

THE
LIBERAL CHRISTIAN.

VOL. II.

APRIL, 1855.

No. 4.

A COMMON ERROR CONCERNING THE LORD'S
SUPPER.

BY REV. DR. GREENWOOD.

THERE is hardly a more common, and hardly a more hurtful mistake on the subject of religion, than the belief that its obligations may be assumed or deferred at our pleasure, or, as we sometimes choose to term it, our convenience. Many a one there is, who, like Felix, will take it upon himself without the least fear or shame, to defer the acknowledgement of duty, to dismiss the most serious considerations of life, and bid them come again at another time, a more convenient season. Many a one there is, who, fully aware of his obligations, fully sensible that there is such a thing as duty, and acquainted with its several requirements, yet imagines that he can in some measure evade their demands, and escape from their authority, by neglecting to make a public avowal of his subjection to them; imagines that he can throw off a portion of his responsibility, by withholding his confession of it. Just as if his assent or his silence made any difference in his moral situation; as if he really possessed

the right of thus trifling and dallying with the service of God.

This strange and pernicious error I shall now endeavor to expose.

In the first place, let us see what is the origin, and what the extent of human obligation. Its origin is obviously to be carried up to the Being by whose will we are placed in this world. Our existence, faculties, preceptions, and pleasures, are all derived from God. All that we possess is his free endowment and gift, and he is therefore the first and supreme object of our duty; and as he is perfectly good and wise, as he has never acted unjustly towards any one of us, and consequently never forfeited the minutest particle of his right over us, our obligations toward him are constant and entire, as constant as breath, and as comprehensive as the capacities of our nature and the circumstances of our being. As long as we live, we are the subjects of the King of kings; and as his right over us is unquestionable and unlimited, the extent of our duty is to do at all times and with all our heart, precisely what he requires us to do.

The next question is, what does God require of us? "He hath showed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" This is a summary of our obligations, pronounced by one of his own prophets. In his revealed word, the particulars of our duty are sufficiently explained. It is there that we must look for them, and it is hardly possible to misunderstand them. It is not in the least degree necessary for me, while on this subject, to enumerate them. Suffice it to say, that it is the duty of all men to cherish every

amiable and holy feeling, and to practice all the virtues ; or, to speak more strictly and properly, it is the duty of every one to *endeavor* to do this, earnestly, faithfully, and sincerely. Whatever is good, that we should strive to do, or be ; whatever is bad, that we should dismiss or avoid, as quickly and as effectually as we can. It is our duty to aim at perfect righteousness, perfect virtue ; and as I have shown from the nature of our relation with the Deity, this is our duty at all times, and under all circumstances, in youth and in age, in prosperity and in want, in gladness and in grief.

And now let me ask, how these obligations are to be postponed ? How, on the one hand, are they to be assumed, and on the other, how are they to be delayed or set aside ? it seems to me to be trifling with the declarations of God, and the conditions of humanity, to talk of a right, or an ability, or an intention to do either. How can that be assumed, which was imposed upon us at our birth ? How can that be delayed or set aside, which from its very nature can neither be averted, nor in any way altered or moved ? We begin existence as the subjects of God, and at no one period of life are we more under his government and jurisdiction than at any other ; in what possible manner, than, does it belong to us to say, that now we will not be amenable to his laws, and now, by our own free thought and pleasure, we will place ourselves under his authority ?

The reader will have perceived, ere this, the particular point which I have had in view ; and I will therefore enter at once on the subject to which these general remarks were intended to lead. I hesitate not to acknowledge that I do not understand the propriety of the lan-

guage so common in the mouths of those who approach for the first time, or who are about to approach for the first time, the communion table of our Saviour. They say that they are going to take on themselves new and solemn obligations. Others, in speaking of the act, express themselves in the same manner. In short, there is no phrase more common. In my opinion, there is none more unmeaning; and I shall continue to think so, till it can be shown to me how it is possible that a creature of God can take on himself a *new* religious obligation; how it is possible that by professing his intention to obey the divine commandments, he has added a single one to the list which already existed, and which had bound him down from his cradle with the adamant strength of condition and necessity.

To say, that this person has just begun to entertain a proper sense of his obligations; that he has received new impressions of his duty, is perfectly correct. He may in time past have scoffed at virtue and religion, and held his own pleasure to be his only law and guide; and now he may see the folly of such a course, and repent of it, and turn to the Lord his God, humbling himself before him, and resolving to keep his commandments. But still he has taken on himself no new obligations. He was as much obliged to perform all his duty before this change of feeling, as he is now. The obligations were always upon him, every one of them; but instead of being treated, as before, with neglect and contumely, they are now soberly and rightly apprehended. What I mean to say, is, that though to acknowledge is infinitely better than to slight them, neither their nature nor their number, their strength nor their degree, is altered in the least. The

individual, let us suppose, was formerly profane; now, having made a profession of faith, he sets a guard upon his lips; but was it not as much his duty to observe the third commandment then, as it is now? Was it not criminal then? Has his confession of its criminality increased it? Has he really such a power over right and wrong?

This is perhaps an extreme case. Let us attend to a more common one. There are those, who, without having ever been notoriously bad, who indeed have gone along through life commendably and with fair reputations, have nevertheless refused to come to the communion table, because they have no idea of giving up a certain way of living; which so long as they abstain from a profession of religion, they pursue without scruple, as being perfectly harmless, but which they regard, and which is generally regarded, as inconsistent with such a profession. They like to be gay, gay in spirit, and gay in external appearance; they are passionately fond of dancing; they delight in going to splendid entertainments, and in splendidly entertaining their friends in return, and they will not accept the invitation of their Saviour, because they conceive that by so doing they render that course criminal, which, till they do so, is perfectly safe. Now, I presume not to say, that the way of life which they love is not innocent; it may, or it may not be so, according as certain rules are observed or transgressed, which it would not be in place to discuss here; but I say, that if their way of life is innocent before they become visible members of a church, it will also be innocent after that connexion is formed; and if, on the other hand, it would be criminal then, it is assuredly criminal now. What is

right is right, and is not made more right by any confession. What is wrong is wrong, and cannot be made right, by our backwardness to abjure it.

All that has been said of pleasure, may be applied to business. The man of trade hesitates to come to the altar, because he does not wish to encumber himself with any religious shackles in his road to wealth. He does not wish to enter into any *new obligations*, which may render his pursuits guilty or improper, and prevent him from following them. In his present situation he feels easy, feels that he is doing what others of good character do, feels that he is bustling along with the throng, and no more obliged to be scrupulous and nicely fastidious than his companions and competitors. If he should openly profess himself to be a disciple of Christ, why then indeed he must take heed and inquire of his conscience more frequently, and guard his purity more carefully than before; but as this might be inconvenient and troublesome, he will postpone the engagement and avoid the risk. Does he avoid the risk? Will his approach to the altar, make those practices dishonorable which used to be upright? Will his absenting himself from the altar make the transaction fair, which, if he went to it, would be a blot on his name? Is virtue of this versatile character?

There is still another class of persons who delay their obedience to the last injunction of Christ, on account of the prevalent ideas about new obligations. It is that class who omit to do right, from the fear of doing wrong; a class among whom we find some of the most valuable members of society, some of the most conscientious and pure-minded servants of God. Desirous as they are

of performing their duty; strict as they have always been in discharging their known obligations, they are deterred from joining in a solemn remembrance of their Master, from an impression that it will render them responsible in some additional manner, which they know not how to define, but to which their poor ability may not be equal. To such persons I would earnestly repeat what I have said in substance before; that whatever they esteem and practise as virtuous now, will lose none of its virtue after they have become communicants, for that which is holy will be holy still; and that it is absolutely impossible, that they can, by any act, or confession, or subscription, engage to do a single thing which was not always their duty, as rational creatures of God.

That I may be somewhat more circumstantial, I would ask them whether any thing can be named or imagined, which is superadded to their existing obligations by the act of christian communion? Is it a generous and extensive bounty, and an ever open hand of charity to the poor? But it was for ever their duty to be as bountiful and as charitable as occasion would demand, and their means would justify. Is it that they should devote a certain portion of their time to self-examination, reflection, and prayer? But just such a portion as their spiritual welfare required, and their necessary occupations permitted, was always exacted of them, or I entirely misunderstand the spirit and letter of the Gospel. Is it that they should assiduously attend upon the outward means of grace; that they should be constant in their place at church; that they should be found at all meetings called for religious purposes, and adapted to promote religious

ends? But all that they could do in this way before, consistently with their real good, and with the duty which they owed to their own families, and the obligations which chained them to their own hearths and domestic altars, they ought to have done; and more than this, let me add, they ought never to do; for it then swells into an excess, and is converted into dissipation, and may, not uncharitably, be called a sin. So it is with regard to conversation, demeanor and dress. In each of these particulars there is a general standard of propriety, which ought never to be transgressed by a wide departure from it on either side. Frivolity and flippancy, levity and extravagance, are errors in any one; and an unnatural gloominess and stiffness, a dark and funereal habit of feature and gesture, required by no circumstances, and tending to no good, are also errors, and can be proper in no one. I am wholly at a loss to conceive what course a communicant should pursue, which should not also be pursued by every individual who is acquainted with the revealed word and will of his Maker.

On a subject of this nature it is highly important that I should not be misapprehended. I would guard as carefully as I am able against the supposition, that I would treat the Holy Communion as a light matter, and represent Christian obligation as a loose and easy tie. On the contrary, it is precisely because I hold religion to be of deep and universal concern, because I know it to be as momentous as life and as serious as death, that I have endeavored to combat the notion that it requires of one what it does not require of all, or that it releases one from what it enjoins on another. It is precisely on account of its unchangeable character, its unlimited appli-

cation, and its inestimable value, that I have denied that any of its obligations can, properly speaking, be new; that I have denied that they can be thrown off or assumed at pleasure; that I have asserted that our Maker has just as many and as weighty claims on our hearts and lives, before we solemnly acknowledge them, as after such a ceremony. I have not advanced, it ought not to be supposed that I would advance, the smallest word of this essay, in order to make any portion of the community less religious; my sincere wish and prayer is, that the whole community may be more so. If I would chase away shadows, it is only that I may introduce substantial realities in their stead.

I would observe, that there is one circumstance which seems to take off the weight of religious obligation; and that is, unavoidable ignorance. In what has been said, I have all along referred to those who either know or might easily know, what the obligations of religion are. To him who knows them not, the untutored savage for instance, they have no existence; or rather, the same obligations which bind the Christian, have no existence. But even the savage is subjected to obligations, according to his knowledge and opportunities; and we may likewise say of him, that no formal acknowledgment of those obligations will make them greater than they are.

The sole point which I aim to establish, is, that our will and our convenience have no legitimate power over the nature of our duty. It would be as proper for a son to declare that he would not fulfil every filial obligation to his parents, till he appeared in court and took a legal oath that he would do so, as for the native of a Christian

land to declare that there were duties to his Maker which he did not intend, nor was he required to discharge, till he had openly allowed them; and the son, after having taken such an oath, might talk as consistently about his *new* obligations, as might the Christian, after the promise was passed, about his. They were both of them born with obligations, which neither of them can dismiss nor change; they might as well dismiss the air which they inhaled with their first breath, and throw off the atmosphere which envelopes the world.

THE CHURCH.

BY REV. S. JUDD.

THE primary meaning of the word *church* is assembly, congregation, any collection of people. Its particular meaning is an assembly or congregation of people united to Christ. It is *par excellence* the assembly, the congregation, as the Bible is The Book. Churches are assemblies or congregations, or numbers of Christian people. This institution called the Church is of great account in the Bible. Christ loved the church, and gave himself for it; he cherisheth and nourisheth it; he designed it for a glorious Church.

But there is something extant in our day, calling itself the Church,—as the Greek, or Latin, or English, or Baptist, or Methodist Church,—about which even good men are suspicious. We find some most excellent men outside of it. They leave the Church, they disown it, they will have nothing to do with it. We find other excellent people whom you could no more persuade to join

the Church, than Daniel could have been induced to join in the worship of Nebuchadnezzar. Is this what Christ and the Bible mean by the Church?

Timothy, who had just entered the pastoral office, is directed by St. Paul how to behave or conduct himself in the house of God,*—not meeting-house, but household, family, or assembly of God,—which is the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground (the stay) of the truth. The first idea, then, of the Church, considered in respect of its action and duty, is, that it is the pillar and ground or stay of the truth. Of course, it follows that that which is the pillar and stay of error is not the Church of God. This is a plain test. The doctrine that Christ is very and eternal God, of one substance with the Father, is an error, a grave error, one of the most salient and pernicious heresies ever promulgated. Whatever is the pillar and stay of such an error is not the Church. It may be a church, it may have something in common with the true Church, but it is not the Church.

The doctrine of the Trinity destroys the whole idea of the Church, as it is set forth in the Bible, which is, that believers are members of Christ, even of his flesh and of his bones. If Christ be God, they cannot be members of him, except through Pantheism. A part of the doctrine of the Church is that God is over all,—that Christ, man, all things, are inferior to God. The notion that Christ is very and eternal God, of one substance with the Father, overthrows the Divine organization, and confounds the economy of God in respect of the Church. It follows that the Greek, Roman, and English Churches are not the Church, for they all teach and hold uppermost in their

* 1 Tim. iii. 15.

teachings that Christ is very and eternal God. They may be a church; their individual votaries may belong to the true Church; but, considered as a whole, considered as a body, they are not the Church. No man who joins them joins the Church, for they are not the Church.

Another test is this, that Christ, under God, is the head of the Church. That which owns any other head than Christ is not the Church. The Pope is accounted the head of the Roman Church. At least, we know that every man, holding any sort of post in that Church, is obliged, on penalty of excommunication, to profess and swear obedience to the Roman Pontiff. The King of England, by the fundamental law of the realm, is supreme head of the Church. I am aware these things are explained as not meaning much; but when every man in the Romish Church, who holds office in that Church, is obliged to take oath to obey, not Jesus Christ, but the Roman Pontiff; when every man who holds office in England is bound to acknowledge, under oath, that the king or queen is supreme head of the Church, it shows how wide is the departure from the evangelical idea of the Church.

A third test of the Church is, that it is that by which the manifold wisdom of God in Jesus Christ might be made known. In the third chapter of Ephesians Paul is speaking of the unsearchable riches of Christ, of God's promise in Christ, of the mystery that had been hidden in God from the beginning of the world, and how he had been appointed to preach thereof, to the intent that unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the Church the manifold wisdom of God, according to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Jesus

Christ. Immediate reference is here had to the fact that the Gentiles should be fellow-heirs, and of the same body, and partakers of the promise of God by Jesus Christ. The general reference, however, is to what he elsewhere styles the great mystery of the gospel, — Christ in us the hope of glory. Here he speaks particularly of an object he has in view, that Christ may dwell in his readers' hearts; that, being rooted and grounded in love, they may know the love of Christ, and be filled with all the fulness of God. In a word, the wisdom of God purposed of old in Jesus Christ, here referred to, is what we now-a-days call the scheme of redemption. By the Church then the true scheme of redemption is made known. There have been many schemes of redemption. Some churches say we must accept Christ as an atoning sacrifice in order to be saved. Some teach that water-baptism is regenerative. The Roman Church says a man is damned who rejects the decrees of the Council of Trent. The English Church says a man is damned who rejects the Trinity fabricated at Nice. But that only is the Church, which teaches the scheme of redemption, or mystery of God in Christ, as laid down in the Gospel.

Here, then, are three very plain and simple tests of the Church. First, that it is the pillar and stay of the truth; second, that Christ is its head; and third, that it teaches the purpose of salvation by Christ.

These three things are found in this our Unitarian Church. First, it is the pillar and stay of the truth. The truth in regard to God and man, revelation and nature, humanity, duty, life, death, and eternity, is here enforced and maintained. The aim of Unitarianism has ever been the simple truth of Scripture. I need not refer to the

writings of Locke, Lardner, Norton, Channing, Dewey. The truths of Unitarianism, I mean the truths which God in his providence out of the Bible, in conjunction with human reason, has revealed to the Unitarian mind, are at this moment affecting, modifying, agitating, reforming, the whole system of theology. There is hardly an intelligent mind in the land, of whatever persuasion, but finds his views influenced by these Unitarian truths. The dogmas of the Trinity, Total Depravity, Vicarious Atonement, Baptismal Regeneration, everywhere are giving way, either in substance or form, to the light thus manifested. This Church, then, is the pillar and ground or stay of the truth.

Secondly, it acknowledges Christ as its head, and rejects all other heads. Creeds do not bind it, Councils are not its authority, it has no king or pope to whom it owes allegiance. It has no articles, aside from the Gospel, to be subscribed as a condition of fellowship. You acquire admission to it, not by the way of its clergy, but by way of Christ. Its criteria of heresy are reason and revelation: Unitarian churches, each and all, profess Christ to be their head. I know no exception to this. I do not know a single church amongst us that puts any thing but the Gospel between a man and his duty. I do not know of a single church amongst us that requires of its ministers, its deacons, or any of its officers or agents, any thing more than a belief that Jesus is the Son of God, or a belief in the words and teachings of Jesus and the Apostles. By this test, then, this is the Church, that body of which Christ is the head.

A third test of the Church is, that it teaches the method of salvation, originating in the wisdom of God and devel-

oped through Jesus of Nazareth. This indeed may be variously stated. "Christ in you the hope of glory," is the summary language of St. Paul. It is making Christ our Way and Truth and Life; it is possessing the spirit of Christ; it is bearing the fruit of the spirit; it is receiving the life of God into the soul through Christ; it is having Christ manifested in our mortal bodies; it is dwelling in love; this is the wisdom of God according to the purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord. And this we hold and teach. By this test too we are the Church.

There is a definition of the Church in these words: "The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in which the pure word of God is preached and the sacraments duly administered according to Christ's ordinances, in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same."* And by this test the Unitarian body are the Church.

Heresy, in a generic view of the term, is a departure from the word of God. The doctrines that Christ is very and eternal God, that the Holy Spirit is the third person in the Godhead, that human nature deserves God's wrath, that man can will or do no good thing, that relics are to be worshipped, of the resurrection of the body, of water-regeneration, etc., are all heresies, all departures from the word of God; and most of the so-called churches are, herein, heretical. This Church rejects these things because they are departures from the word of God. This Church is not heretical.

Orthodoxy means sound doctrine. That is sound doctrine which is according to reason and Scripture; or

* xixth Art. Ch. of Eng.

which is according to the word of God. The Unitarian Church is the orthodox Church.

Catholic means general, universal. That is the Catholic Church which sees all men one in Christ, which expands its sympathies wide as humanity, which recognizes the universal brotherhood of the race. The Unitarian Church is in the best sense the Catholic Church.

The *Apostolic* Church is that which has the same foundation as the Apostles; that is, Christ. This is the Apostolic Church.

Evangelical is simply Greek for *Gospel*, which is Saxon for *good news*. The message of the angels was good news, glad tidings, or Gospel; the whole scope and spirit of Christianity is good news, glad tidings, Gospel, Evangelical. We adhere to the whole scope and spirit of Christianity; hence are we the Evangelical Church.

This, my friends, is Unitarianism. Some have been suspicious of it because they did not know what it would lead to. It seemed to be a departure from the old standard, and where it might end was not known. This is what it leads to, the recovery of the Church. It departs from dogmas that it may find the truth as it is in Jesus. It abjures Romanism, Anglicanism, Calvinism, that it may give its allegiance to the Gospel.

If I am to be hedged in on every side, to be fretted by the perpetual presence of arbitrary will, to be denied the exercise of my powers, it matters nothing to me whether the chain is laid on me by one or many, by king or people. A despot is not more tolerable for his many heads.—*Channing*.

THE RIGHT SORT OF POPULAR EDUCATION.

BY REV. C. PIERCE, OF WEST NEWTON, MASS.

NEVER went there by an age, when such outlays of time, labor, and money were made for education, especially for school education, popular education, as now. This is universally acknowledged. And yet it is the general wonder that crime should be on the increase, and so abound! The mystery finds its solution in the imperfect, unsound education of the present day. It is not that we have too little education. We have perhaps enough, but it is not of the *right sort*. The truth is, our education, in the family, in the school-room, and in the influence of every-day circumstances, is, and has been, more of the head than of the heart. It has been intellectual, rather than moral discipline. There has been, it is true, a great extension of means and efforts in behalf of education; but it has been chiefly for the advancement of secular instruction;—to make children learned and accomplished rather than wise and good; to enlighten the head, rather than improve the heart. At least such has been its tendency. Now, since it is more important to make people righteous and holy than learned and accomplished, and more difficult, a great deal, to make them so, the fact ought to have been precisely the reverse. The greatest outlay should have been in behalf of moral culture. While much has been done, and well done, in our schools and elsewhere, to make children and others intelligent, a great deal more should have been done to make them good. This matter has not been generally understood: legislators, and educators, and all, have been too much in the way of think-

ing, at least they have been too much in the way of *acting*, as though, in order to reform the world, it were necessary only to enlighten it. This idea has predominated too much in all our modern educational movements.

In this country, — in New England, and especially in Massachusetts, we have increased the number of our schools, lengthened the time of their continuance, enlarged and improved our school-houses, advanced the qualifications of teachers, and multiplied apparatus and books and other facilities of school-operations, almost indefinitely. Committees are also more attentive and laborious; and we have our examinations and exhibitions, and all that, and much more. But, in all this, there is one thing that strikes me very forcibly. It is this. Most of the outlay that has been made in behalf of education has had reference to purely *secular* instruction: it is very much an effort to advance in science and literature, and quite too little to promote sound morality and practical virtue. Look at our legislation, our books, our examinations, our rules and regulations touching schools; yea, look at the whole school-movement! look at the school in actual operation! Has it not this savor and aspect? A good school with us, in the ordinary acceptation of the words, is understood to mean one in which the languages and sciences and polite accomplishments are well taught. It is a place where a boy may be prepared for college or for the counting-room, and a girl fitted for polished society; as though the world, its ways and interests, the gaining of the means of subsistence, were the great object of living, the chief end of man. By a *good* school is not meant, I will not say in *any* degree, but first of all and chiefly, a school in which sound principles and good man-

ners are inculcated ; where the cardinal virtues of purity, integrity, truth, temperance, justice, and righteousness, occupy the same platform with grammar, geography, history, mathematics, and the languages. I hardly know the school where they occupy equal ground, either in regard to time or attention or expense.* Where is the school in which these things are looked after with as much anxiety and interest, either by committees or parents or teachers, as those which are generally understood to be the common-school branches ? Our school-books are purchased, and school-arrangements are made, mainly with reference to intellectual training and literary acquisition. Preparation for teaching, with us, means, too much, a preparation to teach geography, arithmetic, grammar, and the like.

These things fill too large a space even in our normal schools. And, when teachers and candidates for teaching are examined for their work, do committees inquire as much into their moral as their literary qualifications ? They feel bound to satisfy themselves that the candidate understands grammar, arithmetic, etc., and can teach them well. But do they make equal inquisition into his moral fitness ? Do they satisfy themselves that he is sound on the great subject of moral responsibility ? Do they inquire what interest he feels in this part of educa-

* As one means of determining the relative attention to morals and any of the intellectual branches, let us compare the number of books in use for the one and the other. Take, for example, arithmetic. Most pupils in our grammar-schools study arithmetic, and all should attend to ethics or morals ; yet of the most popular school-arithmetic in use (Greenleaf's,) I am told by good authority, there are sold per annum a hundred thousand copies, while of the most popular work on morals (Wayland's) there are sold only ten thousand copies.

It is presumed very similar results would be obtained by comparing it with any other of the common branches ; geography, grammar, or reading.

tion; and what measures he means to pursue, and what qualifications he possesses, to carry it on? Are they careful to know what supervision he will exercise over his pupils in this regard; what motives he will present to them to secure good lessons and good conduct? Are committees as careful on this point as its importance demands? And so at our school-examinations, when committee and parents and others come together to ascertain what progress has been made in good, what the condition of the school is, are these things inquired after and looked into as are grammar, arithmetic, and the like? Do they ask the teacher how much and what has been done, and with what success, in the inculcation of sound moral principles and good manners? The pupils are examined in geography, grammar, etc.; but are they examined on the great principles and rules which should regulate human life? Are they asked, or is the teacher asked, how they have behaved *in* the school-room or *out* of it, — whether they have been true, respectful, kind, patient, industrious, obedient; pure in purpose, pure in speech, and pure in conduct? Who ever heard of an examination of this sort? And yet why are not these *proper* subjects for teaching and for examination in all our seminaries? Why should they not be provided for, as well as those less weighty matters, arithmetic, algebra, etc.? Indeed, morals and moral training should be put not only on an equality with other branches, but be made paramount to them. It will not be sufficient to make ethics one of the class-studies, for the pupils to learn lessons on morals and recite them, or for the teacher to deliver lectures on the subject and occasionally dilate upon its importance; though this may be well. The whole spirit and discipline of the school

must be moral, in the highest and best sense of the word. Such it must be in all the intercourse of the pupils with each other, being sustained therein by the daily living example of the teacher. There should indeed be textbooks, and lessons, and recitations; but it will not be enough to talk about morals and recite about morals, even though it be done every day. This needed moral training must be an *omnipresent influence*, pervading and animating the whole school-room: like the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost, it must "fill the whole house." Not *now* and *then* a lesson; not occasional instruction; not separate and distinct exercises, though regularly administered, will do the work. This training, this moral influence, must be continually working, constantly felt. "There is no need of new schools and academies, or new authors, or teachers especially designed for this great work; but moral culture should occupy the first place in all seminaries, and make a part of every exercise." The parent must feel that the house is built mainly for this purpose; the teacher, that he is employed for this purpose; and the child, that he is sent to school for this purpose,—that what he there hears and sees, the great expenditure of time, money, and labor, are designed chiefly for his *moral* education. "It never will do to erect here and there an edifice, and dedicate it to this purpose: it will not do to appoint a professor or teacher of morals to each of our schools;" or to go round from seminary to seminary to deliver a course of lectures, as is sometimes done on particular branches of science or literature, as geology, botany, and the like. No, no. Every school, every teacher, and every exercise, should be consecrated to this work. To be effectual, it must be practical. It must

mingle in *all* the exercises; the sports of recess, as well as the recitations of the school-room. Every striking incident or event, whether sad or joyous, which can be turned to moral account, should contribute to the aid of the teacher. At every school we claim, for moral education, all the time and labor of the teacher which its importance demands. If there be not time and place for every thing, or every thing that it is desirable to learn, let something else be omitted, and not this. Let all that attention be given to it which may be found necessary to lay the foundation of a correct character; all that may be requisite to inculcate the great practical lesson of love to God and love to man. Surely, a teacher can do for his pupils no better service than this. The same spirit should pervade all the purlieus of education, and indeed all the walks of life. It should rule in the nursery and at the fireside. It should be the presiding genius of home. It should rule in all the departments of business; be found in the market, and in the work-shop; in the stall, and in the counting-room; on the farm, and wherever men resort either for deliberation, for action, or for pleasure. Men can be nowhere and can do nothing, when they should not be controlled by this spirit. It should appear in all things, at all times, and in all places, and nowhere more than in the school-room, that CHARACTER is the object for which we should live, and labor, and pay our money. I have already said, and I say again, that this thing cannot be taught effectually in our schools by means of books and lectures and set lessons, though these may help. Goodness cannot be simply *talked* into children: it must come by a LIFE, by practice, by example.

TOTAL DEPRAVITY.

BY REV. E. H. SEARS.

We are not at all anxious to keep terms with the old theologies, much less to gloss over any real differences between falsehood and truth. But the terminologies of religion become so vague and so emptied of their primitive meaning, long before they fall into desuetude, that it is necessary to subject them to a clear analysis to see for what ideas they stand, or whether they stand for any. It is a fact very familiar to the historian of opinions, that an old system of theology may pass clean away, and a very different one take its place, without the least change in the old creeds and nomenclatures, just as the Roman republic passed into the empire, and liberty changed into despotism without the least change in the *forms* of government. Nay, when men become secretly conscious that the ancient faith is leaking out of its symbols, it is quite observable how they cling to the symbols with a fiercer dogmatism, in order to elude the charge of innovation and heresy. In this extreme anxiety to preserve the husks of dead men's thoughts, it may come to pass that those whose creeds are hostile may agree substantially both in opinion and sentiment. As it is not the husks, but their contents, that we care for, we wish to compare our doctrine with that which may be supposed to be current under the term "total depravity."

We classify the internal forces of human nature under a threefold division. Under the *first* division we place those which are evil in themselves, and only evil; those which do not admit of being changed into any thing good,

but which require to be expunged altogether. Among these are those corrupt acquired instincts which have become the inheritance of fallen man, hatred, malice, revenge, deceit, cruelty, acquired lusts, and selfishness in its myriad forms. These, when once acquired, are transmissible from one generation to another. They are not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be, because in their essential character they are the very opposites of the Divine nature. They are that "body of death" which all along through the centuries has formed and stratified upon our burdened humanity, and which can in no wise be incorporated with it, but which must be rolled off, as the burden of the pilgrim rolled away when he came to the cross. Under the *second* division we place the natural appetites, affections, and powers; and these are good or evil according to their ultimate *ends*, according to the service in which they are used. Under the control of the Divine law they are good, under the control of the selfish nature they are evil. The appetites are good when they serve the higher nature; when their end is self-indulgence, they degenerate into brutal sensuality. Family affections are good and pure when their end is mutual improvement and aid; bad when their end is mutual indulgence and the exhibition of family pomp and pride. Nothing can be so disinterested as a mother's love. Nothing, again, can be so intensely and intolerably selfish. Family affections bring us into a more tender and loving fellowship with all the families of men, or else they are the forms of a noxious self-love, and they differ from those of a gross personal selfishness only because they reflect its hateful fires in a circle removed one degree further from us. Men will

even commit greater wrongs to aggrandize their families than they would to aggrandize themselves. Intellect, when enlisted in the service of God and humanity, pouring light upon man's path to guide him to happiness and to heaven and lead on the groping nations to their millennial era, is a sublime and beneficent power. When enlisted in the service of wrong, having private honor and advantage for its end, and leading astray by cunning arts and glozing sophistries, it is the very attribute of archangel ruined. These natural powers, therefore, whether intellectual or affectional, are good or bad according to the motive force by which they are impelled and guided. Between God on the one hand, and self on the other, they hang and tremble; but it is the tendency of hereditary corruption to make them sway in the wrong direction with cumulative weight; to make the balance come down on the side of evil. But under the *third* division we place those sacred capacities which are the crowning glory of human nature, the capacity already described, of receiving the Divine Light and Life and making God operative in man. This capacity does not "tend to all evil," but to all good, since it is the ground of the regeneration of the individual and the progress of the race. It implies too the power of choice; choice between the agencies which we will suffer to shape our characters; choice between the influence that comes down to draw us into the heavens by its sweet persuasions, and the influence that comes up from below and seeks to draw us downward by its infernal sorceries,—that power of choice in which consists the moral agency of man.

Now if by the term *human nature* we mean to include the forces belonging to the first two divisions here named,

and exclude the last, doubtless it is inclined to all evil, and averse to all good. Man shut in to himself would be abandoned to all depravity. There is hereditary corruption that sways him from behind, and then his natural powers and affections have lost that equipoise which they had in primitive man, and are deflected towards the service of the selfish nature. Appetite, natural affection, and the natural reason would all go over to the service of the evil powers, and toil in the bondage of sin. On their swift and downward course they would rush into the most frightful outbreaks of wickedness. But if by human nature we mean the sum total of all its capacities, and therefore its receptivity of the Divine force itself, — its capacities that open inward towards immensity and immortality, and of choosing the guidance of that power that shall bear it sun-ward like the eagle, — then we ought to abandon the word “total” in describing its depravity, as leading to confusion of thought and unnecessary misunderstandings. Even that theory of conversion which makes it instantaneous would logically presuppose an inborn capacity to be converted. We take it, that it does not quite mean to confound man with brutes and fiends, and that there is some reason in the nature of things why sovereign grace should select human beings for its objects rather than wolves and tigers. Even, then, if the Holy Spirit were not, as we contend, the divine fire that warms in our heart of hearts, and from the dawn of existence seeks to kindle within us all holy affections, — even if the orbit of our being lay through spaces of total blackness until some sudden light came blazing through it like a comet, — still we must be so organized as to be receptive of the light when it comes and be acted upon beneficently by

the new power whenever it strikes us. We do not see, then, that our account of human nature differs from that of these theorists, when consistent with themselves, so much in regard to its real and intrinsic powers and propensities, as in regard to the Divine plan of acting upon them. This difference, we will not disguise, is sufficiently wide,—the difference of supposing the child to be born into a state of the dreariest orphanage, to do nothing but sin up to the era of his conversion, and to be educated for repentance, and of supposing him at first the child of a Father whose claiming voice he ever hears, and whose spirit, unless rejected, ever shines within him “as glows the sunbeam in a drop of dew.” It is the difference between a regeneration which may commence with the very dawn of being and prevent the leprosy from ever appearing in the voluntary life, and the regeneration that finds man full grown in evil, and lifts him out of the pool of sin, and attempts to bring him to life as you bring back life to the drowned, which must be done, if at all, with unutterable pangs.

Nor yet, again, is it to be disguised, that some of the old formulas and terminologies exclude from the original constitution of man any such forces and capacities as we have placed under our third division. They even take from him the power of choosing any thing but pollution, and the capacity itself of receiving the Holy Spirit is only the result of a new creation. Calvin says of infants, “Though they have not yet produced the fruit of their iniquity, yet they have the seed of sin within them; even *their whole nature is as it were a seed of sin*, and therefore cannot but be odious and abominable to God.”* But the

* Institutes, Book II. Ch. 1, Sec. 8.

old formulas themselves become flexible to the all-renewing Spirit that sweeps them through, and dry bodies of divinity find a new life forming under the ribs of death. No matter whether the ancient symbols remain or not. Unless swept away by God's reviving breath, they will be warmed and bent by it, and we cannot keep out of them the plastic spirit which creates all things new. Those who thought they were ruling opinions with an iron rod find, to their surprise, that the rod, like Aaron's, has "budded" in their hands. We may even wake up some pleasant morning, and find that we have written out here a chapter in that progressive orthodoxy which has made its ancient symbols pliant to the shape of modern ideas. Whether so or not, God's truth is moving surely on to its triumphs. Those petrifications called creeds, the cooling down of the religious sentiment into solid crust, cannot contain or shut in a still deeper religious sentiment that swells beneath. Even the creed-makers had thoughts and inspirations which could not be condensed into the formulas, for the Eternal Word shone through them as through all. Calvin himself, after having made out that infants are abominable to God, goes on afterwards to represent, with admirable inconsistency, that they are the objects of the Divine love;* for the central truth of the Gospel could not escape him, that God's love to the world even in its fallen state was the reason why he gave his only begotten Son to redeem and save it. And Augustine asserts the identical doctrine which in this chapter we have aimed to develop; "Wherefore in a wonderful and divine manner he both hated us and loved us at the same time. He hated us as being different from what he had made us; but as our iniquity had not entirely destroyed *his work in us*, he could at the same time in every one of us hate what we had done, and *love what proceeded from himself.*"

* Institutes, Book II. Ch. 16, Sec. 1, 2.

BOOK NOTICE.

A CHRISTIAN LITURGY FOR THE USE OF THE CHURCH. Boston: Crosby, Nichols & Co., 1853.

THERE is no note in this book to indicate the compiler, but we believe we are authorized in saying that the materials were selected, prepared, and arranged by the Rev. Dr. Hedge of Providence, R. I. The arrangement is simple, and we observe throughout the marks of a wise discrimination, and a correct taste. Some of the richest and most inspiring language of devotion extant in any form is to be found here — selections from the sublime and touching psalms of the Bible, the noble Te Deum ascribed to Ambrose of Milan, and a grand Eucharistic Liturgy, portions of which were probably repeated by the Christians of Jerusalem and Antioch in the second century, as they sat together at the sacred Table of Communion.

We are glad to observe that this Liturgy does not contemplate the exclusion of free prayer from the Churches in which it is used. Any such exclusion would be a calamity, and ought carefully to be avoided. We are of those who believe that the “gift of prayer” is more or less in every man, and should feel bound to protest against any systematic hindrance that might be put in the way of its free expression. At the same time we are ready to admit that the use of set forms of prayer may sometimes, and in certain circumstances, be desirable and profitable both in public and domestic worship.

From the book before us we extract the following Litany, or form of general Supplication, which we think might occasionally be used with profit in the religious services of the Church and the household.

Min. O God, our Heavenly Father, have mercy upon us.

Con. O God, our Heavenly Father, have mercy upon us.

Min. O God, by thy Christ, the Redeemer of the world, have mercy upon us.

Con. O God, by thy Christ, the Redeemer of the world, have mercy upon us.

Min. O God, by thy Holy Spirit, the Comforter, Teacher, and Guide of mankind, have mercy upon us.

Con. O God, by thy Holy Spirit, the Comforter, Teacher, and Guide of mankind, have mercy upon us.

Min. Forgive, O Lord, our manifold sins and offences. We have erred and strayed from thy ways; we have left undone those things which we ought to have done, and have done those things which we ought not to have done. We pray thee to remove our transgressions from us; spare thou those who confess their faults; restore thou those that are penitent, according to thy promises declared unto mankind in Christ Jesus our Lord.

Con. Spare us, good Lord.

Min. From all evil and mischief; from sin, from the crafts and assaults of the adversary; from thy wrath and from everlasting death;

Con. Good Lord, deliver us.

Min. From all blindness of heart; from pride, vain-glory, and hypocrisy, from envy, hatred, and malice, and all uncharitableness;

Con. Good Lord, deliver us.

Min. From all inordinate and sinful affections, and from all the deceits of the world, the flesh and the devil;

Con. Good Lord, deliver us.

Min. From the fury of the elements, from plague, pestilence, and famine; from battle and murder and death unprepared for;

Con. Good Lord, deliver us.

Min. From all sedition and civil discord, from all false doctrine and unbelief, from hardness of heart and contempt of thy word and commandment;

Con. Good Lord, deliver us.

Min. In all time of our tribulation; in all time of our prosperity; in the hour of death, and in the day of judgment;

Con. Good Lord, deliver us.

Min. We beseech thee, O Lord, that it may please thee to rule and guide and comfort thy holy Church universal, to bring into the way of truth all such as have erred and are deceived, to send worthy laborers into thy vineyard, and to give saving power to the preaching of thy word.

Con. We beseech thee to hear us, good Lord.

Min. That it may please thee to illumine all ministers of the Gospel and teachers of truth, and to give to

them, and to the people committed to their charge, the needful spirit of thy grace, and to pour out upon them the continual dew of thy blessing.

Con. We beseech thee to hear us, good Lord.

Min. That it may please thee to bless and preserve all rulers and magistrates, and all who are in authority over us, giving them grace to execute justice and to maintain truth.

Con. We beseech thee to hear us, good Lord.

Min. That it may please thee to bless all sorts and conditions of men, to make known thy ways unto all people, thy saving health to all nations; to give to all nations unity, peace, and concord, a heart to love and fear thee, and diligently to live after thy commandments.

Con. We beseech thee to hear us, good Lord.

Min. That it may please thee to give to all thy people increase of grace to hear thy word, to receive it with pure affection, and to bring forth the fruits of the spirit, that all who profess and call themselves Christians may hold the faith in unity of spirit, in the bond of peace, and in righteousness of life.

Con. We beseech thee to hear us, good Lord.

Min. That it may please thee to strengthen such as do stand, to comfort and help the weak-hearted, and to raise up those who fall.

Con. We beseech thee to hear us, good Lord.

Min. That it may please thee to succor, help, and comfort all who are in danger, necessity, or tribulation.

Con. We beseech thee to hear us, good Lord.

Min. That it may please thee to minister unto such as are any ways afflicted or distressed in mind, body, or estate, to comfort and relieve them according to their need, giving them patience under their trials, and a happy issue out of all their afflictions.

Con. We beseech thee to hear us, good Lord.

Min. That it may please thee to preserve all who travel by land or by water, all women in the perils of childbirth, all sick persons and young children, and to show thy pity upon all prisoners and captives.

Con. We beseech thee to hear us, good Lord.

Min. That it may please thee to defend and provide for the fatherless and widows, and all who are desolate and oppressed.

Con. We beseech thee to hear us, good Lord.

Min. That it may please thee to have mercy upon all men.

Con. We beseech thee to hear us, good Lord.

Min. That it may please thee to forgive our enemies, persecutors, and slanderers, and to turn their hearts.

Con. We beseech thee to hear us, good Lord.

Min. That it may please thee to give and preserve to our use the kindly fruits of the earth, so that in due time we may enjoy them.

Con. We beseech thee to hear us, good Lord.

Min. That it may please thee to sanctify us by thy Holy Spirit, to make us perfect in every good work, and to keep us blameless unto the end.

Con. We beseech thee to hear us, good Lord.

Min. The Lord bless us and keep us.

Con. The Lord cause his face to shine upon us.

Min. The Lord lift up the light of his countenance upon us.

Con. And give us peace.

INTELLIGENCE.

UNITARIAN MISSIONS.—The American Unitarian Association has recently established a mission among the Chippewas dwelling near the head waters of the Mississippi, through the agency of the Rev. James Tanner, a native Indian of that tribe. Mr. Tanner must, we think, be a remarkable man. He was educated by the French Catholics, but subsequently renounced the Roman ritual, and took a walk of *five hundred miles* on snow shoes to receive baptism at the hands of a Baptist minister. Coming lately into contact with some earnest and serious persons of the Unitarian denomination, through whom he was lead to read some Unitarian books, he found that his views corresponded substantially with theirs, and he declared himself a Unitarian. He said, too, that all the converted Indians of his tribe among whom he labored as a Baptist Missionary, were Unitarians also. Thus it is that multitudes hold substantially the Unitarian faith without knowing it.

The American Unitarian Association likewise contemplates a mission in Calcutta. Some thirty years since, the Rev. Mr. Adam, a Baptist missionary of that city, became a Unitarian, and in conjunction with the eminent Rammohun Roy, who had been converted from Hindooism to Christianity, established a worshipping society there, based on the simple unity of God, and the Messiahship of Jesus. Since that time Unitarian worship has been maintained there, chiefly through the instrumentality of natives. Application having been made by them to America for help, the Rev. Mr. Dall, formerly of Toronto, has been sent to inquire concerning the condition of the field of labor in Calcutta and other parts of India. He sailed a few weeks since on this highly important errand. Let us devoutly wish him God speed.

The Rev. Mr. Nute of Chicopee, Mass., has also been appointed by the American Unitarian Association as their missionary to Kansas.

THE FIFTY THOUSAND DOLLAR BOOK FUND OF THE AMERICAN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION.—A circular has been published by the Business Committee, requesting that collections should be made up and forwarded during the months of March, April [current] and May. We would remind our readers that Mr. G. H. Fröthingham, of Montreal, is of the General Committee to receive subscriptions.