

RENUNCIATION OF UNITARIANISM.

From The Philadelphia Banner of the Cross. We omit the leading editorial intended for our present number, in order to make room for some notice of a pamphlet, which we have no doubt our readers will concur with us in regarding as both very interesting and important to the cause of evangelical and catholic truth. It is a renunciation of Unitarianism, by a gentleman of learning and high intellectual powers, for some years past the minister of the Unitarian congregation in Pittsburgh, but since last October a constant and devout worshipper in Trinity church, in that city, of which the Rev. George Upfold, D.D., is the able and esteemed Rector, and to whom our thanks are due for a copy of the pamphlet before us. It is entitled, "UNITARIANISM UNDESIRABLE: A Letter, addressed to the Unitarians of Chester, Edinburgh, and Norwich (Great Britain), and Pittsburgh (America). By W. J. Bakewell, their former Pastor. With an Appendix, containing Scripture testimony respecting the nature of our Saviour, the personality of the Holy Spirit, and the doctrine of Christian Redemption: interspersed with remarks."

that our cause might be better promoted by our quietly mingling with the Christian public, and trusting to the silent operation of truth. And I am fully persuaded, that the controversial mode of propagating opinions is not the most successful; and that although it is the duty of a Christian minister to state and defend what he believes to be the truth before his own congregation, the assumption of an antagonistic attitude is not adapted to produce a favourable impression on the mind of the unbeliever. "Sensible of the great importance of public worship, and desiring it to be my duty to accompany my family to the house of God, I was not long in selecting, amongst many denominations, that form of worship which would best accord with my feelings. The beautiful liturgy of the English Episcopal Church, which I have long admired, determined my choice. I remember the time when my prejudices were so strong against the Church of England, that I would rather have deprived myself of the inestimable blessings of public worship than attend its service; but time, which ripens the most acid fruit, gradually mellows the crude opinions of early life. I, indeed, was always disposed to acknowledge that the Church of England had produced some of the greatest, wisest, and most pious men that have enlightened the Christian world; and I am now persuaded, that to this Church the nation is indebted for its long career of glory, in arts, literature and arms; for its substantial prosperity, which cannot be determined by the conflicting elements of political agitation; and for the rich streams of learning, good sense, and real religion which permeate the length and breadth of the land, which fertilize and enrich the moral soil, and diffuse in every direction the healthful blessings of rational and spiritual life. The citizens of the land of my adoption will not look unkindly upon me for this expression of my feelings to the land of my birth. Never, in all probability, shall I again see the cliffs of Albion, which I sailed past with feelings not to be uttered; but should unexpected circumstances take me to its shores once more, how eagerly should I look out for the ivy-mantled towers of its country churches! and with what altered emotions shall I enter again its sublime and venerable cathedrals!"

"But having determined to take the Word of God as its own expositor—to ask myself perpetually 'what readest thou?'—I began to admit, that there were many passages which seemed to favour principles different from those which I professed. I was again and again surprised at the apparent evidence for doctrines which I had been accustomed to regard as corruptions of Christianity. The commentators that I had generally consulted told me that this language was figurative. Every expression relating to the Divinity of our Lord's nature, and to the meritorious efficacy of his sufferings, blood, and death of Christ, was pronounced metaphorical. Such passages as the following, 'Behold the Lamb of God, who taketh away the sin of the world'—'He came to give his life a ransom for many'—'God sent his son to be the propitiation for our sins'—'The blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all sin'—'Ye were redeemed with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish or without spot—who of his own stripes our sins in his own body on the tree—'by whose stripes we were healed'—'Thou hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred'—'If the blood of bulls and goats sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh, how much more shall the blood of Christ, who, through the eternal Spirit, offered himself without spot to God, to purge your consciences from dead works to serve the living God'—such passages as these, I had been led to consider as figurative allusions to the sacrificial rites of the Old Testament dispensation; and by some means, contrived to pay no attention to the express declaration of St. Paul, that 'The law is a shadow of things to come.' But I began to perceive that this system of interpretation was not doing justice to the explicit and often repeated statement of Revelation. I found in all the gospels, in the Acts, in almost all the Epistles, and in the Revelation of St. John, testimony upon testimony to the effect of the death of Christ in removing the penalty of sin. 'Is it not, I began to reflect, explicitly stated, that 'Christ hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God?' 'That Christ our Passover is slain for us?' Can these expressions, and many more, repeated again and again, all be figurative allusions to the legal sacrifices? I was much perplexed. But when the Book was closed, my long established opinions seemed to derive support from what I regarded as the dictates of reason. The examination was renewed at my next leisure hours, and again the word of God, being studied on the principle of 'How readest thou,' spoke to my troubled mind. The language I acknowledge meant something; and in reading the Epistle to the Hebrews, I came to passage upon passage, declaring that 'Christ was offered to bear the sin of many; 'that he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself;' 'that the Lord Jesus was the great Shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant.' To the authority of this epistle, I had previously paid very little attention, having taken up the notion that it was not written by the Apostle Paul. In the improved Version, it is arranged under one of the disputed books, but I am now convinced that the very different passages on the Unitarian scheme which it contains, were the real, though unsuspected, cause of my doubting its genuineness. The principal objection urged, seems to be that its style is more elegant than that of the other epistles; an objection which scarcely deserves consideration after the early testimony to its canonical authority; and which, if true, is satisfactorily answered by the assertion of some of the Fathers, that it was written by the Apostle in Hebrew, and translated at a very early period into Greek. Convinced by studying Lardner's chapter on this work, that it is entitled to the place which it holds in the New Testament, I could not any longer hesitate to admit that the doctrine of the vicarious sacrifice of Christ is taught in this letter. I turned again to the other books of the New Testament, and perceived that they all unite in bearing testimony, 'that Christ has redeemed us to God by his blood.' At length I found in the liii. chapter of Isaiah, and there also I found it written, 'He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed; he was numbered with the transgressors, and he bore the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors.' I could no longer resist the conclusion, that the doctrine of the vicarious sacrifice of Christ is taught in this letter. I turned again to the other books of the New Testament, and perceived that they all unite in bearing testimony, 'that Christ has redeemed us to God by his blood.'

individuals, or nations or tribes, or the peculiar circumstances of the primitive Christians. I shall in the Appendix give a few of the texts which now appear to me conclusive. I believe what I am expressly told in the language of inspiration, and need no glossary to mystify or pervert the words of divine truth. \* \* \* \* \* PLAIN DISCOURSES ON CHURCH GOVERNMENT: (Being the substance of Sermons on the same subject, by G. T. Chapman, D.D., late Rector of Christ's Church, Lexington, U.S.) PREFACE. The Compiler of these pages begs leave to bespeak for them the favorable attention of his fellow-churchmen.— His motive for sending such a work to the press he need not specify, as it cannot easily be misapprehended. It must be evident to all that neither fame nor profit can possibly have been in his view. For the sake of the good cause which he has in this humble way endeavoured to uphold, he is confident that his Brethren of the Clergy, if they approve of the performance, will introduce and recommend it to their flocks; and he trusts that among the lay members of the Church, some may be found so far to enter into his design, as to assist in promoting the circulation of the work among those whose circumstances debar them from access to more elaborate and expensive works on the subject. He must confess that he is desirous that this publication should be encouraged, not only on account of the good which he flatters himself it is calculated to do, but also for another reason. For if, from the result of this experiment, it should appear that persons desirous of increasing the interest of truth and piety, without regard to profit, can do so, through the medium of the Provincial Press, without a less which they could not afford to incur, he thinks it highly probable that his humble attempt would be extensively followed, and that many valuable works would ere long be for sale among us at a price within the compass of almost every one who may be desirous of information on religious subjects. He considers it unnecessary to apologize for the liberties he has in some instances taken with the excellent work from which this compilation is made. For all that is his own, he is of course, and not Dr. Chapman, is responsible. But that there is so little that is his own, he is anxious to conceal his name (which any one who may be curious on the subject may indeed easily discover) he thinks it will best become him not to put it forward but simply to declare himself. A MISSIONARY OF THE SOCIETY FOR THE PROPAGATION OF THE GOSPEL. SERMON I. ISAIAH, LXII. L.—For Zion's sake will I not hold my peace, and for Jerusalem's sake I will not rest until the righteousness thereof go forth as brightness, and the salvation thereof as a lamp that burneth. The Prophet, in the commencement of this chapter, breaks forth into sublime eulogy, and indulges in the liveliest anticipation of the future glory of the Church of Christ. He predicts the arrival of a period, when she should also be a crown of glory in the hand of her Lord, and a royal diadem in the hand of her God. He foretells the ardent love which should be borne her by the ransomers of the Lord, and by the Lord himself. He unfolds the future anxiety of her ministers to extol and glorify her and her bridegroom Christ, until she become the praise of all the earth. 'I have set watchmen upon thy walls, O Jerusalem, which shall never hold their peace day nor night.' (Esaie, 62.) These however, are predictions, that as yet are only in part fulfilled. The bridegroom has indeed come, and with him his Bride, the Church. She hath put on her beautiful garments, and furnished abundant evidence that she is all glorious within. But still the world lieth in wickedness. Her more brilliant triumphs, her more extended conquests over the hearts of men, have yet to ensue. She has not yet been enabled to present unto her Lord 'the heathen for his inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession.' (Psalm, ii. 8.) When the glorious things which are spoken of her, the City of the living God, are to be fully realized, we pretend not to know. But this we know, that ages ago, the inspired servants of God looked forward with confident expectation to their accomplishment; and that even at the remote period in which he lived, Isaiah determined zealously to contribute all in his power to effect it. You have in the text his solemn and impassioned vow—'For Zion's sake will I not hold my peace, and for Jerusalem's sake I will not rest, until the righteousness thereof go forth as brightness, and the salvation thereof as a lamp that burneth.'

Nor did the Apostles inculcate different sentiments. When they went about evangelizing the world, they did not set up, as our modern innovators, the Church of John, the Church of Peter, the Church of James, and from these names bestow distinct appellations upon their several disciples. All these things have been the result of a new flood of light, unknown to them, as it was to the master whom they served. They discountenanced all schisms with as much zeal as they discountenanced all heresy. You remember how solemnly St. Paul, in particular, reprobated with the Corinthians, and counselled them on the subject; 'Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind, and in the same judgment. For it hath been declared unto me of you, my brethren, by them which are of the house of Chloe, that there are contentions among you. Now, this I say, that every one of you saith, I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas, and I of Christ. Is Christ divided? Was Paul crucified for you?' (1 Cor. i. 10-13.) And in a subsequent chapter he rebukes them in these terms: 'Ye are yet carnal; for whereas there is among you envying and strife and Divisions; are ye not carnal and walk as men? For while one saith, I am of Paul; and another, I am of Apollos; are ye not carnal? Who then is Paul, and who is Apollos, but ministers by whom ye believed, even as the Lord gave to every man? I have planted, Apollos watered; but God gave the increase. So then, neither is he that planteth any thing, neither is he that watereth; but God that giveth the increase.' (1 Cor. iii. 3-6.) Can better evidence than this be desired to convince us of the danger of schism, and the extreme fallacy of imagining that our numerous Christian sects have a happy tendency in promoting the interests of religion? St. Paul does not condemn those Corinthians for imbibing unsound and heretical doctrines, such as are contrary to the true faith; but for commencing those very separations and divisions which are now so highly extolled—for doing precisely what Christians do in modern times—saying, I am of Calvin; and I of Muntzer; and I of Wesley; and I of Fox;—Christians who in this particular take no warning from the explicit language of Paul—'Is Christ divided?'

SERMON II. SAME TEXT. Every intelligent reader of the Scriptures must see at once that the Prophet in this passage expresses his ardent affection and zeal for the Church of the living God. Jerusalem was the name of the City of David, which contained the Temple of the God of Israel; and Zion, that of the Mountain upon which the City was built. The application of the name Zion to the Jewish Church pervades the Old Testament; and, in the New, St. Paul applies it, as well as the other term Jerusalem, to the Christian Church. We are safe, therefore, in applying these words to the Church of Christ, and in viewing them as a prediction of its future prosperity and glory. At all events, the feeling of attachment which the Prophet expresses towards the Church of God in his day, ought not to exceed that which we bear towards the superior institution of which the Son of God himself is the founder and the head. In the former discourse upon this text, I quoted several of the encomiums upon the Church of Christ of which the New Testament is full. I shall therefore on this present occasion merely recite the solemn declaration of our Lord to his Apostles, 'And I also say unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.' (Matt. xvi. 18.) We have a controversy, as you probably all know, with the Church of Rome, with regard to this text; but I have no design to enter into it now. I will only ask, 'What did our Saviour mean in this passage by his "Church?"' The answer which some would give to this question, would make it to consist of those only among the various denominations of Christians whom God shall receive and acknowledge to be faithful and true disciples of his Son. But this description would not agree with that which our Saviour himself gives of it in one of his Parables, where he compares it to a field containing both wheat and tares; and in another, where it is likened to a net which enclosed fish both bad and good. These parables authorize us to consider it as comprising all who are admitted by the appointed rite of Baptism into that body, of which Christ is the head, because he purchased it with his blood, and because it is a kingdom over which he exercises supreme power and authority. The great question remains, however, to be discussed. Baptism is undoubtedly the initiatory rite or sacrament, by which we enter the visible fold of Christ. But how is that fold itself constituted? and where resides the instrumental power of conferring its privileges upon the sons and daughters of men? Will it be said that any man or set of men can perform this, in virtue of their own will and pleasure? What warrant for the exercise of any such original authority, in that kingdom of which Christ himself holds the sceptre, or what example of its exercise do the Scriptures anywhere furnish? Neither the one nor the other can possibly be produced. The Jewish Church and Priesthood were unquestionably of Divine appointment alone, and the Christian must stand upon the same foundation. We read that Jesus spake to the eleven disciples, saying, 'All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you, and lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.' (Matt. xxviii. 18-20.) By the very terms of this commission, you perceive that it is limited in its nature, and in the privileges it conferred. Our Saviour did not address mankind at large, or even his disciples in general. He did not address even those seventy, whom he had before elected, and sent abroad on errands of miraculous grace and virtue; but the eleven alone. Had any others acted upon this commission, it would have been a manifest usurpation of ungranted power. Nothing, I think, can be plainer, than that to them alone, who are styled Apostles, was then delegated by the Lord himself, the sacred trust of establishing and governing the Church he was about to form, and providing for its perpetuity; 'As the Father hath sent me,' he says, 'even so send I you.' (St. John xxi. 21.) Surely you must see in this transaction a manifest design on the part of our Saviour to reserve all original authority to himself, and the whole conduct of the Apostles in the execution of the commission thus entrusted to them is consistent with this supposition.— He did not surely then descend from the throne which is declared to be for ever and ever; nor relinquish the sceptre of that kingdom over which it is said that he most reign until the end cometh, and he hath put all enemies under his feet. Proper officers there needs must be to discharge its ministry and conduct its affairs—for no Society can continue to exist without such; but all lawful authority in that kingdom must be received from Him. We have partly seen how this exigency was provided for at first; and we have the best reason to conclude that the ministry then constituted was designed to be perpetual. And on this ground we contend that in every religious Society claiming rightly to be a Church, there must be a ministry duly called and ordained, according to the original institution of Christ, or (which is the same thing) of the Apostles acting in his name and by his delegated authority. To shew you that this is the doctrine of the Church to which we belong, I shall recite the 23rd Article—'It is not lawful for any man to take upon him the office of public preaching, or ministering the sacraments in the congregation, before he be lawfully called and sent to execute the same. And those who ought to judge lawfully called and sent, which be chosen and called to this work by men who have public authority given unto them in the congregation, to call and send ministers into the Lord's vineyard.'

\* This it was also with Mr. Philp, late a distinguished Unitarian minister in England, who has renounced Unitarianism, and been received by baptism into the Established Church, for whose ministry he is now a candidate. "In announcing the alteration in his doctrinal views, and declaring his belief in the doctrine of the Trinity, he states, that the chief ground on which he rests his present position is, that he 'adopts a different principle of interpretation from that which he had previously employed.' He now assumes the Scriptures to be an 'infallible rule of faith'—a standard of higher appeal than an. This error of elevating reason above the Scriptures lies at the foundation of the whole system; no man was

ever made a Unitarian by the Bible; and whenever a man goes to the Scriptures to learn—to be governed by its teaching implicitly—he becomes a believer in the doctrine of the Trinity. Unitarians, as a body, do not believe in the divine inspiration of the Scriptures. They set out with the determination to receive nothing as inspired which is not in accordance with their preconceived views of the truth—require the Scriptures to bend to their reason, which is a virtual rejection of revelation; for if reason be the higher tribunal, what need is there of revelation?—Ed. Bas.

"such is the doctrine, and such, as you well know, has ever been the practice of the Church of England, on this subject. But however eminent for piety and theological learning were the men to whom we are indebted for these declarations, we admit that you are no bound to receive them upon their authority merely—and are prepared to shew you that they have their foundation in the Scriptures, and are susceptible of solid and substantial proof.