

THE  
PRINCETON REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1856.

---

No. IV.

---

ART. I.—*The Bible, the Missal, and the Breviary; or Ritualism Self-illustrated in the Liturgical Books of Rome: Containing the Text of the entire Roman Missal, Rubrics, and Prefaces, translated from the Latin; with Preliminary Dissertations, and Notes from the Breviary, Pontifical, etc.* By the Rev. George Lewis, of Ormiston. Edinburgh, 1853: pp. 809.

MR. LEWIS claims this as the first full English translation of the great Roman Liturgy.\* The Missal is not to be found in any other spoken language. One Voisin, in the seventeenth century, who presumed to make a French version, was anathematized for his pains, and the book is not extant. Before the present undertaking, Hussenbeth's was the most complete English translation, and he gives all that is necessary for the information of the unlearned in following the service. The small volumes which are in the hands of the worshippers in these churches, are not missals or mass-books, but guides to the observance of what the priest is performing at the altar,

\* The copy followed is "The Roman Missal restored, according to the decree of the most holy Council of Trent; published by order of the holy Pius V., and revised by authority of Pope Clement VIII. and Urban VIII. Augmented with the new Masses granted by the indulgence of the Apostolic See. Mechlin, 1840."

ART. III.—*Religion in America: or, an Account of the Origin, Relation to the State, and present Condition of the Evangelical Churches in the United States. With notices of the Unevangelical Denominations.* By Robert Baird. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1856. 8vo. pp. 696.

THIS fine volume is the enlargement of a work which its excellent author published under the same title about twelve years ago, but which he has re-written and greatly improved, by new labour and the results of wider observation. Few persons have had better opportunities than Dr. Baird of knowing exactly what is needed in Europe on the subject of the American Churches. He has, therefore, been enabled to adapt his various studies to the wants of transatlantic readers; and from this point of view his performance must continually be judged. The former edition had a wide circulation in several languages of Europe, and contributed to increase that just esteem in which the author is held by Evangelical Christians in the Old World.

We paid our respects to the volume on its first appearance, and we still adhere to the favourable opinion then expressed. We still hold, that there is no American, however well informed, who may not read it with instruction, and refer to it as a cyclopedia of facts not elsewhere extant in connection. This is the more true, when we reflect that the members of different ecclesiastical bodies live very much apart, so that a Lutheran and a Methodist often know less of one another, than either knows of his own fellowship in England or Prussia. We still rejoice that the work has fallen, not into the hands of a partisan or a fanatic, but of a mild, generous, and large-minded man, who has done as much as any other towards the promotion of fraternity among differing sects. Since we thus expressed ourselves, the work has undergone a thorough revision, for the sake of which the author has retired from important public employments. It has been brought down in its details to our own times. Every sentence has been read, and almost every enumeration has been changed; as was inevitable in regard to a country and a period like our own.

Of eight books, the First is devoted to preliminary remarks,

suiting to prepare for the comprehension of what follows. It is well occupied with chapters on the Geography, Colonization, Settlement, Government, and general religious Characteristics of the United States. Four important chapters are given to the consideration of the Voluntary System; a topic which in its interest for foreign Christians fairly overshadows all the rest, and which perpetually recurs in the subsequent details. Matters have greatly changed; for example, in Scotland, since the day when the *Church of Scotland Magazine*, and other prints, afforded the arena for conflict over the American experiment, and when our method of sustaining the gospel was held up to scorn by the very men who have since been driven to the practice of the same principles. Dr. Baird has on this subject done justice to the wise and holy endeavours of our forefathers, while he has communicated to the Churches of Europe facts too weighty, and results too lasting and too vast, to be ignored in any plans for the reorganization of old economics. We will even go so far as to say, that not even the chaotic mass of Anglicanism can be informed by any principle of order, or reduced by convocations and parliaments to any symmetry or congruity, without perpetual reference to the laws of church progress which have been realized in America. And it has been well for those old prescriptive and traditionary structures, amorphous and tottering, ill able to endure the axe and hammer of reform, and fraught with every sort of combustible material, that Providence should have afforded the American field, three thousand miles away, where every explosive experiment might be tried as it were in the open air. Dr. Baird was one of the first to show to foreign inquirers, simply and modestly, but with the incontestable logic of facts, how the high principles of Vinet and others were taking concrete shape, in all the wonderful extent of the Western Republic.

The Second Book treats of the Era of Colonization. The subject is one of the greatest which our age has presented; and though America is no longer the only great territory which invites thronging millions, it still is, and will continue to be, the world's exemplar and grand instance of the law of human diffusion.

The Third Book, entitled "The National Era," treats of the

National Independence of our country, with the political and religious consequences of that event. The ecclesiastical results of separation from the mother country are set forth; it is shown that the dissolution of the union of church and state was gradual, and was not effected by the government. The discussion of these points involves matters of unusual interest, concerning which egregious errors prevail among European Christians. The silent and peaceful revolution, naturally most surprising to investigators whose notions have followed the transatlantic track, is expounded step by step, in what we consider one of the best portions of the work. The question is discussed, how far the State has the power to promote religion; and it is proved that the General Government is not restrained from promoting religion, though it is not free to prefer one denomination of Christians. It is further shown, that so far from being infidel or atheistical, as some zealots have maintained, the Government is Christian; as recognizing the Sabbath, as recommending other stated days of devotion by executive proclamation, as authorizing the appointment of chaplains, as subjecting the administration of oaths to Christian conditions, and as manifesting a religious spirit in its acts. The government of particular States is shown to have been organized upon the acknowledged basis of Christianity, and their legislation is cited as carrying out the same principles. The truths which are contained in this part of the work strike us as having a great value for our own lawgivers and people; especially in their relation to the observance of the Lord's Day, the securing to the poor of their right to rest, worship, and instruction, and the whole vexed question of religious education and the Bible in schools. We greatly wish that these statements, with fuller development and illustration, could be fairly exhibited to those ill-informed, prejudiced, and wrongheaded religionists, especially among the Germans, who, in their dread of Jacobinism, and their revulsion from the antichristian spectres of 1848, are continually citing the instance of the United States to demonstrate that a separation of Church and State is necessarily followed by the elimination of the religious element from the Constitution.

The Fourth Book discusses more fully and professedly the

operation of the Voluntary Principle in America. Here it is that Dr. Baird brings together in great amount those facts which are new and almost incredible to the old-time Statesmen and Churchmen of Europe. It is made to appear most clearly, that the voluntary principle was the great alternative, and that as soon as all union of the Church with the State ceased, religion was constrained to fall back upon spontaneous support, which has thus become the true American policy, underlying all our immensely expanding interests of churches, schools, and charities. It is here shown by what means moneys are raised for church edifices, for the support of pastors, and for missions. The same is carried out in the matter of education, from the lowest primary school to the most distinguished professional seminary or university. The extension of manifold beneficent, moral, and patriotic enterprises in the most remote parts of the land, is adduced to evince the strength and elasticity of this beneficent principle.

The Fifth Book is upon the Church and Pulpit in America. Amidst much under this head which is both true and seasonable, we find some things which savour too much in our judgment of a particular school or party in homiletics, and some things which have become almost obsolete. We refer entirely to the chapters on Preaching, and we admit the inherent difficulties on the subject. It is no easy task to bring under one rubric the various, and we might almost say, opposite modes of preaching which prevail in our extended country. Dr. Baird has unwittingly assumed his point of observation in the midst of a particular class, and hence his descriptions do not represent Episcopalian or Methodist preachers, or Presbyterians of the Middle and Southern States, so much as Congregationalists and Presbyterians of New England and the North. After a careful examination, we do not consider the American pulpit, as a whole, to deserve the praise conveyed in the ten characteristics of the sixth chapter. So, also, on the subject of Revivals of Religion, while in the main we agree with the author, there are assertions and implications with which we totally disagree. That his account is faithful in regard to a certain sort of revivals, and a certain sort of doctrine employed to produce them, we readily admit; but as belonging to a very large and im-

portant branch of that American Church which he represents, we find ourselves unable to accept the portrait. The view given (page 406, sqq.) of the mode of presenting truth, which is characteristic of American Revivals, may be very true of New England and of New School Theology, and of revivals connected with these, but is far from being so of revivals in general, or of the wide-spread awakenings with which God has blessed the churches of our own name. Upon this point, which we consider a very serious one, there can be no fairer method than to adduce the very language which Dr. Baird has adopted as his own, and which we are unwilling to accept on the part of Presbyterians.

“The leading doctrine at such seasons is that of ‘the new birth’—of the sinner’s entire dependence, for a change of heart, on the direct interposition of God. And yet for this very reason, the other doctrine implied above, of *duty*, of *obligation* to immediate right action, is urged with redoubled force. Without feeling this, the sinner cannot feel his guilt, for there is no consciousness of guilt without consciousness of having violated duty; and where guilt is not felt, the influences of the Spirit are not given to renew the heart. And here, at this precise point, is the great difficulty in dealing with the impenitent. They do not believe that God requires them, in their present state, to become instantly holy. It is not possible, they think, that He should command them to do that very thing without the influences of His Spirit, which, if ever done, will be the result of those influences. They, therefore, feel that there must be, somewhere at this stage of their progress, a kind of neutral ground—a resting-place, where, having done their part in ‘awaking out of sleep,’ they are allowed to ‘wait God’s time’ (in the customary phrase,) until He has done His part, and renewed their souls. Nor are these views confined to the impenitent. They have been openly avowed by some theological writers, and have exerted a secret but most powerful influence upon far greater numbers who never maintained them in form. There has been, extensively, a feeling that all that the unconverted are bound to do is diligently to use the means of grace; that if they do this, it would be hard in God to withhold the renewing influence of His Spirit; and that He has promised

that influence to their prayers and exertions, if sincere—meaning, of course, a kind of sincerity in which there is no true holiness. These views prevailed in New England previous to the revival of 1735, and were one cause of the great decline in religion which preceded that event. Mr. Edwards was therefore called upon, when that work commenced, to take his ground on this subject, and the principles which guided him in that revival have been the great controlling principles in all our revivals ever since. They are thus stated by his biographer: ‘To urge repentance on every sinner as his *immediate duty*; to insist that God is under no obligation to any unrenewed man; and that a man can challenge nothing, either in absolute justice or by free *promise*, on account of anything he does before he repents and believes.’ The celebrated Whitefield, when he first visited America, in 1740, was much struck with the power imparted to our preaching by these principles. ‘How can *they* possibly stand,’ says he, in a letter to an English friend, ‘who were never brought to see, and heartily confess, that after they had done all, God might, notwithstanding, deny them mercy! It is for preaching in this manner that I like Messrs. Tennents. They wound deeply before they heal. They know there is no promise made but to him that believeth, and, therefore, they are careful not to comfort overmuch those that are convicted. I fear I have been too incautious in this respect, and often given comfort too soon. The Lord pardon me for what is past, and teach me more rightly to divide the word of life in future.’ Against this disposition to ‘comfort too soon’—to allow the impenitent some resting-place short of instant submission, the following very pointed cautions were once given by Dr. Nettleton, who has had great experience in the conduct of revivals. ‘Now what do you mean by this? Do you mean to encourage the sinner in his sins, and take his part against God? You are attempting to ease and soothe him while he is in rebellion against God. When the sinner is in this distress, there are two things that press heavily upon him—a sense of his obligation to repent, and a fearful apprehension that he never will repent. Now, if you tell him to ‘wait God’s time,’ and the like, you take off this obligation at once. You remove all anxiety, and most probably cause him to sink down

into a state of stupidity and indifference on the subject. You take away the apprehension, also; and the danger is that he will sink down into a state of stupidity, or mistake the relief he feels for a change of heart. Now, instead of quieting him in his sins by such language, you should endeavour to increase his distress as much as possible. You should *press him down*, and tell him he must submit to God, and generally he will. I know some have been brought out truly regenerated after all this flattery, but it was not in consequence, but in spite of it. Again, you say, 'Look to the promises.' Now, there is no promise to the impenitent, and how can you expect him to look to the promises while he is in his sins? I distinguish between *promises* and *invitations*. Men are invited to repent, but there is no promise to them till they do repent.' Such has been the uniform mode of exhibiting this subject. The promises of God are a part of His *covenant*, and the indispensable conditions of the covenant are repentance and faith."

Our judgment has not changed since what we wrote eleven years ago, and which we now repeat, with a repugnance to the noxious errors involved, greatly increased by the experience of the intervening period. There is scarcely anything in the historical matter touching revivals, to which we object. But when the writer undertakes to give the instrumental causes of these effects, unless he means deliberately to limit his statements to certain cantons or provinces of the Church, we are unwilling to have such testimony sent across the ocean to our brethren of the Reformed Churches. To them we protest with earnestness, that such are not the views of the genuine Presbyterians of the United States. We abjure, as much as the most zealous adherent of new divinity, the tenet that repentance is not a matter of duty; but we equally abjure every doctrine or system which would make regeneration *a mere item in a series of duties*. And we record our renewed protestation against a plan of teaching, which would represent bare submission to God's rectoral justice, as the critical act to which the sinner must be brought, and which excludes the promulgation of Christ's priestly work, until such time as the convicted soul shall have been sufficiently humbled in the judgment of his spiritual guide. To our Reformed brethren in Scotland, and France, and Swit-



zerland, who honour our pages with their perusal, we declare that these points of what is assumed to be New England Theology are as odious to the sound Presbyterians of America as they can be to themselves. When Dr. Nettleton, therefore, would say in regard to a distressed soul, "you should *keep him down*, and tell him he must submit to God," we persist in rejecting the recipe. It wants all scriptural warrant. It enjoins an act which, in any valid sense, is impossible without faith; and which, as understood, has nothing evangelical. It hangs a thick curtain before the great object, the sacrifice of Christ, and refuses to raise it, till when? Till the moment when the minister shall declare the humbling process to be complete. Awful is the responsibility of that man who shall undertake to determine when that last drop of consummating anguish has been distilled into the cup of bitterness, or when the instant has arrived when a sinner may behold the Lamb of God without damage. How simple, how plain, how safe, how glorious, in comparison, the scriptural advice to an awakened man, *Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved!* Such was the method of Whitefield, as it had been the method of Livingstone, of Knox, of Luther, and of Paul and Silas.

We further express our surprise and disgust, that the shibboleth of New England Divinity, so called, namely, the metaphysical dogma of Natural Ability, should be again paraded before the eyes of our transatlantic brethren, as a principal means of revival. If Dr. Baird means to underwrite the statements on this head, which appear on pages 407 and following, we declare openly that he does not represent the theological teachers, authors, or clergy of the Church to which he and we belong. We trust he rather gives utterance to opinions of the "distinguished friend and professor" to whom resort has been had for the contents of this sixth chapter. We should have been better pleased to hear Dr. Baird in his own person; and his account of revivals, in the diction of New Haven, makes us exclaim, "The voice is Jacob's voice, but the hands are the hands of Esau."

With the serious exceptions above taken, we regard the matter of the fifth book as important. When the author speaks

for himself, on the history, character, and abuses of revivals, we read his observations with much respect, and consider them worthy of wide circulation.

The Sixth Book treats of the Evangelical Churches of America, which it takes up in detail, with abundance of valuable record and statistics. The Seventh Book gives a view of the Unevangelical Denominations of America. As a volume for reference, whether at home or abroad, these two books furnish a treasure-house of information which is not anywhere equalled; but the nature of which forbids either extract or abridgment.

It is with some concern that we find ourselves constrained once more to animadvert on a paragraph which re-appears in this new edition; and we do not disguise our profound regret, that after years of reflection, so crude and groundless a statement, and one so likely to be abused by the patrons of error, as that which next follows, should have been retained and perpetuated:

“The great achievement of American theology is, that it has placed the doctrine of the atonement for sin in the clearest light, by illustrations drawn from the nature of a moral government. Nowhere is the distinction between the work of Christ as the propitiation for the sins of men, and that of the Holy Spirit in renewing and sanctifying the sinner, more clearly drawn—nowhere is the necessity of each to the salvation of the soul more constantly and forcibly exhibited. The tendency of our theology, under the impulse of the Edwardean exposition of the doctrine of the atonement, is to avoid the habit—so common to philosophers and philosophizing theologians—of contemplating God exclusively as the First Cause of all beings and all events, and to fix attention upon him as a Moral Governor of beings made for responsible action. Here it is that the God of the Bible differs from the God of Philosophy. The latter is simply a first cause—a reason why things are—sometimes, if not always, a mere hypothesis, to account for the existence of the universe, another name for nature or for fate. The former is a moral governor, that is, a lawgiver, a judge, a dispenser of rewards and penalties. God’s law is given to the universe of moral beings for the one great end of promoting the happiness of that vast empire. As a law, it is a true and earnest express-

ion of the will of the lawgiver respecting the actions of His creatures. As a law, it must be sanctioned by penalties adequate to express God's estimation of the value of the interests trampled on by disobedience. As the law is not arbitrary, but the necessary means of accomplishing the greatest good, it may not be arbitrarily set aside. Therefore, when man had become apostate, and the whole human race was under condemnation, God sent his Son into the world, in human nature, 'to be made a sin-offering for us;' and thus, by his voluntary sufferings magnifying the law, 'to declare the righteousness of God, that God may be just, and the justifier of him who believeth.' Thus it is that God, as a moral governor, is glorified in the forgiveness of sinners; that he calls upon all men to repent, with a true and intense desire for their salvation; that he sends into a world of rebellion the infinite gift of his Spirit, to impart life to those who are dead in sin; that in a world of sinners, who, if left to themselves, would all reject the offered pardon, he saves those whom he has chosen out of the world; that he uses the cooperation of redeemed and renewed men in advancing the work of saving their fellow-men. Men are saved from sin and condemnation, not by mere power, but by means that harmonize with the nature, and conduce to the ends of God's moral government. This method of illustrating the gospel carries the preacher and the theologian back from the Platonic dreams and dry dogmatizing of the schools, to the Bible. It sets the theologian upon studying, and the preacher upon imitating, the freedom, simplicity, and directness, with which the apostles addressed the understandings and sensibilities of men. And thus it may be regarded as coinciding with other indications of the tendency of religious opinion in the various evangelical bodies of America."

Anywhere else we should regard the opening statement as no other than the cant of New Divinity. It either means nothing definite—an ambiguity which is always dangerous—or it imports a favour for theological error which we repudiate. There is no such achievement of American theology, in any sound sense. There is no American school of orthodoxy, which has placed the doctrine of Atonement in any clearer light than it was placed in by the Reformed Theologians. No valuable illustration

of atonement has been peculiarly derived by American writers from the nature of a moral government. As we once before said, when the same injudicious dictum was set forth, so we now say, for the information of our friends and brethren abroad, the sound theology of the Reformed Church in America claims as its work no such emendation. Various doctrines concerning atonement are held among us. We have, for instance, the doctrine of Calvin and Owen, which is taught in the very terms of transatlantic symbols, by Presbyterians of the sounder sorts. We have the doctrine of Wesley, among the Methodists. We have the doctrine of Taylor, Fitch, and Finney; for omitting lesser differences it is the same, taught more or less extensively in and out of New England. These have no common trait so prominent, as to justify us in asserting of them, that they, or their common tenets, open a clearer view of this august subject than had previously been attained.

The great achievement of American theology, we are told, is, that it has placed the doctrine of the atonement for sin in the clearest light, by illustrations drawn from the nature of a moral government. Can we err in supposing the particular school here meant, to be that of New England? No other has vaunted any new light from this source. The reference to Edwards confirms our persuasion. Now we take leave to say of this venerable man, that nowhere in his works does he exhibit this doctrine in any new mode, which seeks to rid it of difficulties by recourse to the analogy of government. All the old divines drew illustrations indeed from government, but in perfect harmony with the grand scriptural illustration, or rather essential principle, of substitution and vicarious righteousness. To justify any such statement as that of Dr. Baird, he should have adduced something at once novel and American. The statements which he actually adduces in the remainder of the paragraph, exhibit no achievement whatever; but if we except the implied censure of other systems, present not a proposition which would stagger the veriest Scotch Covenanter. We could wish our author to have applied his mind with more discrimination to a point of theology at once so nice and so important. If any marvel at our feeling the allegation to be a grievance, let us remind them, that this claim of a grand achievement on the

part of American theology, in the matter of a "governmental" atonement, is the very claim which is continually and offensively put forward by those who wish to explode the notions of piacular suffering, endurance of penalty, legal substitution, and imputation of righteousness. In place of such an atonement as includes these elements, this school introduces an atonement which seeks, not satisfaction, but only exhibition. This is, we admit, the American view of atonement, if America means the modern Congregationalism of New England. The leading tenet of this scheme surrenders that which is vital to atonement, reducing it to a mere *setting of God right in the view which creatures take of his rectoral acts*. The germ of this doctrine is to be found in the work of Grotius, *De Satisfactione*. Amidst many noble positions of that celebrated treatise, this pregnant error was allowed by the orthodox to remain long unmarked. Not so, however, with the Socinians, who saw that in this concession the real piacular nature of atonement was given up. It was *not* by the elder Edwards that this view of the atonement was first taken, but by later divines of New England, whose sons are now carrying it out to such extremes as make easy fellowship with the more sober Unitarians. According to this doctrine, the atonement removes only that ground of punishment which arises from the tendency of sin to disturb the good order and happiness of the universe. Instead of a legal satisfaction, it is an exhibition or display of the righteousness of God; and this achievement of American theology places the atonement in light derived, not from priesthood and sacrifice, but from the nature of a moral government. If this is not the idea which the reader of Dr. Baird's unguarded statement is likely to take up, what, we demand, is meant by his assumption that the mode which Calvinism had previously employed for representing the atonement was unhappy and obscure, and even that it contemplated "God exclusively as the First Cause of all beings and events"? What system of teaching is here censured, if not that of Dordrecht, of Westminster, of Cambridge, and of Saybrook? Will not every plain reader think of this as the system which has been improved? For ourselves, and for all Presbyterians of our body, and all sound Baptists, Methodists, Lutherans, Episcopalians, and Moravians, we reject the fruits of every such achieve-

ment, and abide by the doctrine and the illustrations which prevailed before the boast of "American Theology" was ever heard. Great as may be the abuses of his remark, we have no cause to believe that the author has individually deviated into any such error as his words might import. The candour of criticism has led us to speak plainly of one or two blemishes which cover only a few pages in a work, which as a whole we esteem, and most cordially recommend.

The Eighth Book relates the Efforts of the American Churches for the Conversion of the World. A concluding chapter gives us a valuable summary, including such topics as the following: the progress of our country, in regard to its material interests, and its intellectual and moral interests; the progress of religious liberty, and the hopeful prospects of the American churches.

✓ We lay down this volume with increased respect for its amiable, diligent, and pious author. Every portion of it bears marks of close observation, industrious research, sound judgment, and generous philanthropy. It is remarkably free from everything like chimera and extravagance. The effort is every where apparent to hold the balance even, among varying sects and conflicting parties. Throughout the book the spirit which predominates is that of a sound and liberal protestant catholicism. We are particularly warmed and comforted by the filial and patriotic vindication of our beloved country, against the calumnies which are rife in Europe. In this respect it is written in a truly American temper; equally remote on one hand from vulgar brag concerning "this great country," as on the other from truckling concession to the arrogant assumptions of European censors. Every day the balance of influence turns a little more in our favour, as to books, schools, churches and charities; but in no particular is this so manifest, as in those things which concern religious liberty and Church independence, topics concerning which this work will take rank as an authority. In all instances, and as well in person as by his authorship, Dr. Baird has been the tried defender of our Christian and national reputation in foreign lands, and we believe this work will crown his valuable services in this regard.