

a new and very beautiful edition in six volumes, with a dull biography by the Rev. Dr. Ide, and a very sprightly addendum to the same by Professor Park, of Andover. Of the latter we will say, that a more readable production we have seldom seen. The author meant it to please youthful hearers and readers, and he has succeeded. He meant to leave it uncertain on which side of the great theological question his opinion lay, and he has done so; in this being in signal contrast to old Dr. Emmons, who never went about in regard to an opinion, but let his readers know at the first dash the very worst of his dreadful creed. But the Professor's treatise is rich in matter, and could have been written by none but a man of genius, a wit, and a New Englander.

At our distance from the sphere of Dr. Emmons's great influence, we have always been filled with surprise at the awe with which his name has been mentioned, and the comic dread with which his dogmatic chair has been approached, and we opened volume after volume of the work now before us, in hopes of finding some new revelation of his doctrine, or some more thorough explanation of its great power in the past generation of Massachusetts and Connecticut ministers. But we are disappointed. There is little here that has not been printed before, and the body of the ponderous work is eked out with a species of theological and homiletical literature, such as our knowledge of books cannot pretend to match. The sermons in the first and second volumes are entirely 'occasional,' to employ a phrase familiar in the east; those in the third are about as exclusively funeral sermons; all indeed having marks of the great hand of their author, who could not have written a note to his blacksmith but in the clearest, tersest, concisest manner; but none of them bearing any great relation to his creed, and few of them demanding preservation. The excellent editor, with much naiveté, tells us that "the materials for ten volumes, as valuable as those with which these six are composed," are in his hands; we can believe it, even if for ten we should read twenty. Emmonsists, in the proper sense, would enshrine as a relic the shoe-latchet of their father; these we believe, however, to be few, feeble, and decreasing. Yet around the darkness produced by the hideous eclipse, there was a penumbra, which includes we fear a large number of those who call themselves the Calvinistic divines of New England; and who, having receiv-

ed their first views of anti-Arminian doctrine in the shape of the old fashioned 'new divinity,' have mistaken the reverse of wrong for right, and, whether for good or evil, never see the face of Calvinism but under the gorgon mask. As Calvinists, therefore, we take no pleasure in the reproduction of this system. We have already suffered by it, as one would suffer who is burnt in an exaggerated effigy. We disclaim its aids. If Arminianism is to be destroyed only by such allies, let Arminianism flourish. *What new discoveries does the Calvinistic student find in Dr. Emmons?* He finds, first, that God is the efficient cause of sin; that "God can make men act right freely, and act wrong freely;" that "he is now exercising his powerful and irresistible agency upon the heart of every one of the human race, and producing either holy or unholy exercises in it." He finds the fall of Adam cleared of all mystery, since "God wrought in Adam both to will and to do in his first transgression." He finds that man has natural power to frustrate the decrees of God. He finds, contrary to scripture and to Calvinism, that "all sin consists in the free, voluntary exercise of selfishness." He finds that "if infants die before they become moral agents, it is most rational to conclude that they are annihilated. He finds that conscience is "entirely distinct from the heart, and every other power of the mind," and, in the human body, "that conscience is seated in the *breast*." He finds that "the Spirit of God, in regeneration, produces nothing but love;" and that the order of the Christian graces is reversed, being this, Love, Repentance, Faith. He finds too that the sinner is bound to be willing to be damned; and that after all this "believers, at the time of their justification, are only partially and conditionally forgiven." Such is Eminentism. To say that it is not Calvinism, is only to say that black is not white, or that preposterous and exorbitant absurdity is not scriptural wisdom.

Believing in our souls that the tendency of the scheme called Emmonism, is evil and only evil, seeing its results in the Pelagianism of Professors Fitch and Taylor, who have whitewashed and re-erected its least hateful parts, and the desolations wrought even among good men by its exhausting, parching, attenuating influence, and especially knowing and feeling that its whole spirit and tone are diametrically opposed to the scriptures, so much as to be not so much a different scheme, as a different religion, when fairly acted

out, we do not scruple to declare our sorrow and fear in regard to the publication of these volumes. Sorrow, we say, and fear—because we will not affect a contempt for Dr. Emmons: it would be the very effrontery of ignorance to do so. His weapons are fearful weapons. He is an enemy whom no system need wish to meet. As a metaphysical writer he has, within our knowledge, no superior, if an equal, for stating exactly what he means in the shortest, clearest, plainest, strongest, and (in the sense of the mathematicians) most elegant manner. You never doubt an instant what his doctrine is. You never find him, like Dr. Taylor, complaining that he is not understood. Nay, he *is* understood, and that too well. His intrepidity in the assertion of the most startling and odious of his dogmas is perhaps the grand secret of his strength; he saves time by it; he saves the multiplied explanations and ambages of the New Haven school; he commands respect for his candour, and there is a sort of sublimity in the very impiety of his declarations, when he tears the veil away from the secret pavilion of God, tells us what Jehovah can and cannot do, and trumpets in the very sanctuary that God is the creator of every sinful thought of men and devils.

Again we fear the influence of Dr. Emmons because he is a master of subtle dialectics. No man reasons more clearly, more ingeniously, or more speciously. No man better knows how to assume the point, at the very moment when the opponent is least expecting such a turn. The countenance is so open, the mien so erect, and the manipulation so bold and unembarrassed, that you never dream of legerdemain. The ratiocination of Dr. Emmons most nearly resembles those chains of mathematical reasoning which brings out startling and even opposite conclusions; they occupy, enchain, exercise and astound the mind, but they do not convince. We doubt not, there are to this day many who think they have been made willing to be damned; they have yielded to the seeming proof, notwithstanding the never-ceasing and healthful revolt of consciousness, reason and grace. We fear the effects of an entangling in any meshes of thin-spun sophistry: the more subtle the more dangerous; the invisible net is worst. We fear the necessity which sound men will be under to unravel these specious tissues, and the metaphysical cast which must thereby be given to theological disquisition. New England has in every portion of her enlightened and happy territory groaned under the influence

of this very evil. Since the days of Edwards it has been true. Far different in our estimate is the sort of thinking there prevalent, from that which marked the era of the Reformed Divines. They too were philosophers. They too handled the scholastic scalpel. Since the days of Aristotle none have more nicely dissected, or more dexterously unfolded every web and tissue. But the *materiel* of their operations was derived from 'discourse,' using the term in its higher sense ; from exegesis, from sound authority, and from divine experience. They reasoned with holy awe. It was not from dulness that the great minds of the Dordrecht Synod failed to reach those points which Emmons laid open. They saw them. What was it which they did not see, of the tendencies of their almost unwarranted speculations ! They saw and shuddered. They looked over the brink, but they beheld an abyss and they returned. They distrusted their sounding line, when its lead sank into the depths of divinity, and ceased to read off the fathoms, when they found themselves declaring falsehood. They revered positive statements of revealed truth, as superseding all argument. Hence, when weary and astounded at the seeming issue of some of their flights, they alighted on the solid supports of revelation. Hence the abundant exegetical discussion in such writers as Calvin, Gomar, Turretine, Witsius, Zanehius, Van Maestricht, Mark and Wytttenbaeh ; while Emmons and the metaphysical divines treat the text of scripture as a mere impertinence ; to be cited exoterically, but to be twisted to any meaning or emptied of all.

In speaking so highly as we have done of the close reasoning of Dr. Emmons, and in thus exalting its power, we must not be understood to represent it as fair and conclusive. If it were fair and conclusive, its results would be truth ; but our complaint is, that, so far as they are peculiar, the results are false. And there is always cause to fear the ingenious statement of error. Error is always and only evil. Every assertion—the merest assertion of a false proposition is evil : hence the enormity of all falsehood. But when such assertion is accompanied by a display of reasons, neat, bright, concatenated, apparently inseparable from the premises, from one another, and from the conclusion, the danger is greatly increased. Besides the few who will be misled by the argument, there are the many who will be captivated by the show of it. The evil is all the greater, when the false-

hoods are engrafted on truth, or as in the present instance, when they borrow the name of an accredited system. How easily may the young student of theology be led into absurdity and error who comes to the study of Emmons, believing him to be only a profounder and more consistent Calvin!

No system of theological opinion has been more fully refuted than that of Dr. Emmons: and none has given more clear indications of approaching dissolution. Single positions indeed, such as that all sin is voluntary action, will continue to be a part of other and more cunning theories, but Emmonism, properly so called, has ceased to propagate itself. Its casual entrance into a theological school, even of New England, in insulated rustic students, is as strange and incongruous as the apparition of Banquo at the feast. Other forms of error possess the public mind. But nevertheless, the republication of these speculations in a new and attractive shape will awaken a temporary attention, vex the minds of inquirers, puzzle the unwary, and cause experienced polemics to take down their old armour.

The influence of the work cannot but be injurious, upon the preaching of the gospel. It has already been so in a high degree, and to a wide extent, in all those parts of America which have felt the power of New England; as what part has not? A Sermon, in the eye of Dr. Emmons, and of some before and since his day, is a composition of very marked character, but unlike any thing bearing the same name in other parts and eras of Christendom. All Dr. Emmons's works are sermons, and all his sermons are turned out of the same mould. Indeed, it might almost be said, that, through life, he was a sermonizer, and nothing else. He was not a student of the dead languages; he was not an expositor of scripture. He did not practice parochial visitation. Though he had a farm, he was no agriculturist; he was no traveller. While he was a profound thinker, he made no pretensions to erudition. For more than seventy years he patiently went on in constructing sermons. It would have been wonderful, if he had not acquired a great facility in his art. They are all alike; whatever be the subject, there is the same short and easy exordium, the same statement of the proposition, the same brevity of proof, and the same disproportionately prolix "improvement." His method of sermonizing we consider the worst of all methods. "I seldom preached textually,"

he tells us, "but chose my subject in the first place, and then chose a text adapted to it." On this method, any thing may be preached from any text. Thus, when he would show that love precedes faith, he founds his doctrine on the fragment—"But Faith which worketh by Love :'" and when he would teach, that God discovers no order in calling men out of the world, his text is—"Without any order." It is reasoning, which is claimed, and with justice, as the great characteristic of these discourses ; but the reasoning, even where it is not sophistical, is not scriptural. It is rationalistic ; spun most ingeniously out of the author's own head, and not founded, as a general rule, on the positive teachings of revelation. When scripture is quoted, which in comparison with Calvinistic divines, Dr. Emmons seldom docs, he appends the passage as a *purpureus pannus* ; it is no part of the texture ; as one who should say, 'if you must have a text here it is ?' Just so the French preachers cite their little morsels from the Vulgate. You may leave the text out, and yet lose nothing.

The preaching of American Congregationalists of a certain age and school, may be characterized as metaphysical ; that of Dr. Emmons was such in an eminent degree. In this, so far as our knowledge goes, it differs from all other preaching, since the world began. We say preaching, for metaphysical theology has flourished in the most brilliant periods of the church ; but only here has the wall been broken down between the church and the schools. The Athanasian, the Augustinian, the Calvinistic theology was highly metaphysical ; but the same men who demonstrated the osteology of truth on the tables of their lecture rooms, fed their flocks with the food of plain doctrine. Let any man satisfy himself by looking first at the extant discourses of Austin, Calvin, Rivet, Daillé, Charnock, Owen, the Erskines, and Saurin, and then at those of Dr. Emmons. Even in Germany, where philosophy is rampant, we are informed that a metaphysical sermon would not be tolerated. In the hands of ignorant, foolish, erroneous or mischievous men, such sermons become the stalking-horse for inane janglings and heresies : as no one acquainted with New England theology needs to be told. Yet the theology of New England is a varied structure, the parts of which are not to be confounded, and the very errors of which savour of thoughtfulness and dialectic skill. Of the fathers of the school, it is impossible to speak with-

out reverence, for of this Academy the Socrates was none other than the venerable Edwards, and those who followed him, including Dr. Emmons himself, were mighty reasoners, and pious men; of whom, all and singular, we shall take heed not to speak in any terms but those of respect. The disciples of President Edwards, who adopted his principles and imitated his method of theologizing, were Dr. Bellamy, Dr. Samuel Hopkins, Dr. Stephen West, Dr. John Smalley, Dr. Samuel Spring, and Dr. Nathanael Emmons. As President Edwards had made great use of abstruse reasoning to remove some of the objections which were commonly made to the doctrines of Calvinism, so those theologians were encouraged to go still further in this metaphysical method of theologizing, until they brought out an entirely new system, which they considered a great improvement on old Calvinism. While these divines were agreed in rejecting several of the most offensive doctrines of the old system, they did not all proceed to the same length, in the new opinions which they adopted. Dr. Bellamy agreed with Mr. Edwards in his general views, but departed in some particulars from what had before been considered the standard of orthodoxy; while Dr. Hopkins and Dr. West went boldly forward, step by step, until they had carried out their new opinions as a system. Dr. Hopkins took the lead, was the principal writer, and published the new divinity, in a work of considerable extent; it therefore took his name, and was thenceforward denominated HOPKINSIANISM. Dr. Smalley seems not to have proceeded to the same length in his new opinions as Dr. West and Dr. Hopkins; and his views were very generally adopted by the ministers of Connecticut. Dr. Emmons, as appears by his own account, received his views of this system from Dr. Smalley, under whom he studied divinity; but being of a speculative turn, and possessed of a very acute and metaphysical mind, he was not contented to stop on the moderate ground assumed by his master, but went on to adopt and publish many opinions in advance even of Hopkins and West; so that, although he was willing to be denominated a Hopkinsian, he had by his new and startling doctrines so modified the system of Hopkinsianism, that his followers thought proper to give his name to the peculiar opinions which he had united and advocated. Dr. Emmons may, therefore be considered as having given the finishing strokes to the fabric of the new divinity. And it

seems to have been wisely ordered for the benefit of sound theology, that the system was by him pushed forward into so many extravagant and absurd consequences, that few were found willing to follow him to the conclusions which he adopted. It can scarcely be doubted, that the progress of these new opinions had no small influence in facilitating the spread of Unitarianism, the seeds of which had already begun to take root in Boston and other places.

It seems proper now, when a new edition of Dr. Emmons's works is published, to bring under review the leading peculiarities of his system. And, in attempting this synopsis, we shall not regard the chronological order of the publication of his new doctrines, but rather aim at exhibiting them in their systematic relations; and, in doing this, we shall not confine ourselves to what in strictness may be called Emmonsism, but will notice most of the doctrines of the system of new divinity, in which it departs from the Calvinistic theory.

Having shown that the principle, that all virtue or holiness consists in benevolence, necessarily leads to the opinion, that the ultimate end of the Deity in the production of the universe of creatures, was to effect the greatest possible degree of happiness, and that what appears abstractly to be evil, was nevertheless a means of a greater degree of happiness than would otherwise have existed, it is an easy inference, that there is nothing in moral evil, thus considered, which would render it inconsistent with the holiness of God to will its existence absolutely; and not only to will that it should exist, but to bring it into existence by his own efficiency. Dr. Hopkins therefore, was, perhaps, the first who openly taught, that God was the author of sin, and in addition to the argument derived from viewing it as a necessary means to the greatest good, this subtle reasoner used a metaphysical argument, which many of his followers believed to be demonstrative: that the author of sin, in the nature of things, could not be sinful in producing it, for that would involve a contradiction, and suppose that it existed before it did exist. As Dr. Emmons maintained that God was the efficient cause of all our thoughts, of every kind, by immediate agency, so of course he believed and taught that God was the author of sin. Indeed, according to his theory, will and power are identical, and therefore for God to will the existence of sin, is the same as to produce it. And further, to support this doctrine, it was

maintained, that in men's consciousness of the evil of sin, they viewed it only as a voluntary act of their own, without any reference to its cause. To prove that God might be the author of sinful acts without destroying their moral character, Dr. Emmons argues, that as he can work in men both to will and to do good, without destroying the moral goodness of the exercises thus produced, so he can work in men to will and to do sinful acts, without destroying their sinful nature. On this argument we remark, that the question is not whether God can, by his omnipotent agency, produce sinful exercises in the mind; but whether he can do this consistently with his holiness. And again: the possibility of a thing does not prove its existence. But the conclusive answer to this argument is, that while it is admitted that God produces holy exercises in the minds of his creatures, by his special agency, they are bound to ascribe all the praise to God for his grace in thus enabling them to will and to do; and therefore, when he works in them to will and to do evil, they should lay all the blame on him; the assertion of which is blasphemy. From his own writings, and from the testimony of Professor Park, Dr. Emmons seems to have adopted the philosophy of Berkeley; or, rather the entire consequences of Berkeley's principles, as carried out by Hume; for he will admit nothing to exist in the soul, but what we are conscious of; and as no man is conscious of any thing but his exercises, that is, his thoughts and feelings, therefore we have no right to assert that there is any thing in the soul but these various exercises; in other words, that the essence of the soul is its acts. It is true, that we are not conscious of any thing but exercises, taking the word consciousness in its strictest sense, but we intuitively know that we exist, and that we have a soul which produces these acts; and we have the same intuitive certainty that there are dispositions in our minds, which give rise to acts of a certain kind. To deny these first principles precludes all reasoning; for all reasoning rests on first principles. It would be as reasonable to deny our own existence, or to deny that we have any thoughts, as to deny that there is a soul which thinks; and the absurdities which flow from such denial are numerous and palpable. According to this philosophy both personality and accountability are cut off; for a mere succession of thoughts cannot constitute a person. As all which precede the present exercise are extinct, there can be no such bond of union

as makes personality. All accountability is also necessarily destroyed; for it would be superlatively absurd, as well as unjust, to visit upon one thought or exercise, all the guilt of every former evil thought, in producing which it could have had no agency.

This strange philosophy, it will be found, had a mighty influence on other novel doctrines propagated by Dr. Emmons. For example, the doctrine of original sin, so odious to mere rationalists, is by him utterly discarded. He not only rejects the imputation of Adam's first sin to his posterity, but repudiates innate depravity; that is, the doctrine of a sinful nature derived from our first parents. There is a sense indeed in which he admits native depravity, for one of his biographers records among his pithy but paradoxical aphorisms, 'that natural depravity is the truth, original sin the lie.' What he believed was, that all men's thoughts are naturally sinful, because God by his power makes them such: what he denied was, that men derive a sinful nature from Adam, or that their sins have any thing to do with his, as their cause. In his sermon on Original Sin, he says: "Nor can we suppose that Adam made men sinners by conveying to them a morally corrupt nature. Moral corruption is essentially different from natural corruption. The latter belongs to the body, but the former belongs to the mind. Adam undoubtedly conveyed to his posterity a corrupt body, or a body subject to wounds, bruises and putrefying sores. But such a body could not corrupt the mind, or render it morally depraved. There is no morally corrupt nature distinct from free, voluntary, sinful exercises. Adam had no such nature, and consequently could convey no such nature to his posterity. But even supposing he had a morally corrupt nature, distinct from his free, voluntary, sinful exercises, it must have belonged to his soul, and not to his body. And if it belonged to his soul, he could not convey it to his posterity, who derive their souls immediately from the fountain of being. God is the father of our spirits. The soul is not transmitted from father to son by natural generation. The soul is spiritual; and what is spiritual is indivisible, is incapable of propagation. Adam could not convey any part of his soul to his next immediate offspring, without conveying the whole. It is, therefore, as contrary to reason as to scripture, to suppose that Adam's posterity derived their souls from him. And if they did not derive their souls from him, they could not derive from him a mo-

rally corrupt nature, if he really possessed such a nature himself.”*

The above is a specimen of Dr. Emmons's mode of reasoning, which is nothing else but a string of bold, connected assertions. Such and such is the truth. Unless, however, you take his word for sufficient authority, there is no proof of any one of the assertions. This may be taken as a just sample of his manner.

The reader may observe that another radical principle in the new divinity is here taken for granted, namely, that all sin consists in positive voluntary action. Dr. Ide, biographer of Dr. Emmons, seems disposed to give him the credit of discovering this important principle. Alas! it is as old as Pelagius, of whose system it formed an essential part; nor can it ever be consistently held, without leading to Pelagianism. Upon this hypothesis, a corrupt nature is a thing impossible. The vilest criminal, who has spent a long life in sinful acts, has a nature as pure as that of Adam, when he came from the hand of his Maker. And, according to Dr. Emmons's philosophy, a sinful nature prior to acts, or behind the exercises of the mind, cannot exist, because there is no such thing in man, as nature or disposition, distinct from his acts. It is truly wonderful how ignorant all the New England writers of that age appear to have been of the theology of the standard Calvinistic writers whose names we have already cited, such as Turretine, Pictet, Van Maestricht, and Marck. The account of sin and its propagation, given by these theologians, is not only not refuted by the admirers of the new divinity, but is never alluded to. All who are acquainted with the history of theological opinion, know, that not only the Calvinistic, but the Lutheran divines, as well as the soundest of the Romanists, considered the fountain of sin as privative. They viewed the first sin, and every other sin, as originating in a defect of what the law of God requires. They held that Adam by his fall lost that original righteousness, that holy nature, in which he was created, and what is expressed in scripture by ‘the image of God.’ Now, supposing his posterity in virtue of their natural and federal union with him, to be born in a state of destitution of this image, they are born in a state morally corrupt: for the want of this original righteousness of heart is the real source of all

* Volume iv. p. 490.

the streams which from the beginning have filled the world with iniquity and misery. Humanity, deprived of this original endowment, a holy nature, must be in a state of moral corruption : if light is removed, darkness necessarily ensues ; or if health is taken away, disease is the necessary consequence. Now, according to this old and universally received opinion among the orthodox, there is no difficulty in conceiving the propagation of a corrupt nature ; because to bring souls into existence without the image of God, is to bring them into existence in a positively corrupt state. Nor need we determine any thing as to the origin of the soul ; further than that while nothing can come into being but by the creative power of God, he can nevertheless exert that power, in such a way, as to bring the posterity of Adam into existence as his offspring, both as it relates to soul and body. Upon this hypothesis, the old and common one, all that Dr. Emmons has said, is inconclusive.

All sin, Dr. Emmons further asserts, consists in selfishness. Dr. Hopkins has defended this opinion at great length ; and as far as we know, it has been held by all who have adopted his system. Yet it is hard to see whence it has been derived ; or why it has been so strenuously defended. After making all virtue to consist in disinterested benevolence, it should seem logical, inasmuch as sin is the opposite of virtue, to make it consist in malevolence. In selfishness, considered abstractedly, there is nothing of moral obliquity. Selfishness can be an evil only when a less good is preferred to a greater. When the love of God ceased to be a governing principle in man, the desire of gratifying the inferior appetites, and the desire of self-exaltation no doubt took possession of the mind. As all actual sin involves the exercise of the will, and as the will is moved by the desires which exist in the heart, all sin may in that sense be said to be selfish ; for in committing it some gratification of some appetite or desire of our own is the motive. But to make the formal nature of sin, or its essence, to consist in selfishness, is, in our opinion, superlatively absurd ; and it receives as little countenance from scripture as from sound reason. There is, as far as we recollect, but one passage, where self-love is spoken of as sinful, and it is then given merely as one specification of sin, and not as comprehending all conceivable acts of transgression. In describing the depravity of times yet future, Paul says, " Men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, disobedient to pa-

rents," &c. &c. Nor have we seen any benefit which this opinion confers even upon New Divinity; except that it gratifies an ensnaring rage for simplicity, which induces certain theologians to put a force upon the common meaning of words, in order to reduce all virtuous acts to a single principle. To us it seems evident, that there are implanted in our constitution affections, which are the very opposite of selfishness, such as the love of offspring; which though not of a moral nature abstractedly considered, require to be morally governed and directed. When the love of offspring becomes excessive, it is a sin; but it would be a solecism to say that it is a selfish affection. Yet the abettors of this opinion would, to maintain a favourite opinion, insist, that even this was a mere selfish affection, although its tendency is to self-denial, and even to the sacrifice of self.

Among the most zealous and able defenders of the new divinity in its most ultra points, may be named Judge Niles of Vermont. At length, however, he pushed his consequences so far, that running into the opposite extreme, he maintained that men, in their holiest acts, are governed only by selfish feelings; since whatever they love, is loved as agreeable to self, and whatever they choose is chosen only as most strongly recommended to our own hearts, that is to ourselves. In his old age, therefore, he wrote a pamphlet, directed principally against Dr. Emmons, in which he maintained something like the fore-mentioned opinions.

In regard to the imputation of Adam's first sin to his posterity, Dr. Emmons, and all the new divinity men, not only reject the doctrine, but speak of it in the same contemptuous manner, as did the Pelagians. In the sermon before quoted, we find the following remarks; "Guilt is a personal thing, which belongs to him alone who does a sinful action. The guilt of an action can no more be transferred from the agent to another person, than the act itself."—"It was unjust in the nature of things that the Supreme Being should transfer Adam's guilt to his posterity. And no constitution which he could make, could under such a mode of conduct be consistent with his moral rectitude."—"It is beyond the province of his benignity to transfer the guilt of an action from the proper agent to an innocent person—hence, we may conclude that the guilt of Adam's first sin was never transferred from him to his posterity, by the authority or appointment of God."

Here again, let it be well noted, we have nothing but as-

sersion. Proof is sedulously avoided. Dr. Emmons may be in part excused for what he asserts respecting the transfer of guilt, which he pronounces to be impossible, because he appears to be utterly ignorant of the sense in which the word *guilt* is used by Calvinistic writers. He seems never to have dreamt that the term has any other sense than *ill-desert*, but if he had had the least acquaintance with the standard writers of theology, he would have known, that the definite sense of the word (*reatus*), in theological writers of every school, is merely a *liableness to punishment*, which we all know is capable of being transferred from one to another, if one man is permitted to assume the place and suffer the punishment of another. This ignorance of the force of the theological term, seems to have been common among even the learned theologians in New England; for we were informed by a friend, that when a certain theological professor had published some elaborate sermons on the atonement, and when these were reviewed, and the meaning of this term explained, the learned author declared any such acceptation of the word to be new to him; and when his attention was further turned to Turretin's definition, he appeared to be filled with surprise.

Peremptory as Dr. Emmons is, in denying that guilt may be transferred, we will undertake to show that, in the true sense of the term, he himself holds what is far more objectionable. In the same discourse, (vol. iv. p. 490.) he says, "But if Adam conveyed neither sin, nor guilt, nor moral depravity to his descendants by his first transgression, how then did that act of disobedience make them sinners? The only proper and direct answer to this question is, that *God placed Adam as the public head of his posterity, and determined to treat them according to his conduct.*" Here then we have the very thing which the old Calvinists called the imputation of Adam's sin. By this they meant, that this act of Adam was so set down to the account of his posterity, that they were treated as though they had committed it. Adam sinned, and in consequence lost the favour and image of God: his posterity came into the world under the same circumstances. If this is not the transfer of guilt, it is the punishment of innocent persons to whom no guilt is imputed. And we are left to choose between the justice and reasonableness of punishing the posterity of Adam for his act, when he stood as their public head and representative, and of punishing them just as he was punished, but without regard to sin.

The Hopkinsian divines seem to think that they have gained a great advantage over the old-fashioned Calvinists, when they discard the doctrine of imputation. They commonly refer the sufferings of Adam's posterity, and their subjection to death and misery, even in infancy, to their own inherent depravity, or corruption of nature, derived from him. Dr. Emmons could not do this, because he believed in no such corruption of nature. He therefore ascribes their sufferings to the sovereign appointment of God, who made Adam their public head, and determined to treat them according to his conduct; that is, to punish them as he punished him; or to bless them, if he proved obedient, as he blessed him; which is really nothing short of the imputation of his first sin. But let us see whether those who maintain that all his posterity derive a corrupt nature from him, but deny the imputation of his sin, relieve themselves from any real difficulty; or whether they do not involve themselves in far deeper and more inextricable perplexities. Adam's sin, say they, is not imputed to them. They are punished for their own sins. But how came they into this sinful state? It is answered, that according to the laws of nature, like begets its like, and as the parents became corrupt, they could only communicate the nature which they had, to their children. But who established these laws, according to which those who had never offended, and to whom no sin was imputed, should be brought into the world, under the greatest of all curses, a depraved nature? To allege that this happens according to the established laws of nature, is merely to state the fact, and not to account for it. That men are born in a sinful and miserable state is evident. What we wish to know is, how this can be accounted for under the government of a just and good God. There are only two answers which can ever be given. One is, that God has, in a sovereign way, so ordered things, that this should be the result: the other is, that the first man was constituted the federal, as well as the natural head of his race, and, as their representative, acted for them; so that as he sinned, they are treated as if this sin was their own, as indeed in a legal sense it is; or in other words, his sin is imputed to his posterity. Which of these answers is most reasonable and satisfactory, we leave to the judgment of the impartial reader. For us, the doctrine of imputation is the only source of any light on this obscure subject.

In regard to the person of the Mediator, we find nothing

peculiar in the writings of Dr. Emmons; except that with all his brethren of the new school of theology, he denies the eternal generation of the Son of God. In other respects, he is sound on the subject of the Trinity, the personal distinctions, and the supreme divinity of the Son and the Spirit. As this opinion respecting the relation between the Father and the Son has no connexion, that we can see, with the other parts of the system of New Divinity, we pass it by with the single remark, that a fondness for new opinions in theology, and a disposition, without urgent reason, to unsettle opinions long established in the church, are dangerous, and almost sure to lead into error. There is, in fact, nothing new in theology. The word of God was as full and complete when the canon of scripture was closed, as it is now or ever will be in the present life. Some things may be better understood at one time than another, but surely they who lived in the times of the apostles, had the best opportunity of knowing the true and full meaning of divine revelation; and it cannot for a moment be supposed, that the word of God contains important doctrines never discovered until our age.

In the sermon on 'The Law of Paradise,' Dr. Emmons has published numerous errors, some of which are as dangerous in their tendency as any thing which has ever proceeded from his pen. He denies that there was any covenant entered into with Adam. He asserts that neither temporal nor spiritual death was included in the penalty; but only eternal death. He maintains, that God is not under any moral obligation to execute his threatenings; that otherwise the condition of fallen man would have admitted of no remedy; no Mediator could have been introduced. His own words touching the Law of Paradise are these: "Some suppose that it had the power of condemning not only those who actually transgressed it, but millions and millions of those who never could transgress it. They suppose that the threatening to Adam, in case of disobedience, extended not only to him, but to all his posterity, and did actually condemn them as well as him for his first transgression. This is to suppose, either that his posterity did actually eat of the forbidden fruit before they existed, or that they were condemned for a transgression which they never did nor ever could commit; each of which suppositions is absurd in the extreme, and barely to mention it is sufficient to refute it." Now this is by no means a fair

statement of the matter. The posterity of Adam are not personally condemned until they come into existence, when this sin is imputed. Or, Adam, having been constituted by God the federal head of all his posterity, violated the law given for the trial of his obedience: they were involved in the penalty incurred; so that they are actually born under the curse of a broken covenant.

But while Dr. Emmons thus unceremoniously rejects the doctrine of the imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity, he maintains a doctrine liable to all the objections which can be made to this. He holds, that God made no covenant with man, and did not give him a law the penalty of which could reach his offspring; yet he teaches, that God formed a *constitution* (where does he find this in the Bible?) which was totally distinct from the law given to Adam, and according to this constitution, determined that his posterity should become sinful or depraved, in consequence of his first sin. This constitution was neither expressed nor implied in the law respecting the tree of the knowledge of good and evil; and there is no reason to suppose that Adam knew any thing more of God's constituting him the public head of his posterity, than of his providing a Saviour for them, in case of disobedience. Here, indeed, is a new scheme, erected upon the ruins of the old; amounting to the same thing, in the end, but liable to far more weighty objections than have ever been alleged against the orthodox doctrine. The posterity of Adam have no concern whatever in his obedience or disobedience to the law given in Paradise; but God makes a constitution, according to which they are brought into existence sinners and depraved. Adam, without knowing any thing about what depended on his conduct, is made the occasion of his posterity coming into existence in the most wretched condition conceivable. It is, forsooth, a crying injustice for men to be punished on account of the sin of their father and representative, but no injustice to be subjected to the very same evils arbitrarily, by a *constitution* of which he knew nothing, and without any sin being laid to their account. Is not this the very same thing, as if they had been created sinners? Why treat them as Adam was treated, if they had no federal connexion with Adam? If the new divinity can bring us no better relief from our difficulties than this, we disclaim its aids; hoping that after this, there will be no more complaint of the injustice of punishing Adam's pos-

terity for his sin, until it can be shown that the very same punishment may be inflicted without regard to any sin.

But having already received Dr. Emmons's opinions respecting original sin, we will direct our attention to the dangerous doctrine which he defends, in regard to the threatenings of God; namely, that he is under no obligation from his veracity to execute them. He makes a wide difference between the obligation to fulfil promises, and the obligation to inflict threatened punishment. An attempt is made to prove that neither temporal nor spiritual death was any part of the penalty of the law of Paradise; but that the death mentioned in connexion with the precept was nothing less than eternal death. Now as Adam did not die a temporal or eternal death on the day in which he sinned; and as spiritual death is no part of the penalty of the law, the threatening, "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die," could not have been executed. From these assumed principles, he draws the conclusion, that God is not bound to execute his threatenings. The obvious objection to this doctrine, from the veracity of God, he fairly states, as follows: "It is said that a divine threatening always pledges the divine veracity; so that whatever death God threatened to Adam, he was obliged to inflict upon him, or violate the truth, which was morally impossible; for God cannot lie. But he did not die temporal or eternal death, the day he sinned, which proves that spiritual death was the only death threatened." To which he answers: "It must be allowed that this reasoning is just and conclusive, if God does pledge his veracity to inflict the punishment which he threatens to the transgressors of his laws. But he never does pledge his veracity to inflict the punishment threatened in any law." This falls strangely on our ear. If it is so, then his threatenings do not mean what the words import. Suppose a man were solemnly to declare that if a servant or son committed a specified offence he should certainly be expelled from his house; would there be no breach of veracity in omitting to execute his own threatening? And shall man be more regardful of his word than the God of truth? If God says positively to man, In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die, has he not spoken the word, and will he not do it? Most certainly his veracity is pledged in every word which he speaks; and in regard to this point, it matters not whether the declaration be a promise, a threatening, or a mere asser-

tion. To deny this is to deny one of the plainest principles of duty which could be stated; yet this doctrine sets up a plea to justify God in solemnly declaring one thing, while it is his secret purpose to do the contrary. Away with such Jesuitical pretences, fitted to cast dishonour upon the veracity of our God. For if God is not bound to execute threatenings which are not conditional, how do we know that he will fulfil his promises? If he can omit to execute the one, he may neglect to fulfil the other. And if this doctrine is true, there is no certainty that God will ever execute any of his threatenings of future and eternal punishment: after all, these may be a mere *brutum fulmen*, intended to frighten man. God is very merciful, and delighteth not in the death of the sinner, and therefore at the day of judgment, instead of saying to the wicked, "Depart into everlasting fire," he may say the contrary; and no punishment whatever may be inflicted on men or devils. This consequence did not escape the acute perception of our author, and he made an effort to obviate it. "There is," says he, "a wide difference between a divine threatening, and a divine prediction and promise. God always pledges his veracity to fulfil a promise or prediction; but he never pledges his veracity to fulfil a bare threatening. A legal threatening is always a bare threatening, which implies neither a promise nor prediction." "There is a wide difference between his predicting, or promising to punish the wicked, and his merely threatening to punish them; and the reason is, that in predicting, or promising to punish the wicked, he expresses his design, intention, or determination to punish them; whereas, in his threatening, he expresses his disposition, not his design, or determination to punish." "We may hence conclude that God might have pardoned and saved Adam, notwithstanding he had threatened to punish him with eternal death for the first offence."*

A horrible doctrine! It tends directly to cast a deep blot on one of God's glorious attributes; and by calling in question the truth of his word, in one class of his most positive and solemn declarations, breeds distrust of all that he has ever said in regard to the final destiny of the wicked. "But let God be true and every man a liar." As to the subtle and pretended distinction between a threatening and a prediction it is without the least foundation. An absolute threatening

* Volume iv. pp. 473-4.

is nothing else than a prediction of the evil which God will bring upon sinners ; and a prediction of such evil is precisely a threatening of the same. There is no difference whatever in the things. In some cases, as in that of Nineveh, the threatening was evidently conditional : although the condition was not expressed it was implied ; for Jonah was sent to call the people to repentance ; and when they repented, of course the threatened judgment was averted.

But in regard to the threatening against Adam, there was no need to invent any such doctrine to save the divine veracity. The death threatened comprehended all sorts of evils which will ever follow in consequence of sin. It included, therefore, every kind of death to which men are subject, and under whatever circumstances, temporal, spiritual, and eternal. For as to our author's reasoning that spiritual death cannot be the punishment of sin, it has no force, and is the old, stale Pelagian objection which has been answered a thousand times, and by none better than by Augustin himself. Suppose we allow, that eternal death was the only thing meant in the threatening. It must have a beginning, and can never be inflicted wholly in any limited time. It began then when Adam was cast out of the favour of God and lost his image. When we consider what eternal death is, it cannot be separated from that spiritual death which, Dr. Emmons confesses, commenced on the day of Adam's fall. The continuance and maturity of spiritual death is eternal death. Remove this, and hell would lose more than half its horrors. The threatening, then, was literally executed. Adam did die, in the most important sense of the word. The body became corrupt, diseased, and mortal. Death that day began to operate on it. The soul died, by being separated from the love and communion of God, and by the loss of his image.

It is pretended that if God's threatenings must be executed, then there could be no salvation for fallen man, but that the penalty must be executed. The penalty is executed. God hath revealed to us a plan of substitution by which one fully qualified can bear the penalty of the law in the room of the guilty. This is the grand mystery of divine wisdom, now revealed to us in the ever blessed gospel. Christ, our mediator, has completely fulfilled the law and satisfied divine justice for all whom the Father hath given to him.

We have not time nor space to review Dr. Emmons's

theory of Conscience. It leads to the greatest absurdities, and is contrary to all just principles of mental philosophy, and to all experience. But as it is rather a subject for the metaphysician than the theologian we shall not detain the reader with any of our remarks on the subject.

Let us rather inquire into the opinions of Dr. Emmons, respecting the work of the Mediator. Here the doctrine of the Atonement, as being the central point in the Christian system, demands our special attention; and no doctrine of scripture has been more perverted and corrupted by the New Divinity than this. Indeed, some of the views on this subject, which have been published and zealously circulated, approach so near to those of Socinus and his followers, that there is not much to choose between them. It appears from Dr. Emmons's life, prefixed to his works, that his sentiments, published in several sermons, gave no small offence; and that some of his friends were grieved on account of the boldness of his opinions. One of them, who is represented as a man of some distinction, wrote to him: "My dear sir, I have read your sermon on the atonement, and have wept over it. Yours affectionately, A. B. C." These admonitory words were no sooner read, says Professor Park, "than the following reply was written and sent to the Post Office, 'Dear Sir, I have read your letter and laughed at it. Yours, Nathanael Emmons.'" The reverend professor deserves a charm in this laconic repartee. If a sound judgment and delicate taste had guided the pen of the biographer, the coarse and flippant witticism would have been suppressed, as altogether unbecoming in such a theologian as Dr. Emmons.

The sermon on the 'Necessity of the Atonement,' the first in the fifth volume of his works, contains in the body of the discourse, a concise but just statement of the grounds of this necessity; and what he says respecting the substitution of Christ, to suffer in the room of sinners is correct, though very inconsistent with opinions which he elsewhere expresses.

But it is in the 'improvement,' or inferences of Dr. Emmons's sermons, that we are to look for his most startling and erroneous opinions. In these, he comes on his readers by a surprise, and deduces from the preceding discourse such inferences as probably no other man would have thought of. So in this discourse there are no less than eight inferences, no one of which is, in our opinion, any inference at all from

the matter of the discourse to which they are appended. The first is, "that if the atonement was necessary entirely on God's account, that he might be just in exercising pardoning mercy to penitent sinners, then it was universal." Now from the doctrine of the body of the discourse, the very contrary would seem to be the logical inference; namely that Christ died only for those in whose room he suffered. The second inference is, "that if the atonement of Christ was necessary on God's account to satisfy his justice towards himself in exercising pardoning mercy to the guilty, then it did not satisfy justice towards sinners themselves." We have never met with a greater confusion of ideas than in this sentence. The notion of a satisfaction to justice on God's account, which is no satisfaction for the sinner, is simply preposterous. The true state of the case is this: man having transgressed the law, and incurred its penalty, lies under the curse of God, from which he cannot be released, unless an atonement be made. The thing to be effected by the atonement is the satisfaction of the laws of justice, which bind the sinner to suffer the penalty. A mediator interposes and undertakes to make the requisite atonement; that is, to satisfy the law for the sins committed. This can be done only by enduring the penalty, which otherwise must have fallen on the sinner. It is evident, therefore, that when justice is satisfied in relation to God, it must be a satisfaction to justice for the sinner. The notion of a satisfaction to justice, which has no relation to the sins which have provoked divine justice, is utterly idle. The author goes on to say, "that justice as it respects them (sinners) stands in full force against them. Nothing which Christ did or suffered, altered their characters, deserts, or obligations."—"Both the precept and the penalty of the law are founded in the nature of things; and Christ did not come to destroy these, nor could he destroy them by obedience or sufferings. The atonement which Christ has made has left sinners in the same state they were in before." Here we see the fountain from which some of our modern writers have derived their opinions. And here we have the doctrine of the New Divinity fairly brought out; throwing into confusion the whole system of the gospel, and actually subverting the scriptural doctrine of atonement.

The third inference deduced from this sermon, is even more extraordinary than either of the former. It is this: "If the atonement of Christ was necessary entirely on God's

part, that he might be just and the justifier of him that believeth, then he did not *merit* any thing at the hand of God for himself, or for mankind." What connexion this has with the doctrine of the discourse, we have not sagacity enough to discern. The opinion expressed in the so called inference, is shocking to the pious mind. It denies that there is any merit in either the obedience or sufferings of Christ. The pretext for this bold and impious opinion is, that pardon is a mere act of grace, and therefore cannot be the result of merit in any one. But may not that be graciously given to the sinner, which was dearly purchased by the Saviour? Why may not the merit of Christ be the ground of our free justification? "In whom," says the apostle, "we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins." But there is no need to argue this point. The opinion here given is abhorrent to the feelings of every Christian. Perhaps Dr. Emmons was the first who ever made an assertion like this, "that Christ did not merit any thing from the hand of God for himself, or for mankind." And again: "As Christ did not merit pardon for believers by his sufferings, so he did not merit a reward for them by his obedience."*

The other inferences are less offensive, but equally arbitrary with those considered; except the fourth, which is a mere truism, that if the atonement of Christ was necessary, it is absurd to suppose it merely expedient. The last inference, however, deserves a passing remark, viz.: "That none can come to Christ and accept pardoning mercy, on account of his atonement, *without accepting the punishment of their iniquities.*" The true import of this phrase when used by Emmonites, is, unless they are first willing to be damned. But how this can be inferred from the doctrine of the sermon, we know not.

The opinions of Dr. Emmons, on the atonement, may be further learned from his sermon, entitled 'The purchase of Christ's blood.' In volume v. p. 32, we find the following decisive remarks: "Christ did not purchase salvation for us in a literal sense. He did not pay our debt of punishment, nor our debt of obedience. Though he suffered in our stead, yet he did not suffer the punishment which we deserve, and which the law threatens to us. He never transgressed the law, and so the law could not threaten any

* Volume v. p. 25.

punishment to him. His sufferings were no punishment, and much less our punishment. His sufferings were by no means equal in degree or duration to the eternal sufferings that we deserve, and which God has threatened to inflict upon us. So that he did in no sense bear the penalty of the law which we have broken and justly deserve. But supposing he had suffered the same things, in degree and duration, that the law threatens to us, yet his sufferings could not pay the debt of punishment which we owe to divine justice. For his sufferings could not take away our desert of suffering. They cannot dissolve our obligation to suffer, nor pay our debt of suffering." "Nothing, therefore, that Christ did or suffered here on earth, can satisfy God's distributive justice, or pay the debt of suffering which we owe to him. Christ did not literally purchase, or buy, or ransom, or redeem mankind from the punishment which they deserved, and which God in his law threatened to inflict on them. His sufferings and death did not literally pay the debt to divine justice which we owe." All this is plain enough; and if it be not subversive of the scripture doctrine of atonement, then we confess that we have read the sacred volume in vain. But where are the testimonies from scripture in support of these anti-evangelical opinions? Our question is however somewhat hasty. Dr. Emmons is not in the habit of referring to scripture for the proof of his doctrines; nor frequently does he condescend to offer any reason in support of his opinions. He simply asserts that the thing is so, and can be nothing else. Of himself he used to say, that he had spent his life in making joints: it might more truly be said, he spent his life in making assertions. In no period of the church, from the days of the apostles until our time, was such a view of the atonement ever entertained, unless by such as denied the essential Godhead of our Saviour. Nor is it saying too much, to declare, that these opinions are in direct hostility with the uniform testimony of the sacred scriptures, as well as of the orthodox church in all ages. It is, indeed, another gospel. Yet multitudes, in our country, have swallowed these doctrines with avidity, not only as great improvements in theology, but as Calvinism!

But what, according to Dr. Emmons, is the atonement? What is to be understood by the purchase of Christ's blood? Let us hear the doctor's own words: "By Christ's purchasing salvation for us, or ransoming, and redeeming us, we

are to understand, *that he made a proper atonement for sin,* which rendered it consistent for God to offer salvation to all mankind, and to bestow it upon all believing, penitent, returning sinners." But what does he mean by "a proper atonement for sin?" The Redeemer did not bear the punishment of our sins. He did not satisfy Divine justice for sinners. On what account then did he suffer? Or, what possible end could his sufferings answer? An innocent person is subjected to an ignominious and inconceivably painful death, when neither law nor justice demands his death. He dies for sinners, and yet he bears no part of the punishment due to sinners; and no sin is imputed to him. Men may give what meaning they please, and sufferings under such circumstances may be called "a proper atonement for sin," but from such sufferings every proper notion of an atonement is excluded. There is nothing like an atonement in the whole transaction; nor can any satisfactory account be given of such a transaction. But this is not the place to argue this matter. We have fully discussed this point in some former articles of this work.

Having taken a brief view of our author's opinions on the atonement, we will now inquire what views he entertained on the important subject of Justification. And here we can be at no loss, for we have a sermon on this very subject; and our author never covers up his meaning, as is the custom of some, in clouds of ambiguous terms. He always comes directly to the point, and lets his reader know, without equivocation, what he would be at. We admire this candid, manly boldness; but nothing can be a sufficient excuse for the promulgation of error. And perhaps, as hinted before, Dr. Emmons's peremptory, clear, and dogmatical style of writing has had no small influence in giving a temporary currency, in certain quarters, to his most extravagant opinions.

"We are to consider," says he, "how God justifies, pardons, or forgives true believers. The Assembly of Divines say, 'justification is an act of God's free grace, wherein he pardoneth all our sins,' &c. But have we any evidence that he does or says any thing, when he justifies or pardons believers? Do they see any thing done, or hear any thing said, when they are justified? Or is there any reason to suppose that God puts forth any act, or makes any declaration, at the time of their justification? But if he does neither, we have still to inquire how, or in what manner he justifies

believers. To this question, a plain and satisfactory answer may be given. God justifies all true believers by *will*. He has formed and published his last will and testament concerning mankind, in which he pardons all true believers, and makes them heirs of salvation," &c. As the doctor called for evidence of the truth of the answer, 'What is justification?' in the Shorter Catechism, we would venture to ask him to bring forth his strong testimonies to prove that this is done merely by *will*. There is no passage of scripture where God is said to have made a last will and testament: and no intimation that when he justifies a sinner, he performs no act. The gospel propounds the doctrine of justification, and informs us in what way it is attained, but it is no where said that the gospel justifies. "It is God that justifieth," and if he justifies, he surely performs the act of justification. When a sinner believes, he passes from a state of wrath and condemnation to a state of favour. God is now reconciled to one, towards whom his displeasure was directed; is there no act of God in all this? Dr. Emmons not only departs from the old system of Calvinistic orthodoxy in numerous particulars, but he seems to take a pleasure in dissenting from these venerable standards; so that he makes a point of difference, where indeed there is none. We do not, in any case, pretend to explain how God acts. All our language respecting this incomprehensible Being is inadequate, and expresses no more than a distant approximation to the truth, which in its fulness is far above our feeble conceptions. But to take advantage of this, to raise objections to important doctrines of the gospel, savours much more of a cavilling self-sufficiency, than of a sincere love of the truth.

The next particular in which our author departs from sound doctrine on this cardinal point is, in maintaining that justification, when it does take place, is conditional; so that it is not complete until the believer has done something else. "Although believers are justified, pardoned, and accepted, as soon as they believe; yet if we look into his last will and testament, we find that their full and final pardon, or title to their eternal inheritance, is conditional." The condition of a full and final pardon is perseverance in holiness to the end. Justification will not, therefore, be complete and absolute until the believer has finished his course of obedience. This doctrine of conditional justification depends on the rejection of the imputed righteousness of Christ;

for if this were admitted, it would necessarily follow that the moment when a sinner believes, his justification before God is as complete and absolute, as it ever can be. But the New Divinity teaches that while the sufferings of Christ procure for him (not merit for him) pardon; yet the title to a reward in heaven depends on his own personal obedience, as will appear immediately. In the sermon, entitled, 'Forgiveness for Christ's sake,' one head of the discourse is to show, "That forgiveness is the only favour, which God bestows on man, on Christ's account." The title to eternal life is not therefore given on Christ's account, nor the gift of the Spirit for our regeneration, sanctification, support, and consolation. Christ has neither merited these rich blessings for his people, nor are they given on his account, or for his sake. Believers are therefore under far less obligation to Christ than has commonly been supposed; and they have from the commencement of Christianity been guilty of a great mistake in their prayers and thanksgivings; but they may plead in apology that they were misled by the very words of Christ himself, and by the words of the apostle Paul. For Christ's declaration was, "Whatsoever ye shall ask of the Father in my name he will give it you." "Ask and ye shall receive." And Paul says, "Whatsoever ye do in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God and the Father by him." These texts seem to have puzzled the doctor a little, but his ingenuity is greatest in overcoming those difficulties which depend on scripture testimonies. He says, "To ask, or do a thing in Christ's name, very often means nothing more or less than asking or doing a thing for the honour and glory of Christ. And to ask or do any thing for the honour and glory of Christ, is entirely consistent with an asking for and obtaining forgiveness for Christ's sake, in distinction from all other favours." This explanation, however, seems not to have satisfied the doctor himself; for in the next paragraph he gives another: "But we readily allow that there is a propriety in asking for every favour for Christ's sake, though God only grants forgiveness on his account. The propriety lies here. We always need forgiveness, when we ask for any favour; and to ask for any favour for Christ's sake, is to ask for forgiveness first, and then for the favour we request." On this reasoning we shall offer no remarks: let the Christian reader judge; but if this doctrine is true, Christ has been honoured in the church entirely too much. Who will venture on so great a blasphemy?

That the active obedience of Christ is utterly excluded from having any thing to do in a sinner's justification, is evident from what has already been said. But this point is brought up again and again ; for no doctrine is more offensive to errorists than imputed righteousness. Against this they are accustomed to direct their heaviest artillery most unsparingly, claiming meanwhile to be Calvinists, and to agree with the reformers.

The very first inference from the discourse last mentioned is : " If forgiveness be the only thing which God bestows upon man, then we may justly conclude, that his atonement did not consist in his obedience but in his sufferings." The second inference is: " If forgiveness be all that God bestows upon man through the atonement of Christ, then forgiveness is not only a part, but the whole of justification. Calvinists have found great difficulty in explaining justification to their own satisfaction, or to the satisfaction of others. The reason is, that they have endeavoured to make it appear, that justification contains something more than pardon or forgiveness. The Assembly of Divines say, that ' Justification is an act of God's free grace, wherein he pardoneth all our sins, and accepteth us as righteous in his sight, only for the righteousness of Christ imputed to us, and received by faith alone.' Agreeably to this, our Calvinistic divines generally maintain that justification consists of two parts, namely pardon of sin, and a title to eternal life. Pardon they suppose is granted on account of Christ's death or passive obedience ; and a title to eternal life is granted on account of his righteousness or active obedience. But we find no warrant in scripture for thus dividing justification into two parts, and ascribing one part to the sufferings of Christ, and the other part to his obedience." And this rejection of Christ's righteousness is intended to make way for the righteousness of the creature. For in the next inference we have the following words : " This subject shows that there is no inconsistency in maintaining that believers are justified entirely on Christ's account ; and yet that they shall be rewarded for all their virtuous actions entirely on their own account." The third inference from this discourse is as wide of the old standards of orthodoxy, as any thing which we have yet mentioned. It is this : " If all that God bestows on men for Christ's sake is forgiveness, then there is no propriety in directing sinners to go to Christ for a new heart or sanctifying grace. Christ did not die for

sinner to procure their regeneration, but to procure their pardon and justification after they are regenerated." These quotations will be abundantly sufficient to put the intelligent reader into full possession of Dr. Emmons's theory of justification.

We have dwelt long enough on the peculiar opinions of Dr. Emmons on the mediatorial work of Christ, and its consequences. It is now proper that we should take some notice of his views of the work of the Spirit in regeneration, conversion, sanctification, and perfection in holiness. Among his sermons we find one on special grace, in which one proposition which he maintains is, that God is able to make sinners willing, by an act of his power. The doctrine of this sermon is sound; but why call this exertion of divine power, 'special grace'? However much the deceitful and desperately wicked heart of man may abound in evil thoughts and malign passions, they are all, according to his monstrous theory, to be ascribed to God, who produces just as much wickedness, as will most glorify his own name, in the greatest happiness of the universe. As there is nothing in the mind but *exercise*, the soul cannot be, as Calvinistic divines have taught, passive in regeneration; but is active; for regeneration is nothing else than the exercise of love, produced by an act of divine power, that is, by the will of God that such an exercise should now exist. "When the Spirit of God renews a sinner, he instamps his own moral image on him, which consists in holiness: and we know that all holiness consists in love." In the sermon from which this is taken, he maintains two propositions: the first is, "That the Spirit of God in regeneration produces nothing but love—And secondly, that he does produce love." From this his first inference is: "If the Spirit of God produces nothing but love, then there is no ground for the distinction between regeneration, conversion, and sanctification. In regeneration he produces holy exercises, in conversion he produces holy exercises, and in sanctification he produces holy exercises."—"But systematic divines generally use them to signify very different things. They use regeneration to denote the Spirit's operation in producing a new heart or a new nature, or a new principle, which is prior to, and the foundation of all holy exercises. They use conversion to signify the Spirit's operation in producing love, repentance and faith; which are implied in embracing the gospel. And they use sanctification for the Spirit's operation

in producing all future exercises of grace. But the scripture makes no such distinction." His second inference is, that "men are no more passive in regeneration, than in conversion and sanctification."—"But if there is no new principle or nature produced in regeneration, but only love, which is activity itself—and it is universally allowed that men are active in exercising love to God or man," then are men active in regeneration. Accordingly the scripture requires men to be active in regeneration, conversion, and sanctification." And in the first inference from the sermon on the 'Duty of sinners to make a new heart,' he says, "If the making a new heart consists in the exercising of holy instead of unholy affections, then sinners are not passive in regeneration. It has been the common opinion of Calvinists, that a new heart consists in a new taste, disposition, and principle, which is prior to and the foundation of holy exercises. And this notion of a new heart has led them to suppose that sinners are entirely passive in regeneration. But if a new heart consists in new holy exercises, then sinners may be as active in regeneration as in conversion."

The next inference is, that "if sinners are free and voluntary in making them a new heart, then regeneration is not a miraculous or supernatural change." Sound theologians have not generally been in the habit of calling regeneration a 'miraculous change,' but with one consent, have denominated it a 'supernatural change;' nor should these two things have been confounded. That it is a supernatural change, that is, not produced by the mere efforts of nature without divine aid, Dr. Emmons himself every where asserts; and surely that which exceeds the powers of nature, and can only be effected by the power of God, may with propriety be called supernatural. Unless he means that, all other exercises of mind being produced by the same power, this operation stands on the same footing with every other exercise of mind, and is therefore merely natural.

In the sermon, 'On the treasures of a good heart,' we have the same views reiterated. A good heart contains good affections, good intentions, good desires, good volitions, good passions; but there is no renewed nature; for, according to the philosophy of this system, there is no nature in man—nor taste—nor principle, distinct from the active exercises of the mind. We need not dwell, therefore, any longer, on this part of the subject; the reader is in possession of the whole theory of mind, as held by Dr. Emmons and his followers. It will only be

necessary to repeat, what the reader has remarked above, that these views lead, of course, to an entirely new order in the succession of the various exercises of piety in the mind. Formerly it was believed, that first the mind must be divinely illuminated, that this new spiritual light produced faith, and faith, as Paul says, worked by love; that from these immediately flowed godly sorrow, working repentance and other graces. The earlier advocates of the New Divinity, however, denied the necessity of any illumination of the understanding, and made the heart, that is the seat of the affections and volitions, the only subject of moral qualities, whether good or evil. Regeneration, according to them, was the creation of a new heart, taste or principle, from which holy affections proceeded. But Dr. Emmons has declared both to be in error, and has given us the following, as the true order of exercises in the regenerate soul. "Love," says he, "must be before either repentance or faith." Next after love comes repentance. "True repentance naturally and almost instantaneously follows true love to God. And as repentance follows love, so faith follows both love and repentance. When the sinner loves he will repent, and when he repents, he will exercise, not merely a speculative, but a saving faith." Although the mere order of the exercises of piety does not seem to be a matter of any great importance, and our views of it must depend on the philosophy of the mind which is entertained by us; yet Dr. Emmons considers it a matter of great moment, and manifests more zeal for his own opinions, on this subject, than on most others. If time permitted, it would be easy to show the arrangement to be preposterous.

Another peculiarity in Dr. Emmons's system of holy exercises is, that every act must be called perfectly holy or perfectly sinful. The imperfection of saints, in this life, does not therefore consist in having exercises which are partly sinful and partly holy, which he maintains to be impossible, but in having their holy exercises interrupted by the occurrence of such as are sinful. Hence the Christian is perfect during the time that he experiences holy exercises, and absolute perfection would be the state of the mind, if these holy exercises were to continue. He seems to have no idea of sin consisting in defect, or in the want of a sufficient degree of love; and yet this is a thing obvious on the most superficial glance at the subject. Many are conscious that they love God, but how few are there who would venture to say that their love and gratitude is at any moment as intense as

it should be? The appeal may, on this point, be very properly made to the conscious experience of the Christian.

The only other subject which we shall mention, as belonging peculiarly to the New Divinity, and especially to that form of the system called Hopkinsianism, is, that the use of means by the unregenerate is altogether useless, and should never be enjoined or encouraged. They insist that the use of means by an unbelieving, impenitent sinner, cannot possibly be acceptable to God, or have any influence in promoting his conversion. This subject has, however, been so frequently discussed, and the scriptural principles are so obvious, that we will not protract this article with further remarks, especially as we do not find that Dr. Emmons has given it any prominence in his works. Those who wish to see the subject ably discussed, are referred to Dr. Dwight's discourses 'on the means of grace.'

It was our purpose to trace the connexion between Dr. Emmons's system, and the still newer theory which has sprung up in New England, and which, from its author, has received the denomination of Taylorism; but the prescribed limits have already been transcended, and we must abruptly conclude.

It would be a pleasing task, if space were left us, to distinguish between the man and the system; to point out the singularities of his peaceful, recluse life, and the history of his conflicts in theology; to show how private religious emotions survived, even amidst a system of opinions subversive of grace, when fairly carried out. But we cannot hope for attention to discussions so protracted. This is our reason for not giving some account of the life of Dr. Emmons, for which the sketches of Dr. Ide and Professor Park afford abundant materials. Those, however, who would be much interested in the details will probably purchase the volumes, especially if the system of opinions which they comprise should find means of awakening a new interest in its behalf among the clergy of New England. That the reprint of these works will afford occasion for many a new discourse, assertory of Emmonistic errors, we do not doubt. Be it so: those who love such views of God and Redemption are not quite extinct; their right to propagate their opinions is undoubted; and our only request is, that when they teach, they should so far reverence the memory of the great Reformer, as never to call it Calvinism.