

THE
CHRISTIAN JOURNAL,
AND
LITERARY REGISTER.

No. 2.]

FEBRUARY, 1825.

[VOL. IX.

*Conversion and Death of Count
Struensee.*

(Continued from page 21.)

DR. MUNTER then proceeds to obtain from him a statement of his system of religion; from which we find that he is a disciple of materialism, considering man as a single substance, or a mere machine; inferring from thence that there was no morality in actions further than as they affected society, and consequently, that there was no such thing as punishment after this life.— Here we cannot but observe, by the way, how the infidel contradicts himself, while he denies the doctrine of future punishments; for at the very moment when he is disclaiming this doctrine, he confesses that man is “punished in this world for his transgressions,” and that he was not “happy himself” during the time of his greatest prosperity: thus effectually asserting the prevalence of that fact which revelation only carries on to its perfection by extending it to a future state.

At the conclusion of this conference, Munter, instead of directly obviating these errors, endeavours to make an impression on his heart, by informing him of a fact which was calculated to awaken a feeling of remorse.

“I had observed that he really was very uneasy about some of his actions, and I thought proper to increase his uneasiness. I suppose my readers know how much he was to be blamed for his conduct towards Count Bernstorff.* I acquainted him, therefore, upon taking my leave of him, with his death. He called out with an emotion of heart—‘What! is he dead?’ and seemed to shudder. Yes, said I, he is.

* “Count Bernstorff was minister of state in Denmark since the year 1750. Struensee got this great and beloved minister dismissed, by a letter of the king’s, dated September the 15th, 1770, with a pension of 6000 crowns; he retired to Hamburgh, where he died the 18th of February, 1772.—T.”

His wisdom, religion, and piety, have preserved him the character of a great man to the last; and it is generally believed, that the grief of his last years had hastened his death. When I spoke this, I looked at him with an air which he seemed to understand, for he blushed.”

The same impression he renews at the next conference, by reminding him of the deep affliction which he had caused his parents, and how much it was his duty “to procure them that only comfort which was left them, not to remain in anxiety about his future state.” He appears already to have succeeded partly in this respect: though he had not been able to convince his understanding by arguments respecting the existence of the soul.

In the third conference, Munter finds him more disposed to receive the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, by the perusal of Jerusalem’s Meditations, (a book for which Mr. Rennell substitutes Pascal’s Thoughts.) Still the count perseveres in his system of materialism. He cannot, however, but acknowledge, when pressed with the fact, that our organs are only instruments, which imply an agent to make use of them, (a fact strikingly illustrated by Bishop Butler in his Analogy); but the shame of sacrificing his own opinion, is still an obstacle to his conviction of the truth. Munter, very judiciously, still has recourse to his heart, as the means of overcoming the difficulty.

“He was sensible of this, but it seemed to be a hard matter for him to own he was in the wrong. Nevertheless, it was necessary he should make this confession before I could proceed any farther. I undertook therefore to prove, that the manner in which his opinion had taken its origin, and had interested his heart so much, tended neither to his credit nor to his advantage. I looked upon this as the best means to expel one shame by another. He interrupted me very seldom during the

blood, that men might be reconciled to that God, and taught to love one another;—the savage drops his weapon. He tells him there is a Spirit, who even now is speaking to his heart, bidding him calm his passions, and repent of his violence;—the savage listens, reflects, and owns the finger of God within him,—he weeps over the bodies on which he had trampled,—he drowns his hateful feelings in tears,—his soul is poured forth in contrition, and “cries out to the living God.” The savage is a new man; he follows the messenger of the gospel, he names the name of Christ, he departs from iniquity; and he invokes a blessing on you who sent light, to irradiate his soul, and peace, to hallow his wrathful bosom.—These are not visions, brethren, but facts. One tribe at least, who are within the ministrations of those to be aided by your alms, have been brought into the Christian Church. They kneel, on the Lord's day, to offer the same devotions with which we honour their and our Father, their and our God. They are converted: but they are young in Christ; and it is for you to bring them forward in his nurture and admonition.

Brethren, I have laid before you the wants of those to whom missionaries are sent; allow me to add an appeal to your bounty in behalf of the missionaries themselves.—Almost all of them are in the humblest circumstances,—having no provision for their support, and that of their families, but their small remuneration as clergymen. A part of this remuneration is given by their congregations; but this is always scanty, and often but precarious: and your preacher can attest, from actual insight into the households of some of them, that the merest wants of life are not so supplied, but that they must often fear lest that supply should cease or be insufficient. They receive also from the missionary fund the small annual pittance of \$125. The deficiency of the fund has occasioned this extreme reduction; and, if that deficiency be not remedied, there must be a farther abatement.—And, will you suffer this?—will you see them bereft of the last comfort, of the very essentials of ex-

istence? Their homes can now have little cheerfulness, but that which arises from the tranquillity of a pure heart, and the consciousness of being useful;—will you suffer the clouds of absolute penury to darken these few rays of their enjoyment,—and bid their last happiness, the happiness of the mind, vanish in the gloom of care too disheartening to be borne? Alas, their case is what *you* cannot realize, surrounded by prosperity, and protected by flourishing affairs;—and may Providence save you through life from the anxieties they experience! You cannot realize the hardship of their fate:—but, brethren,—you can *relieve* it. O let your alms shed a ray of joy into the missionary's household,—cheer those dearest to him, whose deprivations are his darkest discouragement,—and thus cheer *him* also in his labours for those who are “crying out for the living God.”

For the Christian Journal.

MR. EDITOR,

As I am not a subscriber to the Christian Journal, and seldom see any of its numbers, it was by accident, and only within a few days, that I met with the number for last month. In turning over its pages, I was not a little surprised to find a communication subscribed “*Catholicus*,” and entitled, “Presbyterian sentiments on the best mode of disseminating the truths of Scripture,”—in which a most extraordinary construction is put on the leading opinions expressed in my Introductory Lecture on “Creeds and Confessions,” and some no less extraordinary inferences drawn from that construction. My first impression was, that no public notice of this communication, on my part, was required. The representation which it gave of the doctrine of the Lecture, appeared to me so manifestly unwarranted, and, indeed, I must say, such an extravagant perversion, that I thought it might safely be left to the good sense of every reader. But, finding that some persons really seem to form a different estimate of this publication from that which I should have expected; that measures

have been taken to give it circulation, in a detached form, beyond the ordinary sphere of the Journal in which it originally appeared; and that some of my friends think it ought not to pass unnoticed;—I beg leave to occupy a single page of your miscellany with a brief reply to the singular remarks of *Catholicus*. If nothing had been in question, Mr. Editor, but the merits of my humble Lecture, you certainly would not have heard a syllable from me on the present occasion.—But it would really grieve me to be thought an enemy of Bible Societies, or capable of intentionally uttering a word hostile to their universal establishment and triumph. Nor did it ever occur to me that there was any more connection between my doctrine concerning “Creeds,” and such hostility, than between my belief in Presbyterian parity, and the heresy of Socinianism. And whether the efforts of your correspondent to represent me as agreeing with his diocesan, do not betray the weakness of a bad cause, I shall leave to the consideration of discerning and reflecting readers.

It is neither my province nor my design to enter into any discussion concerning the correctness of Bishop Hobart's opinions. But I must be allowed strongly to deprecate being supposed to agree with him in reference to Bible Societies. If I have understood the scope of what has been said and written against that gentleman, in relation to this subject, it is—not that he is zealously attached to his own Church; not that he admires and loves the Book of Common Prayer, and is earnestly desirous of putting it into the hands of every human being to whom it can possibly be conveyed. For all this, I have never heard him blamed by any one:—but for being unwilling to unite with any society, the object of which was to circulate the Word of God ALONE. Now, as to this point, I totally differ from him, both in principle and practice. I consider the Scriptures as the ONLY infallible rule of faith and practice; and as a SUFFICIENT rule, for all who approach them with humble and honest hearts. I am, therefore, perfectly willing to co-operate with any and every person in sending them,

without note or comment, to every son and daughter of Adam. I consider it as a privilege and an honour to be a member of the American Bible Society, and of every other Bible Society within convenient reach:—and my impression of the importance of these societies, in promoting the best interests of the world, is so far from being impaired, that it is daily becoming deeper.

In full consistency, as it appears to me, with all this,—when I go into the pulpit, I think it incumbent on me, not only to recommend the Bible, in general, to my hearers, but also to declare to them *how I understand it*. When called upon to assist in ordaining a minister, I deem it indispensable to ascertain, by appropriate measures, how the *living teacher* whom I am about to aid in sending forth, is likely to explain that Word of Life which we commission him to preach. And when an opportunity is presented, I do not fail to recommend and circulate the Confession of Faith, and the Form of Government and Discipline of my own Church. But I should abhor the thought of withholding a Bible from an ignorant, destitute fellow-creature, until I could accompany the delivery of it with my own Formulas and Articles. Just as soon should I think of withholding a piece of bread from a starving beggar, until I had previously engaged him to come under the government of my own family. I am quite willing to trust the Bible alone in the hands of every inhabitant of the globe; and to leave the question whether they shall be connected with this or that denomination, to their own serious and deliberate decision, aided by that enlightening and sanctifying Spirit, who leads his people into all necessary truth. If I believed, indeed, that the peculiarities of the Church of which I am a member, were essential to salvation; or that it was impossible for a serious inquirer to understand the fundamental doctrines of Scripture, without the assistance of my formularies and expositions, my conduct would be different. But as I believe neither, I am, of course, not embarrassed with any of the consequences of such belief. It is time enough, in

my opinion, when persons make inquiries with a view to join a particular denomination, or put themselves in the way of being taught its peculiarities, to meet them—if candidates for private membership, with those views of doctrine and order;—or if aspirants to the ministry, with those “Creeds and Confessions”—the reception of which appears to me indispensable to the attainment of ecclesiastical concord and edification. Thousands and tens of thousands who will never have an opportunity of coming within the pale of my own Church,—and who might not be disposed to do it, if they had,—may yet be willing to receive Bibles from *any* hands, and may be for ever benefitted by them. Ought I to withhold from them the precious gift? I dare not do it. And I am so far from seeing an inconsistency between this decision, and the doctrine which I have taught concerning Church “creeds,” that they appear to me to illustrate and strengthen each other.

I am, Sir, yours respectfully,
SAMUEL MILLER.

Princeton, Dec. 24th, 1824.

Remarks on the above Letter.

The Editors of the Christian Journal, besides allowing Catholicus an opportunity, in some future number, of answering for himself, deem it proper to annex a few remarks to the above letter.

Most unfortunately, Bishop Hobart's opinions have been greatly mistaken by the reverend author: for to Bishop Hobart a reference must be intended, though not expressed, in the following passage, or it has no point or pertinency:—“I should abhor the thought of withholding a Bible from an ignorant, destitute fellow-creature, until I could accompany the delivery of it with my own formulas and articles. Just as soon should I think of withholding a piece of bread from a starving beggar, until I had previously engaged him to come under the government of my own family.” Bishop Hobart has never opposed the circulation of the Bible alone, though he prefers extending the Church of God with his

word; and this he earnestly recommends to Episcopalians, who by common usage, if not by common consent, are distinctively known as *Churchmen*. It has always been his advice (and repeatedly has that advice been so *published* as to be known to all who do not prefer taking his opinions upon hearsay), to give Bibles where they alone are required, or will be received, but to give a Prayer Book with the Bible in other cases. And we think that no one can peruse the Lecture of the Rev. Dr. Miller without agreeing that his *arguments* tend to justify this very course, whatever be the conclusion Dr. Miller may *himself* deduce from those arguments, or the construction he may give them. We refer the reader to the extracts from that Lecture in our number for November last.

Bishop Hobart's main objection to Bible Societies is not that they distribute *the Bible only*; although he thinks, and it appears to us reasonably, that in many cases greater good would be done by appropriating a part of the expense incurred in that good work to the dissemination of means calculated to draw attention to the Scriptures, to lead to a proper understanding of them, and to enforce their truths and precepts. But the most objectionable feature of promiscuous Bible Societies, and that which has had the greatest influence in inducing Bishop Hobart to decline an union with them, is their strong tendency to promote that indifference to distinctive religious views, the avowal and prevalence of which has led, we believe, to Dr. Miller's able vindication of the utility and necessity of symbols of faith. Does not his Lecture show that the eating of the fruit of these devices has begun? This neutralizing influence is owned, avowed, and even boasted, by multitudes of the friends of those societies. The indifference, to be sure, is called liberality, catholicism, Christian unity, evangelical charity, and has other winning epithets. But its real character cannot long remain generally unperceived. It is making bold and daring attacks upon the truly evangelical unity of spirit in the bond of peace. All who believe that there is in the gospel a required system of