
A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

ARTICLE III.

THE WORKS OF SAMUEL HOPKINS.[1]

By Edward Beecher, D. D., Boston, Mass.

It has, of late, become quite fashionable with a certain class of writers to represent New England theology, in all those aspects of it which are disliked and feared, as peculiarly a metaphysical system, and the offspring of bold and daring speculation. These things are especially said when it is desired to neutralize the power of the Edwardean doctrine as to the nature of true holiness, and of sin as consisting in benevolent or selfish voluntary action, and as to the natural ability of the sinner to do his duty, notwithstanding the certainty that he will not do it, which is caused by the power of his depravity, and is so absolute as to render essential the interposition of the Divine Spirit to effect his salvation.

In view of these things the Princeton divines are wont to expatiate on the influence of Edwards, as the founder of a "School of metaphysics," and of "metaphysical theology," derived from Locke. The piety of "this great and holy man" they do not call in question; they concede that it elevated him immeasurably above many of his followers, but, nevertheless, he did, unfortunately, establish a school of "daring speculators." The metaphysics of this school, they tell us, "is of a hyperborean sort, exceedingly cold and fruitless." "In the conduct of a feeble, or even an ordinary mind, the wire-drawing processes of New England theologizing, became jejune and revolting." School-boys, youth, and professors, "were taught to consider mere ratiocination as the grand and almost sole function of the human mind." Hence the sermons heard in New England pulpits for the half century next after the death of Edwards, were exceedingly "barren and frigid." They concede, indeed, that for a time, even among "the dwindled progeny of the giants," there were "marks of genius," but at last "a winter reigned in the theology of the land, second only to that of the scholastic age."

[1] The works of Samuel Hopkins, D. D., first Pastor of the Church in Great Barrington, Mass., afterwards Pastof of the First Congregational Church in Newport, R. I., with a Memoir of his Life and Character. Boston: Doctrinal Tract and Book Society, 1852.

Lest, however, we should lose ourselves in these eloquent rhetorical generalities, our elevated and all-surveying critics descend to some definite details. They first aim a shaft at that "subtle errorist," Emmons, as teaching "that the soul is a series of exercises; that God is the author of sin; and that, in order to escape damnation one must be willing to be damned."

Of course it was not to be expected that Hopkins would escape, and he did not; nor did Taylor, of New Haven, in fact escape, whatever were his hopes. But, singular to relate, our discerning critics place them both in the same category, and make their respective systems essentially one and the same, and a lineal and genuine offshoot (let him that readeth understand) from that of the great patriarch Edwards. The errors of Emmons, it seems, were too obvious to be very dangerous; not so with those of Hopkins and Taylor. Of them they say:

"Others, running away with an error *less innocent*, because lying nearer the sources of moral reasoning, and less alarming in its guise, reasoned themselves and their hearers into the opinion that *all sin is selfishness, and that all holiness is the love of being in general. Taking the premises of the great Edwards*, they deduced a false system of theology which, under its first phase as Hopkinsianism, and under its second phase as Taylorism, has been to our church (the Presbyterian) the *fons et origo malorum*, and which, in union with the Epicureanism of the Paley school, has assumed the name of Calvinism to betray it to its enemies."

Our critics next proceed to show what was the final recoil of the human mind under this system. It was into Arminianism and genteel Deism, by which they evidently mean Unitarianism. But let us look at the process. Immediately after our last extract they proceed to say:

"Human nature could not be expected to endure such a metaphysics as that of New England. It was not merely that it was false, and that it set itself up against our consciousness, and our constitutional principle of self-love; (what a charge, as against Dr. Taylor!) but it was cheerless, it was arctic, it was intolerable; a man might as well carry frozen mercury in his bosom, as this in his soul. In a word, it had nothing cordial in it, and it left the heart in collapse. If it had remained in the cells of speculative adepts, it might have been tolerated; but it was carried into the pulpit, and doled forth to a hungry people, under the species of bread and wine. No wonder [that] nature revolted against such a dynasty. No won-

der that, in disgust at such a pabulum, men cast about for a substitute, and sought it in tame Arminianism, or genteel Deism."[1]

The substance of what these various writers tell us is, in brief, this, that old Calvinism is the only real New England theology, and that any modifications of it, or additions to it, which have been effected, either by Edwards or his disciples, are no improvements in it, and no part of it. Nay, they are the seeds of all evil. They have filled the land with daring speculation, have chilled the heart of piety, and are the real cause of the existing reaction to Arminianism and Deism.

One would suppose, from such a style of discourse, that its authors had adopted the mode of writing history, so much recommended by certain German philosophers, who regard a reference to recorded facts as needless, since all that exists is but the evolution of existing powers and laws in fixed, definite, and necessary modes, and therefore the most certain mode of knowing what facts have been, is, not to consult fallible records, but to decide from the necessity of things what they must have been. Thus, and thus only, can history be written with scientific accuracy and exactness.

We infer that our learned friends of whom we have been speaking, have written what they have given us of the history of New England theology on these principles, because they are so entirely above the common habit of sustaining assertions by reference to the recorded history, or the works of the New England divines.

For ourselves, we are free to confess that we have not yet been able to conquer our long established prejudices in favor of the old fashioned mode of basing history on an accurate examination of facts and documents. Moreover, since, by such a process we happen to have arrived at results somewhat different from those of our philosophical divines, to whose historical speculations we have adverted, we shall ask the indulgence of our readers while we proceed to state what we regard as some of the real facts of the case.

We are the more disposed to do this, because now, at length, the

[1] This profound and eulogistic *expose* of New England theology, was first given to the world by the Princeton reviewers, in 1839, in a review of certain transcendental works, which was deemed of so much consequence as to be again reprinted in 1846, as one of certain select "Princeton Theological Essays." Such are the views concerning their own divines, which our ingenuous New England youth are, even by certain New England men, encouraged and exhorted to study, as the truth. Certain allies, also, of these Princetonian divines among ourselves, have been, for a few years past, constantly reiterating similar sentiments.

public are in a position in which they can enter into such an inquiry in the orthodox, old fashioned way, to some good purpose. The time has been, when the lives and the works of some of our leading New England divines had so far faded away from the minds of the present generation, that they were rather matters of tradition than of accurate history. The generation of their contemporaries has passed away. The works of Bellamy and of Hopkins have not been in the market. Of their lives, and of their relations to Edwards the elder, and to each other, little has been accurately known. The same has been substantially true of the younger Edwards. Such is no longer the fact. First, we have recently had laid before us the life and works of the younger Edwards, then of Ballamy, and now, at last, Hopkins has come forth from his temporary retirement, to mingle with society, and reason, expound and preach once more. Truly the Doctrinal Tract and Book Society was not formed in vain. If it had done nothing but secure to our churches such a life of Hopkins as Professor Park has given us, and so valuable and complete an edition of his works, it would be a full recompense for all that the public have ever done in its behalf. But we trust that its mission is but begun. There are other eminent New England divines to whose works few students of theology can, as yet, find access. There is, therefore, still room for such historians as we have been considering, to misrepresent them without being liable to immediate exposure. These things ought not so to be. The library of New England divines ought to be completed and laid open for the study of the world. The materials for fully ascertaining the true history of the theology of New England ought to be accessible to all, and still more, the history of that theology ought to be truly and worthily written.

The fundamental thing in writing such a history would be to find the true point of vision from which to view that great theological movement which began with Edwards. Was it, as our Princeton divines assure us, a mere development of the philosophy of Locke as applied to theology? Is it true, as they tell us, that "Jonathan Edwards ventured into the labyrinth with the clew of this great inquirer in his hand?" Was human philosophy at all the impelling power in that great movement? Did Edwards, Bellamy or Hopkins ever of set purpose undertake to speculate in order to get up a system or a school? To all these questions we answer emphatically, No. It is, indeed, true that Edwards early studied Locke with deep, very deep, interest, and found in him abundant and fertile seeds of thought;

but every other thinking mind has done the same, to this day. But Locke never was to Edwards what Aristotle was to the schoolmen. He never called him master. He never treated him as such. He never called him, as Thomas Aquinas did Aristotle, THE PHILOSOPHER. He never feared to oppose him. He often did oppose him. And in their views of *experimental religion*, the central question in theology and theological philosophy, no two men could be more unlike. They dwelt indeed, in this respect, at the opposite poles of the theological sphere.

The plain matter of fact is, that it was not human philosophy, but Divine influence (exerted to cause a great revival of vital religion, and thus to save Calvinism from impending destruction), which was the central power that originated and continued the great movement of New England theology properly so called.

In this statement it is assumed that, at the time when this movement began, the Calvinistic system in New England was in great peril, yea on the very verge of ruin; such was beyond all doubt the fact.

All things were then rapidly tending to this result. There was nothing in England, or in the old school Presbyterian church, powerful enough to arrest that tendency, but much to augment it.

In fact, the practical workings of what is now idolized as old Calvinism, had for various reasons been such, that, unless it could in some way have been modified, the whole Calvinistic system could not have been saved from ruin. On the one hand, some were plunging it into the gulf of Antinomianism; on the other, many more were in various ways enervating it, and depressing its tone, till, though it still retained the name of Calvinism, it was fast approximating towards Arminianism or Pelagianism.

At this time it pleased God, manifestly to interpose, not by philosophy but by a revival, and thus to create that new and great theological movement, which resulted in the formation of what has since been called New England theology. We ascribe it to God, because there was manifestly an entire absence of any deliberate plan or purpose on the part of any man, or body of men, to produce such a movement; because there was no conscious effort to introduce any particular school of human philosophy, and because the great end of the movement from the beginning was entirely practical; by which we mean, as before stated, that it was originated by the impulse of a powerful revival of religion, and that its constant end and aim was so to present the truths of the Gospel, as most effectually to adapt them

for the conversion of sinners, and the production of a high standard of piety, and benevolent enterprise in the church. The fundamental principles of the movement were conceived, not in hours of metaphysical speculation, but in seasons of intimate and elevated communion with God. Moreover, the results of the movement, in revivals, and benevolent enterprise, have ever since corresponded with such an origin. Those views of the millennium which were developed by the fathers of this movement, are now the moving power of the present missionary enterprise, and in fact the germ of all the benevolent and philanthropic enterprises of this age was contained in the spirit and principles of that great movement.

Moreover, it is so far from being true that the reaction of any part of New England to Arminianism and Deism is owing to the existence of the Edwardean school of theology, that, on the other hand, it was the influence of that school which saved Calvinism from extinction, and sent into the old school Presbyterian church all the vitality which it now has; and the defection to Arminianism and Deism, took place among those who continued in the downward movement which existed when Edwards arose, and who refused to adopt his principles and cooperate with him and his school in the great work of theological reform.

It is well known that the great Arian apostasy among the dissenters of England developed itself at the close of the seventeenth and the opening of the eighteenth century. This extensively destroyed Calvinism and spread far and wide the spirit of a false liberality that emasculated the Calvinism which it did not destroy. Of those called Calvinists, few preached the Gospel with any degree of energy and zeal, and as a means of revivals. Of deep experimental religion they knew little or nothing. As developed in vital and powerful forms, they feared it as fanaticism. They preached a dead orthodoxy without practical application, and their congregations gradually melted away and disappeared. Although Arianism did not at this time openly disclose itself in America, yet Arian works were here republished, and the poison spread in connection with Arminianism and Pelagianism in many minds. Moreover, as in England, so the vital power of Calvinism to produce revivals had here also almost entirely disappeared. The great want of the day was, therefore, a Divine reproduction of the highest forms of Christian experience, in order so to modify and vitalize the theology of the age, as to fit it for its appropriate work, the conversion of men to God and the production in them of that activity and enterprise which are the necessary results of high degrees of spiritual life and energy.

At this time, then, it pleased God, first of all, in early life, eminently to sanctify the heart of Jonathan Edwards, and to give him a Christian experience of peculiar depth, purity and power. It was an experience, produced not at all by Locke, but solely by the Bible. It was a reproduction and an embodiment of the combined experience of John and of Paul. Indeed, the whole mind of Edwards became like a mass of metal, thoroughly melted, penetrated and dissolved in the glowing furnace of the Word of God.

Through a man thus thoroughly regenerated and eminently sanctified, it pleased God to arrest the theological degeneracies of the age, and to restore life to Calvinism, then dying out upon this continent, and in the world. He did it by first making him the glowing centre of a series of revivals, and thus by arousing him to discover and expose those current perversions of Calvinism which unfitted it to produce revivals. By first giving him an experimental knowledge of the real nature of true and eminent holiness, and then aiding him to detect and expose its counterfeits. By first creating in him a deep interest in the conversion of the world, and in all enterprises of benevolent reform, and then enabling him so to state the truth as to sustain, perpetuate and extend that spirit. Such were the real ends of the great movement of New England theology; not to develop a system of metaphysics, not to establish a school of original speculation and daring innovation, but to secure in their greatest amplitude such results as true regeneration, eminent sanctification, benevolent activity and enterprise, and the conversion of the world. Moreover, the theology thus generated stood simply in the relation of a means to an end. It was the system which men thus taught of God, adopted for two reasons: first, because they saw it to be best adapted to gain these ends, and destroy the malignant errors which were thus laying waste the heritage of God, and also because they had previously found it clearly set forth, not on the pages of Locke, but in the Word of God.

It was in this great revival that Bellamy and Hopkins were converted. In the family of Edwards they for a time resided. There they imbibed his spirit, and entered into his sympathies and those of his eminently devoted wife. There, too, in such a glowing atmosphere of life and love, they studied theology. There and ever after, "like kindred drops they mingled into one," renouncing all ambitious ends, all rivalries, all strife for preëminence, and aiming solely at the great ends of the angelic world, glory to God in the highest, on earth peace, good will to man.

If there is anything true in history, this is true. Nothing shines

more refulgent from the mass of facts and documents accumulated and arranged by Prof. Park, than that holy unity of principle, purpose and feeling, by which these eminent servants of God were united in that great enterprise which he inspired them so prayerfully to undertake, and so triumphantly to accomplish.

For this reason, it is impossible to understand either of this great triumvirate unless we understand all. They were engaged in a common work. Of this each accomplished a part. Therefore we need to arrange in historical relations their particular works, in order to take a consistent view of the great whole which they aimed to effect.

That we may not, however, imitate our assailants by resting in mere general assertions, let us descend from this general statement to a more particular view of their relations to their age and the work which they were called on to perform. We have said, and to some extent shown that, at the commencement of the great theological movement in New England, the system of Calvinism was in great peril. We will now attempt more fully to set forth the nature and sources of that danger. In all practical theology, the doctrine of human depravity is the fundamental doctrine. The great ends of God in this world are first to prepare a way in which sin can be pardoned, then to regenerate and sanctify the church. But, manifestly, as depravity is, so must regeneration and sanctification be. At the time, then, of which we speak, the course of events was rapidly tending to destroy the true and Scriptural doctrine of depravity. This result may be produced in two ways: first, by a direct theoretical assault on the doctrine; secondly, by the adoption of practical measures which involve false principles, and can be defended only by them, while the true doctrine is nominally retained. In the latter case, the danger is peculiarly insidious in its approaches. There is no open assault on orthodoxy, and yet a feeling of self-consistency gradually impels all men to bring their theoretical principles into harmony with their practice. In both of these modes, the doctrine of depravity was assailed. The assailing influences proceeded from three sources: from the errors of the old world, from the peculiar social organizations of New England, and from the Presbyterian church. From the combined influence of all these causes, we shall now proceed to show that in the first part of the eighteenth century the state of Calvinism in New England was truly critical.

We have already adverted to the fact that it had been directly and powerfully assailed in the old world by Arminius and his followers,

and by Pelagian errorists under the lead of Dr. John Taylor. We now add, that no logical defence against their assaults had appeared, which had so deeply convinced and affected the leading minds of the evangelical world as to be regarded as a sufficient and permanent barrier against that swelling tide of error. In our early colonial state, we were substantially dependent for our defences of sound theology on the mother country, and therefore the Calvinism of New England shared in all the weaknesses and reverses caused by the assaults in the old world to which we have referred.

To this we must add, that Calvinism was no less in danger from the perversion of its principles in the form of Antinomianism. The early heresies of Anne Hutchinson are well known. In England Dr. Crisp, revolting from Arminianism, went, as is too common, into the opposite extreme. Though up to his death, in 1642, his doctrines had not exerted any widely extended influence, yet on the republication of his works, in 1689, the state of the public mind had so far changed that they gave rise to a fierce, protracted and agitating controversy among the dissenters of England. Though Dr. Williams, the chief antagonist of Antinomianism, undoubtedly had the best of the argument, yet the vitality of the system was by no means destroyed. The defeated error from time to time reappeared in the eighteenth century with sufficient power to give just cause of alarm, and to call for the earnest effort of the defenders of Scriptural Calvinism. In all the perils thus caused, the Calvinistic churches of New England were also sharers, even as they were in the perils caused by the assaults of Arminianism.

Nor were these the only sources of danger to the churches of our fathers. An error from the first introduced by the founders of Massachusetts into their civil organization, created unexpected and unforeseen tendencies to weaken the foundations of Calvinism. In order to secure legislation from abuse, and to defend religion, they placed the political power of the State in the hands of church members, excluding all others from the privilege of voters. This, though designed as a defence of the church, and her doctrines, in fact created a strong tendency towards such changes of doctrine as might in some way allow the introduction of unregenerated men into the church. No one can fail to see that a very strong predisposition would be thus produced to receive the theory that the Lord's Supper is a converting ordinance, and the church a school for conversion. So entirely, however, were this theory and practice opposed to the original principles and practice of the New England churches, that, although

their civil constitution most directly tended to them, and all efforts to secure such results were defeated during its continuance, they were not fully developed till the time of Stoddard, a few years after the political system, to which they mainly owe their origin, had been abolished. This, however, is no rational cause of surprise. Tendencies of systems are not unfrequently a long time in coming to maturity, and then continue after their originating causes have ceased. The existence of the tendency in question must be plain from the nature of the case. It is also an undeniable historical fact, that earnest but unsuccessful efforts to extend the privileges of church membership to all moral and sincere persons of sound doctrinal views, had been made before the exclusive government of church members had been abolished.

The tendency of such a state of things to depress the tone of Calvinism is too obvious to need comment. Under this system, a moral and orthodox unregenerate man could enter into covenant with God and become a church member, in full communion, and having so done, it was a logical inference that he was taking the very course prescribed by God to secure his conversion. Of course, he was led to believe that he was, to a certain extent, acting with moral sincerity and in part performing his duty even before regeneration, a view at war with all sound views of the doctrine of entire depravity, the fundamental principle of genuine Calvinism.

Another practical measure of an ecclesiastical kind tended to the same theoretical results; we refer to the celebrated HALF-WAY COVENANT. It is not within our limits fully to investigate the causes and results, civil and ecclesiastical, which led to this arrangement or proceeded from it. They deserve a more full and philosophical investigation than they have yet received, or than our time and space will now admit. Suffice it to say, that the desire of extending to their posterity, from generation to generation, the blessings of baptism, and of at least a qualified church membership, led our ancestors to originate the singular and inconsistent idea of an incomplete or half-way covenant, by entering into which the parents, though not performing their full duty as regenerated persons, yet, if orthodox and morally sincere, did to such an extent perform some duties towards God as to authorize and render the baptism of their children a duty. Here, again, as we see, reappears the doctrine of an acceptable moral sincerity in some duties on the part even of *unregenerated* men, such as shall merit to some extent favor and reward. In this is at once involved, as must be perfectly obvious, the same virtual denial of the

entire depravity of all men before regeneration (and of course of the fundamental principles of Calvinism), which we have just before briefly considered and set forth as resulting in another way from the unsound political constitution of the State.

That such doctrinal principles are implied in this practice, is proved by notorious facts. Though apparently not a doctrinal question, but one concerning mere church organization and practice, still when it was assailed, the controversy at once led the contending parties into the very depths of doctrinal discussion. In the controversy on this subject, for example, between Bellamy and Mather, the former undertakes formally to show, that the practice in question is at war with the Calvinistic doctrine of depravity, as held by the reformers and first fathers of New England, and that it has in fact led Mr. Mather to develop in its defence a false system of theology, respecting the law of God, sin, regeneration, and the Gospel. Indeed, some of the most interesting and decisive of the doctrinal discussions of Bellamy occur in the works published by him on this controversy. There can, therefore, be no doubt that, while the half-way covenant was in existence, it was exerting a fearful power to paralyze and depress the Calvinistic system in New England.

We would next call particular attention to the fact that new dangers arose from certain practical measures with respect to the use of the means of grace, which were suggested by the ultra-orthodox doctrine of human depravity. By this we mean the doctrine which places depravity in something anterior to voluntary action, and teaches, as a consequence, the absolute natural inability of man to become holy by repentance and faith, until he had been the merely passive subject of a supernatural change effected by Divine omnipotence. From this doctrine certain unintended practical results immediately followed. In the first place, it was intuitively seen to be true, that the impenitent could not be consistently directed to do what they had no power of any kind to do, and apparently the only rational direction was to call on them to do such things as they could do, and such as would induce God to change their hearts. Hence, in fact, to use the means of grace with earnestness and assiduity, while still unregenerate, and to pray to God for his Holy Spirit to change their hearts, was practically treated as the sum of the duties of impenitent sinners. But, manifestly, in all this was virtually involved a denial of the sinner's entire depravity, and a belief of an acceptable moral sincerity in him before regeneration; for no one could really believe that God could be moved to interpose in behalf of an impenitent

rebel by acts of mere selfishness and continued rebellion. Moreover, the same extreme views of depravity in another way aided in the introduction of impenitent persons, and even ministers, into the churches. For it was naturally and correctly argued that, since regeneration is not a voluntary change, so it cannot be a matter of consciousness; and to this it was soon and extensively added that, in the case at least of religiously educated persons, it is followed by no experimental change such that it can be discovered by examining candidates, and receiving from them a statement of experiences. Therefore baptized persons who have been religiously educated, are to be presumed to be regenerated persons and to be admitted to full communion, and even to the ministry, unless some open and scandalous sin proved them to be unregenerate. These views prevailed in the established Presbyterian church in Scotland, and were adopted and defended by most, if not all, of the original old school Presbyterian churches of this country. Their influence extended also to New England, and was there powerfully felt. Together with other causes they introduced many unregenerated persons not only into the churches, but even into the ministry.

What could tend more directly to corrupt the foundations of Calvinism, than such principles? What could more thoroughly paralyze the whole power of preaching? Based on the doctrines of absolute inability, and passive, unintelligent regeneration not ordinarily disclosed by a recognizable experience, they left the audience in a confused mass, in which no one was sure of his own regeneration or the reverse, and therefore no one in particular could be made to feel that he was in danger of perdition, or to respond to an appeal to escape from impending ruin by immediate repentance and faith. Practically, nothing was to be done, but to use the means of grace with moral sincerity, and to leave the result to the sovereign grace of God.

Such, so powerful and so manifold, were the influences which in the days of Edwards tended to destroy Calvinism. It is certainly remarkable to notice that, from whatever part of the circumference they started, they all soon came to one common centre, the great delusion that there can be in sinners an acceptable moral sincerity before God anterior to regeneration, in consequence of which it is proper to call upon them to do various things not involving that great moral change, instead of calling on them, at once and directly, to repent of sin, and believe in Christ, and declaring that God was pleased with nothing which did not involve this.

This wide-spread principle of the erroneous practices of the age,

Edwards was called distinctly to look in the face, in his controversy on the proper conditions of church membership. What he said on this occasion, however, admits of universal application to the theory of acceptable moral sincerity in unregenerate men, from whatever practices it may have originated. It universally assumes man's absolute and entire inability to perform the radical duties of repentance and faith demanded of him by God, while it teaches that he is able to perform certain external duties acceptably, either by reading the Bible or by prayer or by half-way covenanting, or by partaking of the sacrament, or by using any other of the means of grace, and to it the censure of the following passage of Edwards may be properly applied: "The way of making such a (practical) difference between outward duties of *morality* and *worship*, and those great inward duties of our *love of God, and acceptance of Christ*, and that, under a notion of the latter being IMPOSSIBILITIES, but the other being WITHIN MEN'S POWER; this, I think, has a direct tendency to confirm men in an *insensibility* of the heinousness of *unbelief* and *enmity* against God our Saviour, which are the source and sum of all wickedness. It tends to prevent their coming under a humbling *conviction* of the greatness and utter inexcusableness of these sins, which men must be brought to, if ever they obtain salvation. Indeed, it is a way that not only has this tendency, but has actually and apparently this effect, and that to a great degree." (Qualifications for Communion, Part III. Objection XX.)

From the preceding brief review of the causes which were conspiring at the opening of the eighteenth century to emasculate and depress the Calvinism of New England, it is plain that a special interposition of God was needed to provide the means of resisting these influences and of infusing into the theology of New England that spiritual energy, and well balanced presentation of truth, which should neutralize and defeat the various erroneous tendencies by which it was encompassed and assailed. Moreover, in view of what has been stated, it is in our judgment too clear to need further proof, that the needed interposition was effected by God, through Edwards, and the school of divines who followed in his train. Among the most eminent of these divines was HOPKINS, concerning whose individual labors in the great work of restoring tone and energy to the Calvinism of New England we propose now to make some additional remarks.

It is plain that the work which was demanded by the exigencies of the day, depended upon the vindication of a few great but simple

principles. It was, in the first place, necessary to explode false views of depravity, and to make it apparent that there is a rational and Scriptural ground in the doctrine of natural ability for demanding of the sinner, in God's name, notwithstanding his extreme depravity, the immediate performance of his most interior and spiritual duties, such as repentance, faith, supreme love and entire self-consecration to God, and for refusing to be satisfied with anything which involves less than this. For if this is so, then so long as the sinner refuses to obey, he is guilty of voluntary and inexcusable rebellion against his Maker; and it is, therefore, absurd to suppose, so long as this is the case, that there can be in any of his acts a moral sincerity which is acceptable to God. It was one of the great labors of the life of Hopkins to develop and defend this view. From no principle have ever flowed more vast results. It was the two-edged sword which swept through the whole current of those erroneous practices which were threatening to subvert the foundations of Calvinism. In the hands of Edwards, it smote through Stoddard's practice of admitting unconverted persons to the communion; in the hands of Bellamy, it smote through the half-way covenant; in the hands of Hopkins, it smote through the theory of a morally sincere and acceptable use of the means of grace in order to induce God to change the sinner's heart; as wielded by all, it smote through the theory and practice of introducing, or tolerating unregenerated men in the pulpit, on the ground that they were orthodox and morally sincere. It fixed upon that which these false theories excused men from doing on the ground of inability, as the very essence of all that is holy and acceptable to God. It held up the obstinate and voluntary refusal of the sinner to do it, as the essence of all sin and guilt. It thus pressed on with irresistible energy to the production of conviction of sin and immediate submission to God. It gave the sinner no quarter. It demolished his excuses and apologies. It shook over him the flaming sword of justice. It pursued him to the very horns of the altar, and drew him forth to certain vengeance if he refused at once to repent, to submit, and to trust in Christ.

In engaging in this work, Hopkins felt that he was in fact defending the very foundations of Calvinism, even against those who professed to be old Calvinists and better Calvinists than himself. Therefore, in his reply to Mills, after illustrating by an analogous case the augmented guilt of an enlightened and convicted sinner professing to use the means of grace so long as he refuses to submit, he says of the opposite view based on the idea of moral sincerity that, although

it does not differ from that of Dr. Mayhew, yet he knew that it was "*very common even among professed Calvinists.*" But he regarded it as directly at war with Calvinism and "of a very bad tendency." Again he says: "This doctrine of man's inability, as consisting in some difficulty in the way of holiness which is independent of the will, and for which they are not wholly to blame, is as agreeable to the corrupt heart of man as any Arminian or Pelagian doctrine whatsoever can be. How many of those who are called Calvinists, have fled to this refuge of lies, and here are like to perish, God knows! Be this as it will, it certainly becomes all the friends of truth and of mankind to do all they can, effectually to expose this unscriptural, absurd and dangerous notion."

Such views, he tells us, render the doctrine of man's impotence ridiculous and indefensible; they comfort those to whom God speaks no peace, and render true conviction of sin impossible.

But it was not enough to vindicate before the Calvinistic churches of New England true views of the depravity of the sinner as not consisting in something independent of the will; it was also necessary so to develop the power, and fixedness of the will in evil, as clearly to evince the depth and obstinacy of the depravity of the sinner, and the reality of his dependence on the Spirit of God for salvation. The tendency of Pelagianism is to resolve sin into a mere series of successive acts, which leave the will still free and do not presuppose or imply, or produce a deep and permanent character. Against any such superficial views of human depravity, Hopkins felt himself called earnestly to contend. In the writings of no other divine can be found clearer or more powerful presentations of the fixed and unalterable character of human depravity; unalterable by any power short of Divine omnipotence. And yet he never for a moment allows us to forget that in all this the sinner is voluntary and inexcusable.

But in addition to this, it was necessary to consider the nature of those exercises of the human mind to which the advocates of the moral sincerity of the sinner's prayers and efforts before regeneration were wont to appeal in support of their views. By doing this, a blow was also struck at the prevalent forms of Pelagianism and Arminianism, and the defence of Calvinism was rendered complete. It was the especial and great design of Edwards, in his celebrated treatise on the Nature of True Virtue, to effect this momentous result. We make this statement on the authority of Edwards himself. At the close of his treatise on Original Sin, after referring to the objections of such as regard various natural principles, existing before re-

generation, as springs of truly virtuous conduct, and on this ground deny original sin, he says to all who desire to see such objections particularly considered: "I ask leave to refer them to a treatise on the nature of *true* Virtue, lying by me, *prepared for the press*, which may ere long be exhibited to public view."

The principles of this treatise Hopkins regarded as fundamental, and made them the basis of his own system. Indeed, he wrote a formal treatise on the subject, as the shortest and most radical way of terminating the controversy on the doings of the unregenerate. And though the Princeton divines have seen fit to hold up the principles of these essays (for they are identical), as the source of all evil to the Presbyterian church, yet they were designed to be and were in fact, a radical and conclusive defence of Calvinism against the dangerous attacks which had been made upon it, not only by its avowed enemies, but also by its injudicious friends. In defence of their erroneous practical measures, they appealed to the actings of natural conscience, of the natural affections, and of other principles of our nature as morally right and acceptable in the sight of God even before regeneration. In defence of these views, even professed Calvinists not unfrequently resorted to what were virtually Pelagian and Arminian expositions of important passages of Scripture, which had been relied on by the original and leading Calvinistic divines. Dr. Spring, carrying out the principles of Edwards and Hopkins, in his controversy with Dr. Tappan, openly charged and conclusively proved this upon him. Moreover, the same was no less true of many others. But, by the treatise of Edwards on True Virtue and that of Hopkins on True Holiness, all of these Arminian tendencies were arrested, and the fundamental principles of genuine Calvinism were confirmed and established. The designed bearing of the principles of Hopkins in his treatise on True Holiness is clearly seen in the fact that they were preliminary to his final reply to Messrs. Mather, Hemmenway and Mills, the leading defenders of the principle of the moral sincerity of unregenerate men, and of the acceptableness to God of portions of their religious services.

The tendencies of that age to Arianism, to which we have adverted, are not as fully recognized in the works of Edwards, Hopkins and Bellamy, as are those towards Arminianism and Pelagianism which we have considered. Edwards did not formally enter into that controversy. Yet there were clear signs, even in his day, of the coming on of the great controversy on the Trinity. The Arian controversy in England was at that time fully developed. Some of the works of

the Anti-trinitarians of the old world were republished here. Emlyn's Enquiry, for example, was republished in Boston, with a dedication to the clergy of New England, and to it a timely and able reply was published. These tendencies were attentively noticed by Hopkins, and led to the delivery of his sermon on the importance of earnestly maintaining the divinity of Jesus Christ. Bellamy, also, earnestly engaged in defence of the same doctrine.

From this summary statement of facts it appears that Edwards, Bellamy and Hopkins were raised up by God to meet a great crisis in the religious history of New England, and that they fully understood the magnitude of the crisis. Edwards felt that the very foundations of Calvinism were giving way. At the close of his treatise on the Will, he speaks of the Reformers, and their successors, the great pillars of the church, as fast coming into contempt on account of their Calvinistic principles. He inquired earnestly for defences of Calvinism in the old world, but found none which to him seemed to meet the emergency. On the other hand, there came from that quarter a succession of the most subtle and dangerous attacks which were ever made on the faith once delivered to the saints. In addition to Whitby, and other Arminian divines, that celebrated Arian, Dr. Taylor of Norwich, led on the hosts to the great conflict. His views of the influence of his famous Pelagian work on Original Sin, Edwards thus sets forth: "No one book has done so much towards rooting out of these Western parts of New England the principles and scheme of religion maintained by our pious and excellent forefathers, the divines and Christians who first settled this country, and alienating the minds of many from what, I think, are evidently some of the main doctrines of the Gospel, as that which Dr. Taylor has published against the doctrine of original sin."

Edwards, therefore, felt impelled to write, not by a love of theory, nor by ambition to found a school in metaphysical theology, but by providential calls, in view of great practical ends. In these views and feelings Hopkins and Bellamy perfectly sympathized. Edwards first began the great work of defence, and led the way as an author. The central questions, as we have seen, related to the nature of sin and holiness, and to natural and moral ability and inability. Edwards developed his views on these points chiefly in his treatises on the Will, and on the Nature of True Virtue. He applied his principles to Pelagianism and Arminianism in their radical elements. He also discussed the practical questions relating to regeneration and sanctification as they were developed in revivals and in Christian expe-

rience. He also applied his principles to the great question of the proper constitution of the church and the principles of communion. Hopkins was called specially and fully to discuss the great question relative to the use of the means of grace by impenitent sinners, and in the course of this discussion, more fully to vindicate and apply the principles of Edwards as to the nature of true virtue. Bellamy applied the same principles to the half-way covenant. He also was the prominent assailant of Antinomianism both in the old world and in the new. In addition to this, he followed Edwards in a radical discussion from a new point of vision of the nature of true Christian experience.

After all these controversies were over, Hopkins, in his old age, undertook the work of systematizing theology, and in so doing of assigning to the great principles which had done such service in the defence of Calvinism their proper place in the system. Of course, he gave to the principles developed in the treatise on True Virtue, a fundamental place. Moreover, if in the system of his revered teacher, there were any inconsistent and contradictory elements, he would naturally endeavor to eliminate such.

This he did especially with reference to the scheme which implies a ground of action in men anterior to voluntary action, which is of itself sinful or holy, and deserving of reward or punishment. Holding that all sin and holiness consist in voluntary action, he at first regarded this alleged antecedent constitutional ground of action as of a neutral character, and at last called in question its existence at all, and seemed disposed to resolve it into a stated mode of Divine agency.

Let us now look at the results of the labors of Hopkins and his associates and disciples. In brief, they arrested and reversed the general tendencies of the age to Arianism, Arminianism, Antinomianism, Pelagianism and Deism. They entirely broke up those various practical measures and courses which have been set forth as implying false principles, and tending to introduce them for the sake of consistency and self-defence. They were in the hands of God the real authors of all the doctrinal soundness which is found at this day in New England.

True, there has been among us a degeneracy "into tame Arminianism and genteel Deism," as our Princeton divines assert. But it was not caused by any reaction from the school of Edwards, Hopkins and Bellamy; on the other hand, it was caused by that portion of the tendencies of the age which they could not arrest and control. No churches which adopted the principles of Edwards and Hopkins

as to the revival and church membership ever became Arminian or Unitarian. On the other hand, the opposers of the revival and of the right constitution of the churches, are the real fathers of all the Arminianism and Unitarianism and infidelity of New England.

The sermons heard in New England pulpits for the half century next after the death of Edwards (the Princeton divines tell us), were exceedingly "barren and frigid." And yet it was within this very period that those celebrated and powerful revivals occurred, of which Dr. Tyler has given us a valuable history, and which he has held up for a model in these degenerate days.

So far is it from being true that New England theology has led to Arminianism or Deism, it has done more than any other cause to save the old school Presbyterian church from degeneracy into these very heresies. Indeed, from this source the Presbyterian church has derived nearly all the vitality which it now has.

On this subject we believe that Mr. Tracy, in his able history of the Great Revival, has spoken the truth. He asserts and proves that the Synod of Philadelphia, in which the old school Scotch party bore sway, who resisted the principles as to regenerated minister's church membership, adopted by the Synod of New York in sympathy with the revival party in New England, were saved from following their allies in New England (i. e. the opposers of the revival) into the dead sea of Arminian inefficiency, and the bottomless gulf of Unitarianism, only by their reunion to the New England revival party in the New York Synod. They consented to this union because they were weak, and the other synod was waxing stronger and stronger through the energy of New England principles. This union gradually leavened the old synod with the leaven of New England vitality and thus saved it from death. "Had the Synod of Philadelphia been strong enough to stand alone, its history would have been like that of Henchman's church at Lynn. It would have kept all its congregations still and quiet. It would have repressed all strong feeling about religion. It would have induced a general apathy in people and ministers, in which neither would have cared much for anything but the privilege of remaining undisturbed. Consequently, all disturbing doctrines would have been first neglected and then disbelieved, and the truly orthodox standards of the church would have been either altered or regarded as a dead letter." Tracy, p. 388.

It was also by Hopkins, and other New England divines, that a true idea of the millennium as a spiritual renovation of the world, was fully developed; that idea which alone excites hope and tends to

effort. Edwards, Bellamy and Hopkins were full of this theme. Under its inspiring influence they formed glowing conceptions of the conversion of the world, longed for it with intense desire, and consecrated their lives to its attainment. Thus they became a warm centre for missionary and reformatory effort for the world. Brainerd was the morning-star of modern missions. Hopkins led the way in efforts for colonizing and regenerating Africa, and for abolishing the slave-trade and slavery.

If, then, the rule of Christ still holds good, "by their fruits ye shall know them," we need no better proof of the substantial excellence of the Edwardean theology than a reference to such effects as we have disclosed. We do not arrogate for it perfection, but we would boldly defend it from such gratuitous and ungrateful denunciations as it has been too often called on to encounter, even from those who are largely indebted to it for almost the whole of their present vitality and power.

For it we take to ourselves no credit. For, though still marred by some human errors and imperfections, we cannot but regard it as in large measure the result of the interposition of God. To such an extent is this true, that the spontaneous language of our hearts is and ever shall be: "Not unto us, not unto us, but unto thy name, O Lord, be the praise."

ARTICLE IV.

PROLEGOMENA TO TISCHENDORF'S NEW EDITION OF THE SEPTUAGINT.

Translated from the Latin by Charles Short, M. A., Roxbury, Mass.

[Concluded from Vol. IX. p. 603.]

§ 12. To the emendations already set forth as received into our text, we may add some other readings, the superiority of which to the Roman lections hardly admits of doubt. Not a few of them, indeed, have been approved by Walton, Bos and Grabe, the same scholars whom, as has been stated, we have in many previous cases followed; but most of these readings have been so collated that they