

THE  
BIBLICAL REPERTORY  
AND  
THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

---

JANUARY, 1831.

---

ART. I.—REVIEW OF WOODS ON INSPIRATION.

*Lectures on the Inspiration of the Scriptures, by Leonard Woods, D.D., Abbot Professor of Christian Theology in the Theological Seminary, Andover.* Published and sold by Mark Newman. Flagg & Gould, printers. pp. 152.

THIS little volume, written on a subject of great importance and no small difficulty, deserves the serious attention of theological students, and of all others who are solicitous to understand the true grounds of evidence on which our religion stands. Commonly, no distinction is made between the authenticity and the inspiration of the New Testament; whereas, the proof of the former does not necessarily involve that of the latter, and accordingly, many believe in the authenticity and divine origin of the New Testament, who utterly reject the doctrine of inspiration. They believe that the scriptures contain a true revelation from God, and consequently that somebody must have been commissioned to make known the Divine will; but they deny that the persons who wrote the books of the New Testament were under an infallible guidance in making those compositions; acknowledging that they were men of integrity, who delivered the truth according to the best of their knowledge and ability; yet subject to the usual prejudices and mistakes which are common to men.

ART. V.—REVIEW OF PROFESSOR STUART'S LETTER  
TO WILLIAM E. CHANNING, D. D.

*A Letter to William E. Channing, D. D. on the subject of Religious Liberty. By Moses Stuart, Professor of Sacred Literature in the Theological Seminary, Andover. Boston, Perkins & Marvin, printers, pp. 52.*

THE Unitarian controversy began in this country in the year 1815. It was occasioned by the publication of a pamphlet, entitled, "American Unitarianism, or a brief survey of the progress and present state of the Unitarian Churches in America." The late Mr. Belsham, of London, in his *Life of Theophilus Lindsey*, drew up this view of "American Unitarianism," from documents furnished by some gentlemen of Boston. The Rev. Dr. Morse, then of Charlestown, republished this part of Mr. Belsham's works, in the United States; and thereby subjected himself to great odium, on the part of some of his neighbours.

But we have no room here for even a sketch of the history of Unitarianism in our country. Our only object is to show that Dr. Channing, from an early period down to the present time, has been engaged in this controversy. The publication adverted to above, produced a correspondence between him and the late excellent Dr. Worcester, of Salem. This resulted in the exposure of a system, which had long been kept in concealment.

In 1819, Dr. Channing, at the ordination of Mr. Sparks, of Baltimore, preached a sermon, in which he gave a view of Unitarianism as a distinct and peculiar religious creed. The publication of this sermon drew forth a series of letters, addressed to the author, by Professor Stuart, of Andover. These letters were reviewed, but not answered; the controversy was continued by Dr. Woods, also of Andover, and by Dr. Ware, of Cambridge, until the year 1823. In these cases, it was generally thought that the Unitarians gained nothing in the argument.

In 1826, Dr. Channing preached a sermon at the dedication of the Second Congregational Church, (as it is called) in New York. This sermon was also published. Its design was to

show the superiority of Unitarianism to Orthodoxy, in its moral tendency. It was ably reviewed by an anonymous writer in 1827.

It is sufficient for our present purpose, to state further, that Dr. Channing, in the course of the present year, has published a uniform edition of his writings, and also a sermon preached by him at the "General Election" in Boston, May, 1830. Of this last discourse, our readers may form a just opinion, from extracts given in the pamphlet under review.

This brief statement will show, that Dr. Channing has entered largely into that controversy, which has for some years disturbed the tranquillity of Boston and its vicinity, and has excited an interest among Christians in all parts of the country. We wish it also to be understood, that Dr. Channing is regarded as the leader of Unitarians in the United States. He is greatly celebrated by his party; and he himself assumes before the world, the character of a man of enlarged thought and liberal feeling; of various learning and refined taste. It is no part of our present business to determine the validity of these claims. We only say, that a man who stands on narrow ground, in a high place, ought to "order well his steps," and "take heed lest he fall."

But like other men, raised far above their original aspirations, this great man seems to have lost both his prudence and his equanimity; and often betrays unexpected irascibility and bitterness of spirit. He ought to remember his own claim as the most liberal of all liberal Christians. Who would expect Dr. Channing so far to forget himself, as to adopt that *art of controversy*, which consists in making his adversary odious, instead of proving him to be in error? But this he has done. After having unsuccessfully tried his strength in argument, he has fixed his name to the charge, made in the most public manner, that Orthodox Christians in Massachusetts, *are designing and plotting the overthrow of religious liberty, the suppression of free inquiry, and the establishment of ecclesiastical tyranny.* The charge, indeed, has not even the poor merit of originality. It is taken up by the champion of Unitarianism, after it had become stale by repetition: it is taken from the mouths of open and avowed enemies of Christianity; and used, as we think, as a very culpable expedient to cover the disgrace of discomfiture. Or, if it is too much to say that Dr. Channing felt himself defeated, we shall be compelled to charge him with the use of poisoned weapons against

an adversary, whom he had not vanquished in open and fair warfare.

That any thing has ever been done by the orthodox men of Massachusetts, to excuse or palliate such a charge as this, we utterly deny. We certainly are not prepared to vindicate, in all cases, the manner in which they have conducted the controversy between themselves and the Unitarians. But, as far as we have seen, the *matter* of controversy, and not the manner, is the *chief* subject of complaint. The great question is this; are the men who deny the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures, the total depravity of human nature, the divinity of our Lord, the personality and divinity of the Holy Ghost, the vicarious sufferings and atonement of Christ, regeneration and sanctification by the Holy Spirit, justification by faith, and the eternal punishment of the finally impenitent, to be reckoned Christians or not? The Unitarians affirm, and the Orthodox deny. This denial is the great cause of dissatisfaction and complaint. The Orthodox have never withheld personal civilities and kindness, have never brought their religious disputes into politics. The whole controversy has been one entirely of a religious character; it concerns only religious opinion and practice. Decisive proof of this is found in the fact, that although a decided majority of the people of Massachusetts are Orthodox, the government of the State has, for some years, been confessedly in the hands of Unitarians.

It is true that loud complaints have been heard, that the venerable college of the State, although chiefly founded by orthodox men, for the express purpose of promoting orthodox sentiments is entirely in possession of Unitarians. But these complaints have been made chiefly, if not entirely, on the ground that Harvard University has been employed for sectarian purposes; and has indeed been used as an instrument of proselytism. The fact is undeniable. Is the public statement of this fact one ground of Dr. Channing's charge?

It was remarked above, that Dr. Channing had repeated the accusations of the avowed enemies of Christianity. As long as these accusations were anonymous, no man of any character thought them worthy of notice. But the case is greatly changed, when a gentleman of distinguished reputation, comes forward before the public as an accuser, and virtually pledges himself for the truth of the charge. He must be held either to produce his proof, or to retract.

We wish it, however, to be understood, that if Dr. Chan-

ning, after convincing himself that the principles and practice of his orthodox neighbours tend to produce the evil alleged, had only endeavoured, by fair argument, to produce the same convictions in the minds of others, *we* should have found nothing to censure in his *conduct*, whatever we might have thought of the soundness of his reasoning. But he alleges it to be a *fact*, that hostility to free inquiry is the motive, and the destruction of religious liberty is the object of his theological opponents. What a specimen of liberality!

Professor Stuart felt that he was called on to notice grave charges, thus publicly made by one whose *dictum* goes for proof among the whole body of *liberal men*, whether Christians or Infidels, in this country. His letter to Dr. Channing is now before us. It is our duty to put our readers fairly in possession of its contents; and it is our privilege to offer such remarks as the occasion seems to demand.

In the first place, Professor Stuart takes even unnecessary pains to prove that Dr. Channing does, distinctly, and in strong terms, make these very serious charges against Orthodox Christians in Massachusetts. Perhaps he supposed that many persons would be slow to believe, without very abundant evidence, that a man so exceedingly liberal as the Unitarian Doctor, would prefer such accusations; and prefer them too, against those very men whose acknowledgment of him as a *Christian brother*, he has for a long time most earnestly desired.

It may be observed, as well in this place as any where else, that such are the matter and form of Dr. Channing's accusations, that they include all *sincere* Trinitarians throughout the country, and especially all who go under the name of Calvinists, to whatsoever denomination they may belong. The charge, virtually, involves at least one half of the Christian population of the United States.

In justification of our own remarks, as well as of those which we shall quote from Professor Stuart, we give the following extracts from the writings of Dr. Channing:

"It is said, that, in this country, where the rights of private judgment and of speaking and writing according to our convictions, are guaranteed with every solemnity by institutions and laws, religion can never degenerate into tyranny; that here its whole influence must conspire to the liberation and dignity of the mind? I answer, we discover little knowledge of human nature, if we ascribe to constitutions the power of charming to sleep the spirit of intolerance and exclusion. Almost every other bad pas-

sion may sooner be put to rest; and for this plain reason, that intolerance always shelters itself under the name and garb of religious zeal. Because we live in a country, where the gross, outward, visible chain is broken, we must not conclude that we are necessarily free. There are chains not made of iron, which eat more deeply into the soul. An espionage of bigotry may as effectually close our lips and chill our hearts, as an armed and hundred-eyed police. There are countless ways by which men in a free country may encroach on their neighbour's rights. In religion the instrument is ready made and always at hand. I refer to opinion, combined and organized in sects, and swayed by the clergy. We say we have no Inquisition. But a sect, skilfully organized, trained to utter one cry, combined to cover with reproach whoever may differ from themselves, to drown the free expression of opinion by denunciations of heresy, and to strike terror into the multitude by joint and perpetual menace,—such a sect is as perilous and palsying to the intellect as the Inquisition. It serves the minister as effectually as the sword. The present age is notoriously sectarian, and therefore hostile to liberty.” pp. 25—28 of his Election Sermon.

“I know that the suggestion of persecution will be indignantly repelled by those, who deal most largely in denunciation. But persecution is a wrong or injury inflicted for opinions; and surely assaults on character fall under this definition. Some persons seem to think, that persecution consists in pursuing error with fire and sword; and that therefore it has ceased to exist, except in distempered imaginations, because no class of Christians among us is armed with those terrible weapons. But no. The form is changed, but the spirit lives. Persecution has given up its halberd and fagot, but it breathes venom from its lips, and secretly blasts what it cannot openly destroy.”—pp. 561, 562 of Discourses.

“Another important consideration is, that this system of excluding men of apparent sincerity, for their opinions, entirely subverts free inquiry into the scriptures. When once a particular system is surrounded by this bulwark; when once its defenders have brought the majority to believe, that the rejection of it is a mark of depravity and perdition, what but the name of liberty is left to Christians? The obstacles to inquiry are as real, and may be as powerful, as in the neighborhood of the Inquisition. The multitude dare not think, and the thinking dare not speak. The right of private judgment may thus, in a Protestant country, be reduced to a nullity. It is true, that men are sent to the scriptures; but they are told before they go, that they will be driven from the church on earth and in heaven, unless they find in the scriptures the doctrines which are embodied in the popular creed.

They are told, indeed, to inquire for themselves; but they are also told, at what points inquiry must arrive; and the sentence of exclusion hangs over them, if they happen to stray, with some of the best and wisest men, into forbidden paths. Now this 'Protestant liberty' is, in one respect, more irritating than Papal bondage. It mocks as well as enslaves us. It talks to us courteously as friends and brethren, whilst it rivets our chains. It invites and even charges us to look with our own eyes, but with the same breath warns us against seeing any thing which Orthodox eyes have not seen before us. Is this a state of things favorable to serious inquiry into the truths of the gospel; yet, how long has the church been groaning under this cruel yoke."

"To oppose what I deemed error was to me a secondary consideration. My first duty, as I believed, was, to maintain practically and resolutely the rights of the human mind; to live and to suffer, if to suffer were necessary, for that intellectual and religious liberty, which I prize incomparably more than any civil rights. I felt myself called, not merely to plead in general for freedom of thought and speech, but, what was more important and trying, to assert this freedom by action. I should have felt myself disloyal to truth and freedom, had I confined myself to vague commonplaces about our rights, and forbore to bear my testimony expressly and specially to proscribed and persecuted opinions. The times required that a voice of strength and courage should be lifted up, and I rejoice, that I was found among those by whom it was uttered and sent far and wide"—pp. vii. viii. of the Preface.

Such are the charges. There is no doubt as to the persons against whom they are brought. To save appearances, indeed, Dr. Channing occasionally throws in words of kindness and professions of liberal feeling. But these are only drops of sweet in bowls of bitterness. We, in common with Professor Stuart, feel no obligation to the Doctor for these little morsels, sparingly dealt out, while he is pouring on us the vials of his wrath.

Professor Stuart, however, feels that he has as good a right to maintain the doctrine which the pilgrim fathers taught to their children, as Dr. Channing has to assail them. And he very justly thinks that the time has not yet come, when any individual, however exalted in his own view or that of his party, can, by sweeping denunciations and fierce accusations, crush all who venture to oppose him. (p. 11.) He also suggests, that the Unitarian Doctor committed a great mistake in supposing himself to be the man whose word is to put down orthodoxy. We remember to have heard a rumour, some two

years ago, that Dr. Channing had said, *Orthodoxy must be put down*. And we should not be surprised to learn, that, in the Unitarian Association, every speech of certain grave and reverend seigniors has, for a long time, been concluded with the declaration of unmitigated and unappeasable hostility—*delenda est Carthago*. But Dr. Channing ought to know, that of those martyrs on whose "heroic spirit" he looks "with solemn joy," nine hundred and ninety-nine in a thousand held the very opinions which he regards with utter scorn and abhorrence. They felt the power of those truths which he treats as fables. It was the constraining influence of the *redeeming love of Christ* which bore them through the flames in their way up to Heaven. Fire could not consume this spirit: the wheel could not break it. It yet lives. And Dr. Channing's voice, even if it were lifted up with the strength and tone of a trumpet, could not put it down.

Professor Stuart sums up, in few words, the charges brought against him and his brethren.

"We are accused of a settled design to invade the religious liberties of this community, and to force upon them, sooner or later, a creed which was framed in the dark ages, and is worthy only of them. We are charged with an intention to erect *ecclesiastical courts*, which, like the Inquisition of old, are by terror and compulsion to bring this whole Commonwealth to one uniform system of religious doctrine."

The professor then places himself at the bar of the public, and put in his plea. It is a plea of *non est factum*; a denial entirely, both of the fact and the intention. But instead of a bare denial, the accused puts in a *special plea*, containing a statement, in detail, of his principles, and (by implication) of his actions, in regard to the matter alleged by the prosecutor.\* We here give the general heads:

"1. *We hold that every individual has a perfect right to examine and decide for himself, what his own religious sentiments or creed shall be.*

"2. *We not only believe that all men should be left free to form their religious opinions, without any civil penalties or disabilities, but we maintain most fully, that when the religious sentiments of any one are formed, he has a right to propagate them, to defend them, and to support them, by his efforts, his pen, his property, or his influence.*"

\* *Accuser* would be the better word; because, although Dr. Channing has brought his accusation, he has not *appeared* to make good his charges.

In the course of his particular statements, Professor Stuart, without at all going out of his way, retorts on his accuser with a force and pungency which must be felt by the most heated partisan. After maintaining his right to defend and propagate his religious opinions by all fair arguments, he says:

"In your view, it appears to be altogether commendable, that Unitarians should deluge the community with Improved Versions, with the works of Fellowes, and Belsham, and Priestley, and Cappe, and others of the like character; that they should form themselves into Tract Societies and distribute hundreds of thousands of Unitarian tracts, assailing the sentiments of the Orthodox openly, or secretly undermining the principles which they regard as of vital importance; that they should form Missionary Societies and endeavour not only to spread their principles among the Hindoos and cooperate with Rammoliun Roy, but to traverse the regions of the West and South in our own land, and forestall the efforts of the Orthodox there; that they should hold public meetings, in which not only the clergy, but legislators, civilians, and judges from the highest seat of justice, come forward and excite the multitude against Orthodoxy; that they should issue periodicals monthly, weekly, and almost daily, in which the public are warned against the *Inquisition* that is forming among them, and the desperate set of bigots who are forging chains for their religious liberty; that they should declaim against these men and their principles, (their alleged or supposed principles,) from one Sabbath to another, (in which you above all others, unless you are very croneously represented, have taken the lead;) all this, and much more of the same nature, is not only lawful in your eyes, but altogether commendable. In public and in private, from the pulpit and the press, you have not ceased to urge on, with all your eloquence, measures of this and the like nature.

"But turn now the tablet, and look at the other side of the picture. When the Orthodox publish their books, tracts and periodicals, they are represented as bigots and as raving mad. They have neither modesty nor humility. When they associate for the purposes of friendly conference and in counsel, and in order to strengthen each other's hands, and to encourage each other to walk in the way of their forefathers, they are plotting in order to enclose the community in the toils of the *Inquisition*; they are forming "*ECCLESIASTICAL COURTS*," before which all liberal-minded men, that choose to think and investigate for themselves, are sooner or later to be brought, and to be made to know that there is *only one* way of thinking which is to be tolerated. And since such high crimes and misdemeanors as these have been laid to their charge, the public are told, that "the times have required a *voice of STRENGTH*

and COURAGE to be lifted up ; and you rejoice that YOU are found among those by whom it has been uttered and sent far and wide." (Preface, p. vii.) Not a movement can they make, but they are suspected of forging manacles for the Liberalists, or at least of looking up the iron to make them with. The forges, to be sure, are under ground and out of sight, like the shops of the fabled Cyclops ; but you know, as the neighbours of these famous blacksmiths of old did, that *operations* are going on, for you hear the strokes."

It is then asked, and there seems to be an occasion for the repetition, why the Orthodox have not as good a right to maintain and propagate their sentiments, as Unitarians have? Dr. Channing has put his case in such a manner, that he is bound to answer the question.

If he says that no man has a right to defend and propagate bigotry, he, in very offensive terms, assumes what he has not proved. It is indeed, no new thing, for Unitarians to charge Trinitarians with bigotry. But Dr. Channing and his allies have been often enough in conflict with such men as Professor Stuart, to know that they do neither adopt religious opinions without a pretty careful examination, nor hold them, without being able to give a "reason." And that they claim, and mean to exercise the right of defending them, is now sufficiently manifest. They could not, otherwise, maintain a good conscience. The right so to do, must be conceded: but Dr. Channing will, perhaps, object to the manner in which it has been done. This, however, is by no means the point of his accusation. He alleges that his neighbours have dark, selfish, and malignant purposes; that they are determined to introduce compulsion in matters of religion, a compulsion worse than the Inquisition, with all its terrors and torments. This is a crime of enormous turpitude: and it is a poor shift for the accuser to whip around the difficulty of producing proof, by saying that he means to censure the *manner* of his adversaries.

But as for the manner itself, Professor Stuart, with commendable frankness, and genuine liberality, concedes every thing which ought to be conceded by a gentleman and a Christian. He does himself and his cause great honour by the following expression of truly Christian feelings:

"Next, as to the *manner* itself, I have but few remarks to make. I am ready to concede on my part, that I have seen and read things among the Orthodox, the manner of which I in some respects heartily disapproved. I have never thought, that to rail at our op-

ponents was either Christian or courteous. Above all, every reflecting man must say, Nothing can be more improbable, than that this kind of proceeding will be likely to convince those who differ from us. Who will hear us with patience, when we begin our reproof by letting him know that we think him either a fool or a knave?

“I am not blinded to this by party zeal. I have seen some of it among those whom I warmly love and greatly respect. Perhaps I may have shown some of this same disposition in my own writings. If so, produce it, and I will tread that part under my feet, and make my atonement by unfeigned sorrow to an injured public, and to the injured cause of Christ. But if I have indulged in such a mode of writing, I am unconscious of it to myself. I disapprove it; I even abhor it; and yet I know that I am not proof against temptation, and that I am exposed to all the weaknesses and faults of those around me.”

But it was due to the cause which he defends, to add the following very just, and, considering the provocation, very temperate reproof:

“I know of nothing in any recent Orthodox publications, which can well compare with the reiterated charges against us by Unitarians, from the pulpit and the press, of bigotry, of gloomy superstition, of dark and fraudulent designs on the religious liberties of our country, of worshipping a God who is a tyrant, of propagating horrible and blasphemous ideas of the Divinity, of worshipping a God who is no better than the devil, of an intention to renew the horrors of the Inquisition, of being gloomy, unsocial, illiterate misanthropes, enthusiasts, hypocrites, deceivers, and other things of the like nature. It were easy to substantiate this charge by abundance of evidence; and this too, from publications which you yourself patronise by your pen, your purse, and your approbation.”

All intention, however, of defending harshness and severity, even under great provocation, is expressly disclaimed. But, when Orthodox men are excited by angry denunciations and bitter scorn, Professor Stuart thinks that Dr. Channing is the last man in the world who is entitled to load them with reproaches. And he does not see that the Doctor, or any of his partisans has a right to say, “I will have unbounded liberty of speaking, writing and acting, in order to propagate my sentiments, but the Orthodox cannot claim the same liberty for themselves.”

Then follows a charge against the Unitarians, to which we have already referred, and which, we should think, would be felt by every one in Massachusetts, whose ingenuous feelings

have not been consumed by party zeal. The University of Harvard was founded by Orthodox men, and consecrated to the support of those religious opinions, which were dearer than life to its founders. And yet, by a course of secret management and unworthy artifice, it has become an entirely sectarian institution. It is regarded as the strong hold of Unitarianism; and all its rich endowments and its influence, are employed in the advancement of a cause, which the pious founder of the institution regarded with utter abhorrence. We choose to present this subject in the words of Professor Stuart:

“ We have rights in a University which is the property of the *whole* State, and was not founded or exclusively endowed by Unitarians; at least we have such rights, so long as we are not absolutely disfranchised. We have a right to expect that the property of the State in such an establishment, should not be appropriated to the purposes of a party; and that the instructors in them should not give their services to one sect only, which has in *fact*, although not in name, excluded all others from any participation with them in these privileges. We who have children to educate, in common with our fellow citizens, feel the loss of such rights. We cannot help deeply feeling them; for we are obliged to send our children abroad, at a great expense, in order to avoid their becoming partizans in the present warfare against our own sentiments. We do not complain that our sentiments are opposed; but we complain that they are opposed in this way, and at the sacrifice of rights that we hold dear and deem sacred. We do not complain that Unitarians build up seminaries for themselves, in order to educate young men to spread abroad and defend their own sentiments; they have an entire right to build up schools, colleges, or theological seminaries of this kind, and to confine their privileges to their own body. The Bill of Rights assures them of this privilege. But they should remember, that it assures us of the same. What we complain of is, that an Institution which belongs in common to the whole State, which was founded and endowed to a large extent by Orthodox men, and consecrated to maintaining their faith, should now be made exclusively a party seminary, so that from the President down to the janitor, no man of *known* Orthodox sentiments, can find access there as an instructor. We complain that rights public and common, should be seized by one exclusive party, and appropriated to their own purposes; that teachers, maintained at the expense of the Commonwealth, should be devoted to a seminary exclusively Unitarian, and paid from a fund in which the Orthodox have a common interest. Of all this we complain; but never shall or can

complain, that Unitarians manage their *own* Seminaries entirely in their own way ; provided always that they concede to us the same liberty.

“ Look now for a moment on this whole case, and put yourself in our place. Would you not feel, could you help feeling, that you had to deal with those, who being in possession of power forget right ? And yet, Sir, you are not only looking on, but heartily approving of all this, and have yourself been an efficient agent in bringing it about. How can it be that there is only one side to such a question ? ”

Professor Stuart, in his plea, takes notice, in the next place, of the reproach brought on the Orthodox, for separating from the religious communion of the Unitarians. In our honest opinion, this reproach would not be uttered, if the Unitarians were not a minority ; and did not feel that this separation is injurious to their interests as a party. Indeed, we cannot be brought to believe that, if they constituted a large majority of the community, and were free from all anxiety about consequences, they would wish to hold communion with their Orthodox neighbours. Our opinion is founded on the manner in which these *liberal christians* speak of the religious opinions and worship of the Orthodox. They say that the Deity worshipped by them is a devil ; that their religion is a strange compound of jarring attributes, bearing plain marks of those ages of darkness, when Christianity shed a faint ray, and the diseased fancy teemed with prodigies and unnatural creations : that one of the fundamental articles of their faith is a riddle ; that they have fallen into some of the grossest errors ; and that their creed is unfavourable to piety, &c. &c. Do Unitarians wish to hold communion with the professors of such a religion as this ? Is Dr. Channing desirous to fraternize with men engaged in dark designs to destroy freedom of inquiry, and crush all religious liberty ? But however this may be, Professor Stuart has placed the subject of separation in a fair point of view. The Orthodox do sincerely believe, that certain doctrines are essential to the Christian religion ; that is, Christianity cannot exist without them. What these doctrines are, has always been a subject of careful inquiry with the Orthodox ; and their opinions are founded on conviction. So at least, they affirm. The Unitarians, then, must believe them to be hypocrites, or wish them to act the part of hypocrites ; that is, openly acknowledge men to be *Christians*, whom they sincerely believe *not to be such*. If they believe them to be

hypocrites, this is a precious specimen of their liberality: if they wish them to act the part of hypocrites, it is an equally precious specimen of religious honesty. But after all, perhaps they only wish the Orthodox to become Unitarians! And zeal for their conversion produces all this bitterness.

The general principle, that there are doctrines *essential* to Christianity, as we have explained the term essential, will surely be admitted by the most liberal Christian: for if not, how absurd is the distinction between *Christians* and *Jews*, *Mahometans* and *Hindoos*! If Unitarians say that they hold these essential doctrines, and ought therefore to be acknowledged among the *faithful*; the Orthodox reply, that they are sincerely and conscientiously of a widely different opinion. They so understand the scriptures, that they cannot admit to Christian fellowship those who deny inspiration, depravity, the atonement and divinity of Christ, regeneration, &c. And what would their accusers have? Do they demand the surrender of most deliberate opinions, to interpretations of scripture believed to be erroneous, and to reasonings believed to be inconclusive? Where then would be Christian liberty? Unless Orthodox men, therefore, will submit to Dr. Channing's dictation, they must bear his reproaches and denunciations.

It is no complaint of the Orthodox that Unitarians separate from them. That liberty is fully conceded. Nor do they separate from Unitarians in any thing but Christian communion. They are perfectly willing to keep up all the kindly intercourse of social life; they contribute to their civil and political honour; and rejoice in their happiness. All this they do, and no one can deny it. In religion, however, there is a painful separation. It is made under a deep sense of responsibility to the Head of the Church; and the Orthodox can never surrender the right of making it. And now, where is the ground of accusation against them as enemies of religious liberty and free inquiry? What right have Unitarians to assume a lofty air, as though with them every thing were just and right, noble and liberal; while every thing among Orthodox men is bigoted and narrow minded, furious and persecuting? Who is to believe such extravagant and arrogant assumptions?

Professor Stuart next sums up the charges already made, and then adduces others made in a still fiercer tone. The amount of the whole is expressed in these words:

“ You have given your name to the world as the author of accu-

sations, that we are aiming to subvert and destroy the religious liberty of this Commonwealth; that we are combined to put down all free inquiry in matters of religion; that we are endeavoring, in secret and openly, to introduce an ecclesiastical tyranny worse than that of the Inquisition; that we are determined to raise up Ecclesiastical Courts to try, condemn, and punish all whom we deem to be heretics; and thus to prevent all right of private judgment, and all freedom in respect to religious opinion."

He then hurls defiance directly in the teeth of his accuser, and declares before heaven and earth that these charges *are not true*. To himself and his brethren as injured men, injured in a manner highly unjust and cruel, he calls on Dr. Channing to make reparation: and if not, to support his charges by clear, unequivocal evidence. They are alleged *as matters of fact*; and Dr. Channing *MUST either support them or retract*. These things have been borne in silence long enough. Grievous accusations have been repeated until some begin to think them true; and Dr. Channing has gone on unquestioned as to these matters, until he appears to think that he may vent his vehement and scornful denunciations, and "not a bird will move the wing, or open the mouth, or peep." But there are bounds beyond which the most meek and patient will not carry their forbearance. Thousands of men have been slandered and abused by Dr. Channing's assertions; and he is required to come out now with his proof or his retraction. *One or the other he must do*. Dr. CHANNING must do it, both because he has put his name to the charge, and because he stands before the world as the leader of Unitarianism in this country. And he may rely on it, that he will be held to the obligation which he has brought on himself. No man in our republic, however elevated by his own talents, or the zeal of his partisans, may bring injurious and heavy charges against even the most humble individual, and then refuse to bring his proofs, because, forsooth, it is inconsistent with his dignity; much less may whole communities be calumniated, without evidence to support the accusation.

Professor Stuart strongly disavows even the suspicion of intentional falsehood on the part of his accuser. But his sincerity, so far from lessening, increases the injury. Anonymous accusations pass for so little among the wise, that men engaged in a great work cannot notice them. But Dr. Channing is a man and a writer for whom Professor Stuart entertains a high respect. He does not, indeed, admit the claim to "perfect

liberality," put in for him by the *North American Review*; and he does not think that the *Edinburgh Quarterly* has done him justice. But in proportion to the reputation of the accuser is the injury inflicted by his false charges. And as an instance in point, Professor Stuart notices the retailings by certain periodicals published in our own neighborhood, of accusations found in the writings of Dr. Channing.

There is also a distinct disavowal of ill will towards the accuser, and of intention to excite hostility against him. Feelings and motives of this kind are held to be inconsistent with the Christian character. But when such men as Professor Stuart and his friends are charged with enormous crimes, with nothing less, indeed, than a conspiracy against the dearest liberties of their country, they cannot be true to themselves and their cause, without demanding that the charge should be either substantiated or denied.

Professor Stuart further remarks, that the Orthodox Christians of Massachusetts have no secrets in their plans and designs. They believe that the scriptures are the sufficient and only rule of faith and practice; they agree in heart and soul, in all the great doctrines of the Reformation, because they find them in the Bible. They are Calvinists; they claim to be *true* sons of the Pilgrims, because they have examined the Holy Scriptures, and find substantially the same doctrines there, which their forefathers embraced and taught. And if Dr. Channing wishes to know how the Orthodox may be put down at once, and for ever, Professor Stuart can tell him. Let him only show that the Bible, when fairly interpreted, does not support Orthodoxy, and it will forthwith be abandoned. But as for submission to any thing but the divine wisdom and authority, the Orthodox never think of it. So far from being the men to bring back the dark ages, they are a great deal further from commending the *faith* and *works* of those who labour to extend the Romish superstitions in this country than Dr. Channing.

As for the reproach and scorn heaped upon them, they have some portion left of the spirit of men, who gave up home, and friends, and country, rather than renounce the least jot or tittle of the doctrine which they had derived from the Bible. And even the *strong voice* of Dr. Channing will hardly turn them from their ways. They may not bear injury as meekly as might be wished. They may feel the exclusions to which they have been subjected; the jeering in private, and the scorn

in public, to which they have been exposed. And all this has gone on long enough. A flame has been kindled in secret, which cannot always be smothered. By saying this, Professor Stuart does not mean to terrify, but in kindness to give reasonable warning. Under a sense of both civil and religious injury, which the Orthodox citizens of Massachusetts have suffered, they are looking now at Switzerland, where men who had dared to preach Christ crucified, are languishing in dungeons, or wandering in exile. And it is known that Unitarianism has done this. A disposition to do similar things is manifested by some intolerant men of the same creed in Massachusetts. But Professor Stuart hopes, that the appearances which now portend storm and tempest may vanish, and that unclouded sunshine may follow.

We have thus given as full a view as our limits will allow, of the manly, temperate, and opportune production. And we are happy in the opportunity thus publicly to express our approbation of the whole spirit and manner of the writer. Indeed, we know not how, in better terms, to give utterance to our feelings in this respect, than by here recording our most earnest wish that Christians, when arguing with their fellow Christians respecting their different views of religious doctrine, might always exhibit the respectful and kind consideration, the fairness and candour, which Professor Stuart has always shown, in his controversy with the Unitarians. On comparing the pamphlet with some things which we have read in the last two years, we have been very much struck with the difference. If our anonymous commendation can affect any thing, Professor Stuart will frequently give examples of the manner in which religious controversy ought to be conducted. But *verbum sat*.

The sketch given by us, imperfect as it is, has been so extended as not to allow room for all the remarks which we intended to subjoin to Professor Stuart's statements. The subject, however, is one of such deep and general interest, that we cannot dismiss it at once.

Our first observation is, that the pain felt on seeing a respectable man bringing unfounded accusations against others, is mingled with some consolation in the present case, arising from the persuasion, that Unitarianism is reduced to great straits. If it were not so, such a man as Dr. Channing, the leader of the most *liberal* of all denominations, a man of real talents and of high standing in the world, would not resort to these petty and discreditable arts of controversy which he has

permitted himself to employ, and on which we suffered the pain of remarking in the beginning of this article. He has brought a charge of most *criminal designs* against his Orthodox neighbours. This is an accusation which it is at all times difficult to establish. Even when *actions* are proved, the *intention* is often uncertain. But in this case, without a single fact to rely on, with nothing, indeed, but passionate declamation for its accompaniment, Dr. Channing has alleged a crime, which, if proved, will fasten everlasting disgrace on thousands, and if *believed* on his authority, will cover them with reproach. He cannot prove the *wicked intention*. If he has half the discernment for which he has credit, he knows that he cannot. And it is impossible for any who do not take part with him, to read his writings and not feel that his design is to bring odium on men whom he has not yet, with all his *strength of voice*, been able to put down. Alas! how are the mighty fallen! In some of the extracts given by Professor Stuart, there are tokens of anger which one is surprised to find in one who thinks himself a conqueror. And in the tone of all his writings, as far as the Orthodox are concerned, there is a querulousness, mingled with acrimony, entirely misbecoming his pretensions. When he, who undertook to instruct the world how they ought to appreciate the genius and character of the greatest conqueror of his age, and the greatest poet of past ages, descends to the arts of a defeated sectarian controvertist, we cannot help thinking that he feels himself to be the advocate of a sinking cause. We speak of Dr. Channing as he appears before the public in his works. Of him as a man we know nothing, and of course we say nothing.

But there are other topics of higher interest, on which we wish to touch in these observations. It does seem strange, that in this country, where the press is perfectly free, and where, every day, men are endeavouring by speech and writing, to propagate Atheism, Deism, Unitarianism, Universalism, Popery, Episcopacy, Methodism, Presbyterianism, Baptism, &c. and all without let or hinderance, there should be frequent and earnest attempts to bring odium on one particular class of men, because they endeavour to maintain their opinions. On what principle may it be accounted for, that the zeal of EVANGELICAL MEN of all denominations, calls forth from various quarters ungenerous, bitter, and even furious denunciations? How does it happen that they who deafen us with loud boastings of their liberality, and with outcries against religious dis-

putes, who have never read a book of controversy in their lives, and almost swear that they never will, how does it happen, that they embrace and even *make* every possible opportunity to calumniate the professors of *evangelical piety*? The alleged *exclusiveness* of these persecuted men cannot be the true reason. Because, the Romanists are of all people in the world, the most exclusive. They alone constitute the true Catholic Church! and all who are out of that pale are heretics, the children of the devil and heirs of perdition. Our Episcopal brethren of the high church party, are also sufficiently exclusive to incur odium, if that were the true cause. Our Baptist brethren, too, might come in for their share of reproach on this account; for in regard to the ordinance which gives them their distinctive character, they hold that none are in the Church of Christ who have not been immersed, after a profession of their faith.

But notwithstanding the efforts, foreign and domestic, to promote Popery, notwithstanding the immense sums contributed or extorted to sustain Jesuit missions and build Roman Catholic Chapels, and establish free schools for the benefit (forsooth!) of protestant children, not a whisper is heard, in certain quarters, on this subject. On the contrary, the very men who in newspapers, magazines and reviews, show a partisan activity and bitterness, in denouncing Evangelical Christians, manifest a strong sympathy with Jesuitism as it is working in the United States. The exclusive high church Episcopalians too, are quite in favour with most of the men who set up claims to peculiar liberality. And as far as our observation goes, the evangelical principles and the zeal of the Baptists are censured a thousand times, for once that a rebuke is given to them for their exclusiveness in regard to baptism. Such instances might be greatly extended; but we shall advert to only one fact more. Perhaps there are not in this country more active, restless *proselytists*, the Jesuits always excepted, than the present Universalists. And unless they have changed their creed to suit the times, their favourite and fundamental principle is, that the merit of Christ in making the atonement is so great, that it covers the sins, and will be efficient for the salvation of all men, whether penitent or impenitent, believers or unbelievers. But Unitarians totally deny the atonement, and reject the whole of Christianity, which depends on that doctrine. And yet, notwithstanding, this eager spirit of proselytism, and this world-wide difference between Universalists and Unita-

rians, the latter have shown quite a disposition to sympathize, and fraternize with the former. We are warranted by facts such as these, to draw the conclusion, that the outcry which has been raised against orthodox men, is not to be attributed to any alleged exclusiveness in their opinions, nor to the claim put in by them to the right of defending and propagating their principles.

Nor can it be said that the reason is to be found in the right to apply the discipline of the Church to members of their own communion, claimed by evangelical Christians. For not to insist on the fact, that every society on earth exercises this right, it is notorious that the terrors of excommunication constitute the sword and buckler of the Romish Church; and to this day, these weapons are used with most tremendous efficacy, wherever popish doctrines are received. But *Infidel Socinian Catholics*, and *Catholic Socinian Infidels* know all this; and yet they smother all resentment against Jesuitism and Popery, and reserve the *bottles* of their wrath to be poured on the heads of evangelical men!

On what principles, then, can we account for the fact, that these men are the objects of dislike, of scorn, of contumely? Is it alleged that they are bigots? All history proves that they have built their system on the sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures, and the right of private judgment, as fundamental principles. This is not the way with bigots? Is it urged that they are intolerant and oppressive? The historian of martyrdom has very few occasions to go out of the record of their sufferings, to give completeness to his narrative. Are they charged with being narrow minded and illiberal? Their confessions of Faith, and their practice, show that they acknowledge brotherhood with all of every denomination, who call on the name of Jesus Christ, the common Lord of all.

In none of these reasons, then, can we find a satisfactory answer to our inquiries. We will, therefore, show our opinion. But to do this, we must make the following statement. All Orthodox, evangelical Christians, whatever minor differences of opinion may prevail among them, agree in holding inviolably the following doctrines:

All men are sinners. No sinner can be justified, except by faith in Jesus Christ as a divine Redeemer. No human being can be admitted to heaven, without a change of heart, wrought by the Holy Spirit. There is no good evidence of faith and regeneration, but a holy life.

As a practical inference from these principles, it is held, that no one can be acknowledged as a Christian, who does not profess to receive these doctrines, and give credible evidence of his sincerity.

*But the leading wish of mankind, is to have a religion which will give them assurance of salvation without a change of heart.* In a word, they want a religion which will allow them to live as they please in this world, and to go to heaven when they die. If, however, the prevalence of religious truth is such, and in Christian countries it generally is such, as to prevent the conscience from resting on this scheme of broad and boundless liberality; then, that system is most acceptable, which as far as possible admits of a compromise, and allows a balance to be struck between the sins committed, and the duties performed. This last plan, however, is only a substitute for the first, adopted through necessity. The one is received, because the truth stands too much in the way of the other. And he who has received it, always manifests a strong leaning towards that, for which it is a substitute.

Hence we see how it is, that various classes of religionists, who differ widely in their external forms, and even in many points of doctrine, approximate in spirit. A *virtuous* Deist, and a *liberal* Unitarian are but a single step asunder. They both rely on their good works, and on the mercy of their Creator; the one because his reason tells him so, and the other because his reason approves that *part* of the Bible, which, he *thinks*, teaches the same doctrine. The gentlemanly, scholar-like, wealthy Roman Catholic, can write in defence of the holy church, and in abuse of the fanatics; buy absolution, and be assured that he is going to heaven, without any change of heart. The Deist and Unitarian, who meet him at the theatre, in the ball room, and at the wine party, never trouble his conscience, and he praises them, for very liberal gentlemen. And then comes the Universalist, with a system wide enough to embrace men of all sorts and conditions. The greatest illiberality of which he can be guilty, is to send the worst men to hell for a few myriads of ages. But his *everlasting punishment* is so much like the Roman Catholic's purgatory, that the two find no difficulty in uniting in cordial hatred of evangelical principles. And if the Universalist should happen not to be a *poor or low creature*, the Deist and the Unitarian can forgive his error also, in regard to revelation, and the atonement, for the sake of his general liberality. And thus Deists, Papists,

Unitarians, and Universalists, with all others, who resolve that they will walk according "to the sight of their eyes, and the desires of their hearts;" and, if there is a heaven, that they will go to it, without being born again, find no difficulty in uniting to denounce, and, if possible, put down orthodox, evangelical Christians. The Deist in his heart despises, and in his sleeve laughs at the opinions of all the rest; the Unitarian has more than half a mind to do the same thing; while the Papist holds them all to be heretics, and the Universalist pities the errors of all. But there is nothing so intolerable as the austerity of the evangelicals; and nothing so wearisome as their everlasting cry, "ye must be born again." This sameness of feeling produces something like mutual understanding and concert, in all parts of the country. A calumny is started respecting an evangelical man, for instance, in New York, and appears in a certain newspaper. To a certainty, the very same thing will appear in some forty or fifty papers successively, in all parts of the country. This is so much the case, that we who have for some time been observing things of this sort, can tell beforehand, with considerable accuracy, in what papers, through a very large part of the country, the falsehood will be reprinted. And we have sometimes had a strange sort of painful amusement, in *guessing* on this subject, and noticing the truth of our conjectures. If, for instance, the *thing* is coarse and blackguard in its character, we have said, this is too low, except for such and such papers. But if the lie, or the caricature, and this is a species of lying, is well got up; if it is *witty*, and *caustic*, and *gentlemanly*, we have said, this will appear in such and such papers, in Boston, New York, Philadelphia, &c.: and, after a little observation, we have been surprised at the accuracy of our guesses. This strong appearance of concert, can be accounted for in no way, but by supposing the existence of a common feeling among men of very different religious creeds. That feeling is a deep dislike of evangelical religion; of the religion which tells them that they are sinners, that they must be born again, and be saved through the merits of the Lord Jesus Christ.

But it deserves also, to be remarked, that evangelical principles are making great progress in this country. And there is strong probability that they will finally become prevalent; not indeed as embodied by one class of Christians, but as embraced by numbers among all denominations of Protestant believers. *Hinc illæ lachrymæ.* Hence the wailings of many

respecting religious liberty, the hideous outcry which has recently stunned us about the union of Church and State, *et id genus omne*. But in connexion with this, it ought to be especially noted, that the evangelical Christians, who, from whatever cause, are, or appear before the world to be most active and zealous in carrying on various enterprises of Christian benevolence, are the objects of the most envenomed hostility. It cannot be denied, that in this country, the Presbyterians and Congregationalists are most prominent in support of the Bible, Missionary, and Sunday School Societies. We are anxious to avoid invidious comparisons; and declare that we have no intention to exalt our friends. We will say, then, that these denominations are regarded by the world as the *principal* agents in carrying on, throughout a great part of the United States, these and other benevolent operations. Now, it cannot have escaped observation, that Presbyterians and Congregationalists, are attacked violently, and without cessation, by all who manifest a strong dislike to evangelical religion. Nor is this any new thing; it has been so from the beginning. The only novelty in the case, is the change in the mode of attack. Before the revolution, they were denounced as enemies to the monarchy, and to the established Church; and many a diatribe was written to prove that their fundamental principles strongly favoured *republicanism*. During the struggle of the revolution their services were so important, that, for the time, they had some degree of favour. But a new generation has risen up, which "knows not Joseph." And now they are denounced as enemies of religious liberty, and of free inquiry; and this, while they hold precisely the same principles, which sixty years ago, made them objects of jealousy to the British government, and of hatred to the established Church! Among these hated, we had almost said persecuted, Christians, we readily admit that there are many things erroneous, many things wrong, on which their adversaries might found charges. They dispute a great deal too much about little things; they do not love one another as much they ought; their ministers are often very culpably jealous of each other's reputation and influence. They all love this world too well; they have not, by one half, as much active zeal as they ought to have. They are often engaged in controversy, when they ought to be engaged in sending the Gospel of Christ to them that are ready to perish. We could swell this catalogue, until we should be

compelled to hang our heads in shame, and blot out our own charges with tears. But all these evils are passed over without notice by the accusers; while they, with one voice, denounce these Christians as conspirators against religious liberty! That is, charges which might easily be proved; under which, indeed, ninety-nine in a hundred would, at once, confess guilt, are not once mentioned; while one is repeated even to hoarseness, which not only cannot be proved, but on the contrary is falsified by facts of every day's occurrence, and by the whole tenour of history. We ask, why is it so? Can it be accounted for on any other principle than this? The enemies of evangelical piety know the sensitiveness of the American people, in regard to liberty in general, and religious liberty in particular: they know too, (for many of them are politicians) the effect of bold denunciations often repeated; and they have resolved to open and keep up this outcry, because it is the surest way to bring evangelical men, and their principles, into odium. The dislike of all unconverted men, to the peculiar doctrines of the Gospel, and to their advocates, is well understood by Dr. Channing, and his *co-accusers* in all parts of the country; and it was no doubt expected that such charges as were brought by him, unsupported as they are, would be believed by numbers, because they want to find some reason for the dislike of which they are conscious. This, then, has all the appearance of a deep laid scheme to stop the progress of evangelical truth in the United States. And it accords well with another declaration understood to have been made by the Dr. in some Unitarian Association or Convention, "These Bible Societies, and Missionary Societies must be put down." Yes, *delenda est Carthago*. But the present race of evangelicals are incurable, they must be permitted to die out; and as for the rest, care must be taken so to rouse public hatred, and so to cover evangelical principles with reproach, that in this country, where every thing is governed by opinion, a stop may be put to their progress.

Our readers will, we hope, understand, that in all these remarks we are attempting to account for facts, undisputed and indisputable, such as these: that evangelical Christians in general, and Presbyterians and Congregationalists in particular, are treated with much obloquy and scorn; that the liberal Dr. Channing, and Deists, and Roman Catholics, and others like them, have openly accused these Christians of dark and malignant designs against the religious liberties of the country.

And now, let every one judge, whether we have assigned the true cause. Of one thing we are most certain; there must be some deep seated, powerful passion urging onward the men, who appear before the world, and accuse millions of their fellow citizens, of a deep-dyed, atrocious, damning crime, without one tittle of evidence to support the accusation. We are willing to admit, that very often this allegation is made by men who do not consider what is implied in it. But it would be a poor compliment to Dr. Channing and to some men who copy him, to plead the excuse of inconsideration. They know that the American nation regards their religious liberty as the most precious part of their birthright; and that they who plot its destruction, are in heart guilty of the worst sort of treason. Of the thousands condemned to infamy in the dungeons of our penitentiaries, perhaps not one ever meditated wickedness so dark and diabolical, as that of which a very considerable part of the citizens of the United States are publicly and frequently accused. It is time that such injuries should have an end. Especially at this period of general agitation; during this shaking of the nations, men appointed to make, and men appointed to administer laws, ought not to inflict deep and irreparable injury on an innumerable multitude of the citizens of this country. But if a sense of justice will not, at least a sense of shame ought to prevent a repetition of these outrages.

What are these men doing who are thus furiously denounced? They are making efforts to put a Bible into the hands of every citizen. They are endeavouring to afford elementary instruction to every child in the United States. And inasmuch as a very great proportion of the instruction received by the mass of our population is received on the Sabbath, they have asked the government of their country not by any arrangements to desecrate a day so important for general improvement.\* And it is inferred that there is a dark, Judas-like plotting against the religious liberties of the country! In other countries, where religious liberty was actually destroyed, the deed of wickedness could not be achieved but by taking the Bible from the people, and preventing their instruction, and destroying the religious influence of the Sabbath. The Reformation too, could not be effected until the Bible was restored and the people taught to read, and the Christian Sabbath consecrated to its

\* It is not our object here to vindicate the *wisdom* of the application to Congress in regard to Sabbath mails; but the *intentions* of the applicants. Of the former we say nothing; of the latter we have no doubt.

proper uses. With these facts recorded on the pages of history, citizens of this country are denounced. Often native citizens are denounced by foreigners and men of foreign education, for doing the very things which, more than charters and laws, have secured religious freedom!

This case is rendered more striking and extraordinary by the fact, that the very same efforts which have brought on evangelical men in this country such injurious accusations, have produced in England, at the same time too, denunciations of an exactly opposite character. Here the cry is, "Liberty is in danger!" There, "The Church is in danger!" Here the accusation is, "These men are plotting to effect a religious establishment." There, "They are the enemies of the establishment." The case was the same in Russia, as far as the experiment was made. The Bible Society was suppressed by the priests and nobles, lest the people should become discontented with their condition. We could easily adduce similar facts in the case of Switzerland and France; and we could easily ask, why do the laws in some States of the Union shut out the Bible, and the Sabbath school, and the Missionary from the labouring part of the population? But the absurdity of these charges is only equalled by the credulity of the men who believe them.

The Presbyterians and Congregationalists are now the prominent objects of dislike and attack. But it is not because they are Presbyterians or Congregationalists; but because they are thought to be particularly active in promoting evangelical principles; because they with some zeal propagate that religion which tells man he is a sinner, and he must repent or perish; he must be born again, or he cannot enter the kingdom of heaven. Orthodox Baptists, Evangelical Episcopalians, and all other evangelical Christians, are as really the objects of this dislike as the men who at present have, for some cause, to bear the brunt of the battle. None need suppose that the world loves them or is at peace with them.

Only let those who have been first selected as adversaries be put out of the way, and the *turn* of some others will come next. The opposition will go on, either until evangelical piety shall be exiled to some Patmos in the Southern Ocean, or, which we believe will be the case, until the "truth as it is in Jesus," shall so prevail as to make all opposition hopeless.

We can only offer one additional remark. The spirit which has manifested itself in the writings of Dr. Channing, as brought

under review by Professor Stuart, and which has shown itself in many other places and on many other occasions, is the very *spirit of tyranny*. It claims for itself the right of doing what it is greatly offended if others do. It arrogates to itself all taste, all wisdom, all liberality, all comprehension of views, and attributes to others vulgarity, folly, contractedness of feelings, and narrowness of mind. "*Nihil non arrogat sibi.*"

---

ART. VI.—THE AMERICAN QUARTERLY REVIEW ON  
SUNDAY MAILS.

We have frequently been struck, in reading the numbers of the *National Gazette*, with the justness and weight of its editorial remarks on the responsibility of the conductors of the periodical press. And we have often sympathized with its accomplished editor, on observing the severity with which he has been treated by party prints, for endeavouring to conduct a paper on national principles, abstaining equally from indiscriminate commendation and abuse. We readily yield the tribute which is due to him, for the elevated stand which he has proposed to himself, and think that, as far as politics are concerned, it has been successfully maintained. As it is universally understood that the editorial departments of the *Gazette* and of the *American Quarterly Review* are filled by the same individual, we had hoped that the moderation and fairness which mark the political character of the former, would also have been impressed on the pages of the latter. We entertained this hope with the greater confidence, from the conviction that the editor had too much discernment not to be aware, that a responsibility peculiarly serious rests upon the individual who undertakes to conduct an *AMERICAN REVIEW*, which aspires, in its measure, at once to form and represent American sentiments and opinions. In despite of our sectional partialities, we are constrained to admit, that in respect to candour and fairness, whenever religion has been concerned, it has fallen far below its great eastern compeer. In the very first number of the work, there was an article, which, from the levity and injustice with which the character of several of the most distinguished of the American clergy was treated, we considered of unpropitious omen. This, however, it seems,