. Superiors inculcated submission on those who were in training for holy orders, and novices submitted without a murmur to the course prescribed. The consequence was, that a race of mendicants sprang up, who were not troubled with those natural feelings which it is deemed criminal to palliate and foster.

There is a numerous class of feelings natural to man (for they are in every man) which we do not know that the religion of the gospel is intended to extinguish; such as the love of parents, of children, of life, and we will add, of independence on the will of man. All these feelings, we are aware, are very liable through excess to become criminal; and there are cases when a sense of duty must induce a good man to sacrifice all these feelings. But then the will of God must be clearly ascertained. To crush these feelings by a course of discipline, to make a man regardless of parents, of children, of character, of life, is not, in our opinion, the way to cherish that supreme devotedness to God which the gospel requires. In defence of loans, the writer of the Postscript has said much respecting the energy and strength of character which that part of the system is calculated to cherish. But here, in this minute and repeated development of private concerns to the officers of a great society, more is lost as respects energy and strength of character than can be gained by the other measure, even if all the hopes of the society were realized.

We shall now notice the reasonings in the Postscript on the subject of loans. And as our objections to the loaning system are stated in an explicit manner in two previous articles on this subject, it is not necessary to enter into a full discussion of this point. We shall merely examine, in as brief a manner as possible, the fairness and conclusiveness of the arguments in the Postscript against the principles we have avowed on the subject. Our first remark is, that the writer has used the word *salary* or *salaries* in such a manner as to make an erroneous impression on the minds of his readers.

“The doctrine, says he, is avowed and advocated, that the churches are as much obligated to pay salaries to those who are preparing for the ministry, as to pay salaries to their pastors.”
Page 36.

And the same term is repeated again and again in the sequel, and that it may not escape the eye, the word is print-

ed in italics and capitals. It is well known that many persons have a strong repugnance to the idea of salary, both in church and state, especially in the former. The very mention of the name *salary* is sufficient to chill their blood. They consider it as synonymous with *sinecure*, and look upon it as a tax paid by the industrious poor to support the rich in idleness. And it seems to us that the use of this word assists very much to give plausibility to the writer's conclusions. Neither in the Review nor in the Remarks have we used the word so conspicuously displayed in the Postscript, in reference to the young men educated by the church for her service. In the *Biblical Repertory*, p. 612, the principle we maintain is expressed thus :

“Whenever any man devotes his whole time and talents to the service of any community, at their request, it is obligatory on that community to provide for his support.”

Between the proposition thus expressed and that put into our mouths by the writer, there is this obvious difference : The one conveys the idea of nothing more than a bare subsistence ; the other may mean, and usually does mean, according to established usage, an annual income, varying from that which is necessary to support an individual to what is adequate to maintain a family in splendour and luxury.

We think, then, that the intelligent, as well as the vulgar reader, is liable, from the representation given in the Postscript, to misconceive the real principle we advocate. Substitute the word *support* for *salary*, as applied to young men preparing for the ministry, wherever it occurs in the argument, and the force of the writer's reasoning will appear very different from what it now does.

In the next place, we object to the conclusiveness of the argument. The general principle we have laid down may be true, and we believe is true, and yet the absurdities to which the writer thinks he has driven us may not follow. The general proposition is, “that whenever any man devotes his whole time and talents to the service of any community, at their request, it is obligatory on that community to provide for his support.” Let the reader notice the qualifying terms “at their request.” The absurdities which are deduced from this general principle are, first, that

“The sons of the rich who are preparing for the ministry are as much entitled to the support of the church as the sons of the poor.”

And secondly,

"That all our youth, from childhood up to mature age, in a course of preparation for the service of the public, in whatever capacity, ought to be maintained at the public expense during the whole term of their preparation."

In order to arrive at these conclusions, the writer has to violate one of the fundamental principles of sound reasoning. He argues from what is true in particular circumstances, that the same thing must be true in other circumstances, and in all circumstances. That since a community is bound to support a man when he engages in their service "at their request," they are also bound to support him when he commences without their request.

In physics we know that a general principle may be so modified or counteracted by circumstances as not to produce the same effect as if it were permitted to operate unobstructed. In morals, also, our duties are greatly modified and varied by circumstances, so that what ought to be done independent of circumstances, often ceases to be obligatory when certain circumstances exist. Thus it is a natural principle of justice that all men are entitled to liberty; but the criminal who has violated the laws of his country cannot plead that this general principle should operate so as to throw open his prison doors. In like manner we think the broad principle expressed in our former remarks is strictly true; yet circumstances may and do exist, which render the application of this principle to individuals, in particular circumstances, inexpedient and improper. It is improper to support the sons of the rich on the funds of the church; because their parents are able to pay the expense of their education; and every young man of a right spirit would wish to give evidence of the purity of his motives in seeking the ministry of the gospel, by deducting the expense of his education from the patrimony he expects to receive. It is also impracticable, because the church is not able to educate all who are needed for her service, and the poor have a superior claim, on the ground that they have no other means of subsistence. When, therefore, the church *requests* a young man who has no means of subsistence to commence a course of preparation for her service, we say she is bound to provide means for his support while thus employed; for on no other condition can he engage in her service. Yet when

the church educates indigent and pious young men, we maintain, in virtue of our principle, that she should not consider the aid she gives as *charity*, but as the *support* which she, as their moral parent, is bound to give. And if this view of the subject were taken, we flatter ourselves that those painful and odious epithets "*charity scholars*" would not so often be heard. We cannot agree with the writer, on the other side, that this view of the subject is calculated to cherish feelings of pride and self-importance, and to annihilate those of gratitude and obligation. The individual, it is true, need no longer consider himself as an idle beggar; but he ought not to cease regarding himself as a son, whose industrious and liberal parent has furnished him with the means of an education, and who expects no other remuneration than that he will employ his talents and acquirements and property (if any he should have) for the benefit of the common family and of the world. Motives to gratitude towards God are certainly not diminished. That he has received his support during his education not in the ordinary way, through the hands of parents moved by the impulse of natural feeling, but through the hands of strangers, governed by a sense of duty, seems to us a consideration as well adapted as any other to inspire the heart with gratitude towards God. But, it is said, these motives in some cases are not felt, and that we have mournful instances of young men thus educated becoming vain and self-important, and even extravagant. Let it be admitted that it is so; it only proves that the most sacred and solemn moral obligations cannot bind some men; and if this page should meet the eye of one such, we would say, Ungrateful man, remember this word, *to whom much is given, of him shall much be required*. But is the possibility of such an occurrence prevented by the system of loans? Suppose a young man, when the time arrives, is able to pay his bonds, and does so; may he not then think his own hands have done this, and become vain of his talents and uncommon worth? Or if an individual be employed in missionary or other service, where he receives a scanty subsistence, and the bonds are cancelled, or the payment not demanded, may not he, amidst poverty and privation, be induced by the favourable decision of the directors to think that his services and merits are very great, and spiritual pride reach his heart through the chinks of his wretched cabin?

The truth is, no means which man can devise, no bonds

which he can impose, no severities which he can enjoin, can inspire that spirit which should actuate a minister of Jesus Christ. You may embarrass and perplex, and even crush him, but you cannot compel him by bonds and fetters to love his Master's work, and joyfully to spend his strength and life in His service.

The answer we have given to the writer's first inference from our doctrine applies with greater force to the second, when he says,

"It must be admitted, on the same grounds of reasoning, that all our youth, from childhood up to mature age, *in a course of preparation for the service of the public*, in whatever capacity, ought to be maintained at *public expense* during the whole term of their preparation."

In addition to what we have already said, bearing on the same point, we answer, that a wise government will adopt the course which the writer here points out, whenever it becomes necessary. If the emoluments of professional and public men be not now sufficient to induce parents, who have the means, to educate their sons for these stations, then the government ought to give larger salaries, or to afford such facilities in acquiring a suitable education, even if the youth should be supported at "*public expense*," as would bring into its service men competently qualified. This principle, which the writer of the Postscript thinks is attended with such alarming consequences, is acted upon by our general and state governments, though not to the extent which we could wish. Not to mention for the third time the provision made for supplying our army and navy with competent officers, we say, that almost every state in the Union, except that in which we have the honour to live, has endowed academies and colleges, furnished them in whole, or in part, with buildings and libraries and apparatus. And why is this done? Obviously to facilitate education and to diminish the expense to individuals. Young men, the sons of the rich as well as of the poor, are now educated in all our colleges of any respectability at an expense less than cost. Calculate the interest of the capital sunk in buildings, in libraries, in apparatus, in salaries to professors, and you will find that it is far greater than the amount paid for instruction and accommodations, exclusive of board, which is usually furnished at cost. Now, whatever is paid for the education of a young man less than it actually costs, is so much given indirectly

to that young man; for it saves so much of the patrimony which he is to receive.

According to the reasoning which we controvert, this difference ought to be refunded by those who are educated; or these institutions ought never to have been endowed by public or private liberality. If the argument we oppose be conclusive, then New Jersey has always had the wisest legislature in the Union. Whenever application has been made to aid either of the two colleges located in the state, our legislators were easily persuaded that if they gave any thing to these institutions it would diminish the expense of an education, and would be so much given those educated, and be virtually a salary. These applications have uniformly been rejected after a brief speech from one of the members to this effect—"Do you not see the consequence of giving money to a college? It will enable them to pay their professors, and then they can live and receive as much as they now do, and charge less, or perhaps nothing, for the instruction of rich men's sons. If they will make their sons gentlemen, let them pay the full amount. You might as well give those young chaps a *salary* at once. It is in fact a *salary*, not quite sufficient to pay their expenses, but it goes a good way towards it, and saves so much in their father's pockets. Go on in this way and even our common farmers will be tempted to educate their sons, and we shall have nobody left to raise bread. Yes, hold out the prospect of *salary* from early life, and see what the consequence would be in one year. Why there would be more statesmen, magistrates, lawyers, physicians, (and may I not add) preachers too, *in the bud*, than there would be citizens to support them. The state would soon sink under its own burdens." It will be seen at once that there is strong resemblance in this speech to a passage at the top of the thirty seventh page of the Postscript; and the reasoning from the premises is about as conclusive in the one case as in the other.

In page 37 of the Postscript we are a second time presented with the resolution of the Assembly's Board of Education, as confirming the system of loans adopted by the American Education Society, and contradicting the principles advocated in this Journal.

In our remarks in the last number we passed over in silence the resolution of the Assembly's board referred to, because we had not pledged ourselves to defend every thing

that board had done, and are now doing, and may hereafter do, in executing their responsible duties. Our object was to present our own views, and to let others adopt or reject our principles, as they might deem them correct or otherwise. As we are called on a second time to answer this objection to our principles, we shall give the resolution of the Assembly's board, and then state our own views; so that it may appear in what respect we differ, if indeed there is a difference of opinion on this subject. The resolution is as follows, viz :

"That no written obligation shall be required of any beneficiary to refund the monies which may be granted him by this board, because we act upon the principle, that the church, as a moral parent, ought to provide for the education of such of her sons as may be indigent, and at the same time may probably become her faithful servants in the ministry of reconciliation; but we nevertheless desire every beneficiary to remember, that his duty to the church and to his younger brethren, who seek the same holy office, and to his Saviour, requires that so soon as he is able he should refund the benefaction conferred on him with interest. Every beneficiary shall be furnished with an attested copy of this resolution."

In our remarks, page 615 *Biblical Repertory*, in answer to the question, whether we consider young men educated by the church under no obligation to return the money expended on their preparation for the ministry? we say,

"That every such man, and every other man who enters the ministry, is bound to do all he can for the cause of Christ. If the education cause be the loudest and most imperious in its calls, let him devote his resources and his efforts in that direction. If there be most need, in the time and place where his lot is cast, to advance the cause of missions, let this command his money and his time."

In accordance with this declaration, we add, that if the resolution of the Assembly's board regards their beneficiary as under an obligation to refund to them the money expended in his education, in preference to every other claim of religion and humanity; if he is bound in duty to give to the cause of education the first money he can save from supporting himself and family, although other objects much more urgent and important may present themselves; if he is not at liberty to exercise his own judgment in deciding what he shall do with the money in his possession, then we say we are opposed to the resolution, and are ready to give our reasons for our dissent. If the board consider their benefaction precisely like a debt contracted in the ordinary

transactions of life, then the beneficiary has no discretion; he must pay his debt before he is at liberty to give to any benevolent object. Thus, if a man has borrowed a sum of money, and promised to return it as soon as he is able, he has no right as an honest man to give to any benevolent object until that debt is paid. The money in his possession is not his own, and he has no right to be charitable with another man's property.

If the board consider what they have advanced as a debt, in the common acceptation of the term, they may involve their beneficiaries in numerous perplexities, and greatly diminish their usefulness. For example, the cause of education may not be so urgent as that of missions. Those prepared for labour may not be able to go forth into promising fields for want of means, and more money may be on hand for education than is needed. (This is a possible case.) Yet in these circumstances, the beneficiary cannot give to missions; he must pay his debt. Calls to relieve the distressed and afflicted may be made on him, but he can give nothing. He must say *Corban*: all I have is devoted to the treasury of the Lord for the education of indigent pious youth for the gospel ministry. How can a man in these circumstances be useful as a pastor? Can he encourage his people by his example to acts of benevolence and christian effort? These difficulties, and others of a similar kind, press on the beneficiaries of the American Education Society with full force. The money expended in their education was borrowed. It is a loan; a debt both in a moral and legal sense. The beneficiary has promised, and bound himself by legal bonds, to pay at a fixed period a certain sum of money to a legal corporation, for a specific object; and when money not needed for the necessaries of life comes into his hand, he can with a good conscience no more withhold or divert it to any other object than if he had bought a horse and given his promissory note to make payment at a certain time.

The directors, it is true, have a discretionary power to cancel a part or the whole of the debt, and the writer of the letter seems to think it will greatly relieve the feelings and conscience of the individual, that the directors assume the responsibility of standing between him and his God, and of deciding whether he ought to pay or not.—*Bib. Rep. p. 590.*

For our part, we should be unwilling to transfer to any man, or any body of men, the right of judging what is or what is

not our duty; we can acknowledge no earthly power as competent to give a dispensation respecting matters which our own conscience ought to decide. In cases of doubt respecting our duty, we might indeed ask the advice of prudent and pious men, and their counsel might assist, but not control us in forming a decision. This provision, which is calculated to throw the responsibility of deciding what he ought to do from the individual on others, we think has an injurious tendency. It teaches us to regard the opinion of men, and not the law of God, as the rule of duty.

Having made these limitations, we are now prepared to say, that if it be the design of the resolution of the Assembly's board, to press upon the mind and conscience of those they educate, their obligation to devote themselves and all they have to the service of the Lord, in whatever way they can best promote his cause in the world, we have no objections to it, nor is it inconsistent with the doctrine we have avowed. When a young man deliberately and sincerely forms a determination to devote himself and all that he has to the service of the Lord, we see nothing in the act which is ensnaring to the conscience or contrary to the word of God. Jacob made a vow of this kind when he was in very trying and destitute circumstances, but he did not say to what particular department of the Lord's service he would devote the tenth of his possessions. Indeed, unless he was instructed by a spirit of prophecy, he could not know in what part of divine service his property might be needed at the distant day contemplated. An indefinite resolution to devote himself to the Lord, would not bind a beneficiary of the Assembly's board to refund the money expended in his education, if that board some twenty or thirty years hence (which is possible) should become corrupt and patronise the most pernicious heresies.

We have, moreover, no objection to the resolution of the Assembly's board, if the design be to impress on the heart of those assisted that they are under peculiar obligations to aid the education cause; that it is their duty to use economy, to exercise self-denial, to make every exertion consistent with the great work to which they have devoted their life, to obtain the means of aiding their younger brethren who are seeking the same holy office, provided this call be more urgent than any other.

We should be willing that the Assembly's board, or any

other education society, should enjoin it on their beneficiaries to remember through life the difficulties under which they laboured during their preparatory studies, and (having received seasonable assistance) to render, when practicable, similar assistance to others.

This is the kind of obligation under which we conceive the church is authorized to place the sons she has educated for her service; their obligation to aid in educating their young brethren is not in its nature different from that under which every other christian is to contribute to this object. When money is needed for the education of indigent and pious youth for the ministry of the gospel, it is the duty of every christian, according as the Lord has prospered him, to contribute to this object. And ministers of the gospel, in whatever way they may have obtained their education, are not exempt from this duty. But if you go on the principle of debt and credit in this manner, then those ministers who were educated at their own or their parent's expense might say that they had long ago paid their proportion, and owed nothing to this cause.

We do indeed believe that those who are educated in whole or in part by the church, are more likely to feel their obligation to aid in educating others. They know from experience the embarrassments and trials of a poor young man struggling to prepare himself for the gospel ministry: and he must be destitute indeed of common human sympathy, who does not feel for others in the same circumstances in which he once was. We may say it is the duty of every man to pity and relieve the stranger in distress; but we cannot make the same appeal to every one that was made to the Israelite: "Thou shalt not oppress a stranger, for ye know the heart of a stranger, seeing ye were strangers in the land of Egypt."

From these remarks every reader may judge for himself how far our views differ from the resolution of the Assembly's board. And if they do differ, we have not charged ourselves with the task of reconciling them. We are happy, however, to notice that the Assembly's board recognises the principle that "the church as a moral parent ought to provide for the education of such of her sons as are indigent, and at the same time will probably become her faithful servants in the ministry of reconciliation." And after this declaration we cannot suppose that they consider their "benefaction" pre-

cisely as a debt or loan, which must in justice be repaid in kind as soon as the beneficiary is able; leaving him no right to judge whether the claims of education are more imperious than any other and every other.

But between the resolution of the Board of Education and the principles of the American Education Society, there is this remarkable difference. The board do not hold their beneficiaries as bondsmen perfectly dependent on their pleasure, liable to have their secular concerns inspected and examined, so that it may be known whether or not they are able to pay their debt. If a corporation will not leave it to a man's conscience to say when he is able to pay the money he has borrowed; if they must have a legal bond, and assume the right of judging of his worldly circumstances, they certainly ought to examine how he lives; whether he is economical; and whether he has not more than is necessary for his immediate support. All creditors have this power, and we cannot see how those who charge themselves with the responsibility of judging when their debtor ought to pay, can perform their duties unless they exercise this power. If they cannot trust to the conscience of a minister of the gospel to pay his debt when he is able, they ought not to trust to his word when he says he is unable: they ought to examine for themselves. We are perfectly sure that the present directors of the American Education Society will never think of adopting measures so odious. Yet when we are looking at the extent of their power, every thing that they may lawfully do, and every thing necessary to the faithful execution of their trust, may fairly be brought into view.

We are reminded, page 38, of our misapprehension in stating the principal reasons which led the directors to adopt the system of *loans* instead of a system of entire *charity*. It is possible we may have been in an error on this point. And since we are assured it is an error, we admit the correction, and have only to say that it was unintentional. Still we are at a loss to see how loans can have a happy effect on the character of those patronised. Look at the operation of the loaning system during the period of preparatory studies. If the beneficiary be constitutionally imprudent, regardless (as some good men are) of remote consequences in pecuniary concerns, the fact that the money in his possession is borrowed, and that he is bound to pay it at some future day, will have no effect in restraining him from extravagance.

The smallness of the sum advanced is the only means of limiting his expenditures. We see that this is the fact with men in all kinds of business. Are not merchants and mechanics who transact business on borrowed capital generally more extravagant than any other class of men in the same line of business? If they have money in their hands, they seem not to think how it came there, or that it will one day be called for. The ruin brought on thousands of families by the accommodations afforded by banks, is a proof that *loans* will not teach all men economy. There is another class of persons: prudent, calculating, afraid of incurring responsibilities in money matters; these do not need to be restrained in their expenditures by the weight of a loan resting upon them. Indeed it often damps their spirits, and paralyzes their faculties, when they look at the heavy load which is daily accumulating. This may be called pride, but when we see young men, as we have seen them, give up their studies, engage in teaching school, or return to a laborious occupation, in order to earn something to enable them to avoid placing themselves under bonds to the American Education Society, we could not call the feeling which led them to adopt this course by so hard a name. We repeat it, we have seen this course preferred when every assurance was given that the directors of the American Education Society would not oppress or injure them. We must say, candidly, that instances of this kind first led us to doubt of the propriety of the system adopted by this society, and to examine more minutely than we had previously done, the tendency and bearings of the whole plan. That it promotes the strength and energy of a young man's character to bring him to submit entirely to the direction of other men, to bind himself so that he must be subservient to their wishes, however wise and good they may be esteemed, we must still be permitted to doubt.

Enough, we think, has already been said in our former remarks, to show that bonds resting on a man after he enters the ministry, can have no very happy tendency.

We cannot think, as seems to be suggested in the last part of the extract from the eleventh annual report, that giving money in the way of loans is the most effectual method of preventing men of ambitious or worldly minds from entering the church; and in this way endangering her purity and safety. There are men of grovelling minds, mean enough

to submit to any thing, in order to accomplish their object. We should think that the door was not opened very wide, and that no very strong temptations of this kind were held out, when Judas entered. Caution, watchfulness, and the pressing continually and solemnly on the consciences of men wishing to enter the holy ministry their responsibility to God, is, in our opinion, a much greater security for the purity and safety of the church than loans secured by bonds,

Near the bottom of page 39 the writer commences his answer to the objections which we have made to the American Education Society, on account of its organization, and the power which, in consequence of its permanent funds and system of loans, this mode of organization is calculated to throw into the hands of a few. His first remark is, that much which we have said under this head depends for its effect upon our objections to the loaning system. And "that if these fail of being supported, the remarks growing merely out of them can have no weight."

It is true, the power of the society is very intimately connected with the system of loans. In one respect, also; we admit, these loans are less formidable than they were three months ago, in consequence of the resolution of the board of directors, that the monies returned should be pledged to the branch societies from which they were originally derived.

This was indeed a most alarming feature of the system, but our other objections to the loaning system, and they are not a few, remain unremoved. We have stated them elsewhere, and we shall not now repeat them.

But without intending to excite sectarian jealousies, or intimating any want of confidence in the integrity and benevolent intentions of those who have the management of this concern, we must be permitted to remark that the bonds of ministers aided by the American Education Society are in the hands of the parent board; that they can demand and compel payment when they think proper. Now, is it safe, is it proper, that the temporal interests of any one church should be in the hands of those who have no connexion with that church, or who, at least, are not responsible to her tribunals? We put this question, not from any want of confidence in the board of directors. Our opinion of them is not changed since we published the first article on this subject. Let it be considered coolly and answered candidly: would the gentlemen concerned like to be themselves dependent, or to

have their brethren of the same theological opinions and ecclesiastical connexion dependent, as to their worldly interests, on a board of episcopalians or baptists, or reformed Dutch or presbyterians? It can hardly be denied that a board of intelligent, liberal and pious men might be selected from any one of these denominations. Why should we be charged with exciting sectarian jealousies, if we lay before those of our own communion objections to a union with the American Education Society? Why are our congregations invited and urged to form such a connexion? Why be grieved and offended if any one say that these bonds may one day become a snare, and at the same time explicitly declare that he believes those who now have the management have no such intention? But the money returned is now pledged to the branches from which it was originally derived, and this "removes even the semblance of an objection." But is there not another way by which the parent society, consistently with the constitution and rules, may have the distribution of this money returned? The branch may draw for it, and it goes into their contingent fund, and consequently increases the sum for current expenses, and renders it probable that there will be a surplus at the end of the year. This surplus goes to the parent board at least once a year. The branch may ask for aid when needed, and the parent board may determine whether it is convenient to grant it. See Art. 13 of the constitution. In page 40 several facts are stated with a view to show that there is no danger of "the accumulation of power in the hands of a few in consequence of monies refunded, and the income of permanent scholarships." The first fact is, "that all moneys refunded form part of the contingent, and not of the permanent fund: and they are therefore expended as fast as received. Of course there can be no accumulation from this source, any more than from any other contingent fund." From this declaration we understand that it is and has been the practice of the board to place into the contingent fund moneys refunded, yet we have no document in our possession which shows that this is a fundamental and permanent rule.

It will be recollected that we have not undertaken to show that the board had abused their power; but merely that, consistently with the constitution and rules, the board, as the organ of the society, had immense power, and that they might increase their permanent funds to an indefinite extent

by adding to them the money returned, and that received from other sources; and so become independent and carry on their operations in defiance of the whole christian community. And unless we greatly err, the second article of the constitution gives the directors this power. It is as follows, viz.

“ A permanent fund shall be formed of bequests, legacies, donations and grants thus appropriated by the donors, and of any other property of the society, as the directors may think best calculated to promote the object in view.”

Here we see no limitation to the accumulation of permanent funds. And if the directors have not thought fit to exercise the power given them, what is there to prevent them or their successors from doing so at some future period?

In the same connexion the writer states the comparative smallness of the present permanent funds of the American Education Society. We have no information on this subject, except that given in the pamphlet before us. We have made some efforts to find the treasurer's last report, and also that of the directors, but have hitherto been unsuccessful.

In the comparison instituted between the amount of money belonging to scholarships in the Theological Seminary at Princeton, and the money in the hands of the American Education Society for the same object, we think an error has been committed. It is taken as certain, that all the money pledged to the seminary has been actually paid, and is productive, which is not the fact; while only the money *received* by the treasurer of the American Education Society is estimated. If, in both cases, the calculation were made in the same way, the result of the comparison would be very different. The funds of the seminary would appear less, and those of the American Education Society greater than they now do. In May 1828, besides permanent funds, sixty-eight permanent and about an hundred temporary scholarships were reported as held by the society. It is supposed that some additional subscriptions have been obtained since that time. But these matters are unimportant. It is from the provision made in the constitution for increasing the permanent funds and scholarships to any extent, together with the fact that the bonds of all the ministers in the United States educated by that society and its branches are in the hands of the directors, and may be put in suit whenever they please, that we apprehend danger.

In the course of this discussion the comparative safety of funds in the hands of the General Assembly, and in those of the American Education Society, has been brought into view. This point is discussed in pages 42, 43 and 44, of the Postscript: and the writer, by an analysis of the constitution of the Presbyterian church, endeavours to show that the congregations, composed of all who hold pews and contribute to the maintainance of divine service in any way, i. e. the world, do virtually elect the General Assembly. We must be permitted to say, that in arriving at this conclusion, the writer left entirely out of view one very remarkable feature in the constitution of the Presbyterian church in the United States. It is this: every presbytery judges of the qualifications of its own members; and what is the result? If a congregation choose a pastor, who, in the opinion of the presbytery, is heretical, or otherwise unfit for his office, the presbytery refuses to ordain or install him: and if the congregation persist in its choice, they must become independent, and consequently have no influence in the judicatories of the Presbyterian church, and cannot be members of the Assembly. And farther, if a presbytery become corrupt, it is amenable to its synod, and to the General Assembly, and may be cast off as easily as single members. These provisions are not a dead letter. They take effect every year to a less or greater extent. It generally, indeed, happens, that when a presbytery refuses to receive a pastor elect, the congregation, confiding in the more enlightened judgment of the presbytery or synod, desists and chooses another pastor; but if not, they cease to have any connexion with the presbytery. This, also, is a provision which no civil legislature can touch, until they are prepared to say that we shall not worship God in our own way. It has no connexion with secular interests, as was the case in Massachusetts, when the legislature took from the church her ancient right of choosing a pastor, or of having a veto on the vote of the congregation.

We do not contend that the General Assembly or its Board of Education is incorruptible; like every thing managed by human hands, the admirable organization of that body may be destroyed. Still we think that funds, according to human probability, are much safer in the hands of a body thus organized, than with a corporation where eleven corrupt men may, consistently with its constitution, get the management of the whole concern.

But it is not necessary that the Board of Education should have large permanent funds, and if our views be followed, this will never be the case. Such an arrangement may be made, that individuals and congregations and presbyteries will engage to contribute a certain sum annually, or found temporary scholarships, while the board will be a centre of union and action, and the agent in distributing these contributions to those places where they are needed.

Having already been more tedious than we anticipated, we omit noticing several subordinate parts of the Postscript, believing that the reader, if satisfied with our answer to the principal arguments, will find no difficulty with any thing that we have passed over.

In conclusion, we cannot refrain from expressing a hope that a large portion of our readers, whatever they may think of the force of our objection to the principles and organization of the American Education Society, will not condemn the course which we have taken in bringing this subject before the christian public. It is one of vast and lasting importance. It concerns the best interests of the present age and of posterity. If there be any reason to apprehend the dangers we have pointed out, the sooner measures are taken to avert them the better. The interests of the great society of which we have spoken may soon become so involved with the concerns of every branch of the church, that it may be impossible to separate the one from the other. If these dangers did not, in our opinion, threaten that part of the christian community with which we are connected, we should have been silent. But this being the fact, we felt ourselves called on to let our voice, however feeble, be heard. It was indeed with no feigned reluctance that we published a syllable on this subject. To differ from brethren whom we respect and love, whom we believe to be honest in their great exertions and labours to do good, brethren with whom we agree in all essential views of evangelical truth, and with whom we are happy to co-operate, and do co-operate, in other efforts to evangelize the world, is no light matter. We commenced not without feeling the painfulness of the task, and the same conviction of duty which induced us to begin, has led us to reply to the strictures on our principles.

We consider ourselves as acting in self-defence, and not carrying the warfare into a foreign territory. The system we oppose was making rapid progress in various parts of the

Presbyterian church; and we considered it not only our right, but also our duty, to point out the dangers which appeared to our mind, so that if evils did follow, we might not hereafter accuse ourselves of a criminal silence.

The friends of the American Education Society cannot be more fully persuaded than we are of the importance and necessity of the general object. Yet we cannot reconcile it to our views of duty to use any means and all means to attain even the most desirable end. We should rather proceed by safer, though apparently slower steps.

T