

UT AUSTIN - GEN LIBS WAREHOUSE



02444151

60068 V

X

2109742785

285.05 C138 N.S. V.2 1847

A89009

285.05

C138

N.S.

V.2



LIBRARY
OF
THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS
THE LITTLEFIELD FUND FOR
SOUTHERN HISTORY

For the full and impartial study of the South and
of its part in American History—Littlefield

THE
Calvinistic Magazine.

EDITED BY

Isaac Anderson, Fred. A. Ross, Jas. King & Jas. McChain.

UNIV OF TEXAS

“EARNESTLY CONTEND FOR THE FAITH WHICH WAS ONCE
DELIVERED UNTO THE SAINTS.”

VOL. II. — (NEW SERIES.) — 1847.

December, 1847.

ABINGDON, VA:

COALE AND BARR.

146206 by Google

INDEX.

	PAGE.
"A link broken"—Preaching in India.— <i>Rev. C. B. Leupolt,</i>	59
A noble Position.—From a Western Missionary, - - -	63
A Servant of the Church, - - - - -	64
A Narrative of the state of Religion within the bounds of the Synod of Tennessee, - - - - -	86
Application, - - - - -	114
A Gem.— <i>Selected,</i> - - - - -	115
Anecdote of Whitefield, - - - - -	136
Admission of Proselytes into the M. E. Church, - - -	221
A Royal Contribution to Missions, - - - - -	264
A Sermon—by the Rev. James H. Gass, - - - - -	278
A Card.— <i>Knoxville Register,</i> - - - - -	295
A Scriptural Test of Bible Orthodoxy—by C. N., - - -	297
A Letter to Rev. Geo. Matthes—by Isaac Anderson, - -	359
Calvinism, its History—by James McChain, - - - -	1
Collections for A. B. C. F. Missions, - - - - -	160
Christ is mine, - - - - -	320
Dr. Nettleton on Perseverance, - - - - -	95
Death and Life of Dr. Chalmers, - - - - -	231
Does saving Faith precede Regeneration?—by the Rev. F. A. McCorkle, - - - - -	337
Election explained—by Rev. Ashbel G. Fairchild, - -	47
Election—by G. M. S., - - - - -	180
Extracts from the Minutes of Holston Presbytery at its late Session at Elizabethton, - - - - -	188
Election—Objections Answered.— <i>Dr. Fairchild's Great Supper,</i> - - - - -	351
Further signs of Decomposition.— <i>Meth. Protestant,</i> - -	224
Hermeneutics—by S. J., - - - - -	90
Hints for those who need them, - - - - -	287
Long Prayers—by D., - - - - -	212
Missionary—Results of the year.— <i>Dayspring,</i> - - - -	57
Methodism as it is, - - - - -	97
Mode of Baptism—by Rev. Wm. Minnis, - - - - -	137
Missionary.— <i>Dayspring,</i> - - - - -	158
Mode of Baptism—by Rev. Wm. Minnis, (Concluded,) -	161
Missionary Circular—by Rev. Wm. Potter, - - - - -	218
Missionary.— <i>Dayspring,</i> - - - - -	289
Minds and Books.— <i>American Messenger,</i> - - - - -	294
Missionary.— <i>Missionary Herald,</i> - - - - -	318
Notice—by the Editors, - - - - -	64
Nestorians.— <i>Dayspring,</i> - - - - -	96
Note from Mr. Ross, - - - - -	384
Objections to the Doctrine of Final Perseverance, - -	193

7/16/19
 Sherrill
 2

	PAGE.
Objections to the Doctrine of the Final Perseverance of the Saints, &c., by J. D. M., - - - -	265
Presbyterianism—Continued from page 279, vol. 1, -	107
Power of caste.— <i>Rev. T. Boaz</i> , - - - -	293
Presbyterianism—(Continued)—by Presbuteros, - -	313
Practical tendency of Calvinism.— <i>Great Supper</i> , - -	190
Resolutions of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church on Dancing, - - - -	136
Raising up our own Ministers—by <i>Terrae Filius</i> , - -	156
Reminiscences of our Venerable Church—by M., - -	154
“ “ “ “ “ “ - - - -	207
“ “ “ “ “ “ - - - -	275
“ “ “ “ “ “ - - - -	372
Short Practical Sermons—No. 4,—by J. K., - - - -	52
“ “ “ No. 5, - - - -	112
“ “ “ No. 6, - - - -	333
Statistical Facts—by L. R. M., - - - -	184
State of Religion within the bounds of the Synod of Tennessee, ending in October, 1847, &c., - -	383
“The Manifold Wisdom of God”—by Rev. Step'n Taylor, -	10
The History of the Calvinistic Magazine—by F. A. Ross, -	21
The Daughter of John Knox.— <i>American Messenger</i> , -	60
The Atonement—by C. N., - - - -	65
The Anti-Calvinist's Liturgy—by A. G. F., - - - -	78
The Way to be Happy.— <i>Dayspring</i> , - - - -	93
“The Great Iron Wheel”—No. 2.—by F. A. Ross, - -	116
The Omniscience of God—by Rev. Stephen Taylor, -	202
The Election of Infants.— <i>Selected</i> , - - - -	215
The Bible Cause—by Rev. Thomas Stringfield, - -	219
The New York Difficulties.— <i>Methodist Protestant</i> , -	223
The Omniscience of God—(Concluded)—by the Rev. Stephen Taylor, - - - -	225
“The Great Iron Wheel”—No. 3—by F. A. Ross, - -	239
“The Great Iron Wheel” No. 2, sustained by High Au- thority—by F. A. Ross, - - - -	321
To-Day, - - - -	319
The Uncultivated Mind, - - - -	320
“The Bible says so,” - - - -	336
The Sacredness of Tears, - - - -	336
The How and the Fact—A Sermon—by Rev. J. McChain, -	361
What we have not done and what we have done—by J. K., -	377

THE
Calvinistic Magazine.

[NEW SERIES.]

"Earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints."

Vol. II.

January, 1847.

No. 1.

Calvinism, its History.*

BY JAMES MCGHAIN.

IN the first number of our Magazine, for the year just closed, the author of the present article gave an exposition of the Calvinistic doctrines, as he understood and believed them. In doing so, in order fully and fairly to bring out his own views, (as he wrote only in his own name,) he touched upon some points, in regard to which true Calvinists differ. Perhaps he should have mentioned what these particulars were, as they passed in review. As it did not occur to him at the time, to do this, he would now state, that many sound defenders of Calvin do not adopt the opinions which the writer expressed respecting *God's permitting or suffering the existence of sin*, and that some take higher and some lower ground than he does on most of our peculiar doctrines. Since, however, he explicitly observed, in the outset, that he wrote solely "in his own name, and his own way," no one but himself could be held responsible for what he says. In the article referred to, the history of Calvinism was reserved for some future time. Circumstances have led the writer to put off considering the latter part of his subject till the first number of our second year.

We do not, as some would seem to imagine, look back to Calvin as the founder of our sect, or as the oracle of our creed. We simply regard him as the one who first reduced our dis-

*The facts stated in this article are almost exclusively taken from a chapter in Hill's Divinity, on the history of Calvinism.

tinctive tenets to a complete system, and also as one of its ablest and best defenders. We do not pretend to hold all his views, just as he held them; nor do we attempt to justify all his conduct, though we think some parts of it defensible which his enemies have assailed with the greatest malignity. We go to *God*, as the author of our doctrines and the founder of our sect. We go to the *Bible*, as the oracle of our peculiar belief. We go to the Lord Jesus Christ and the apostle Paul, as the great expositors of our faith. Therefore, in giving the history of Calvinism, we trace it back to the eternal throne, we take our starting point from the Bible. We do not find our doctrines all reduced to a perfect system in the Scriptures, as we have them in our "Confession of Faith." All the parts of our creed are in the Sacred Volume, and man has only brought the parts together, and formed them into a whole.

The Christian writers of the first four centuries of the Christian era do not seem to have discussed deeply the points under consideration, and it is not known, therefore, what were their views, or whether they had any definite scheme. In the fifth century, however, we find the Calvinistic belief substantially set forth and defended by the learned, able, and pious Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, in Africa. He is justly regarded as the first of the Christian fathers, for his learning, talents, and piety. In his youth, he had been extremely abandoned, but, in answer to the prayers and instructions of a pious mother, he was reclaimed and converted, and became one of the brightest ornaments and greatest blessings of the church in his age. Origen, also one of the most distinguished of the Christian fathers, had written much against a heretical sect called Manicheans. His works were extensively circulated, and had much authority. Pelagius, a native of England, made the writings of Origen his chief study while residing at Rome, in the beginning of the fifth century. He drew from thence the fundamental principle of his creed, which destroys the doctrine of total depravity. To overthrow the dangerous errors of Pelagius, Augustine wrote voluminously, and in his productions we find substantially those views of predestination and grace, which are called Calvinistic.

From the days of Augustine, two different systems of predestination have been advocated in the church. These two

schemes, that of Augustine, and that of Pelagius modified by his successors, had their advocates and opponents for several centuries. The questions thus agitated were buried, for a long time, in the night of the middle ages. They were at length revived, however, in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, by Thomas Aquinas, and Joannes Scotus. The former defended the system of Augustine, and the latter supported one similar to that now opposed to Calvin. These writers, however, multiplied words beyond their distinct thoughts, and only involved in greater darkness many difficult subjects. In the sixteenth century, the corruptions of the Church of Rome had reached such a height, that they were violently assailed by Martin Luthur, a friar of the order of St. Austin. Luther had been educated in the opinions of Augustine. To these he adhered, and *was therefore Calvinistic in his creed*. Melancthon, Luthur's coadjutor, and in a great measure his successor, modified the doctrines of the great leader of the Reformation, and these are the views generally adopted by the Lutheran Church.

John Calvin, a native of France, settled in Geneva in the year 1541, and labored there till his death in 1564. He took the tenets of Augustine, reduced them to a more complete system, expounded them more clearly, and defended them most ably. Hence, Calvin's name was given to that scheme which he taught, and which he professed to have learned from Augustine.

Calvin's learning, ability and industry, exerted a powerful influence in promoting the Reformation in Switzerland, begun and carried forward by Zwingli. Owing to the numerous writings of Calvin, and the multitudes that flocked to his university at Geneva, his peculiar creed was widely disseminated, and was adopted by most Christians who left the Church of Rome.

John Knox, the father of the Reformation in Scotland, visited Calvin and embraced his views. Knox formed the constitution of the Church of Scotland on the plan of the ecclesiastical organization, which Calvin established at Geneva, and introduced all the tenets call Calvinistic. And, to this day, Scotland is one of the most thoroughly Calvinistic countries in the world.

In England, the first reformers adopted the form of worship and the ecclesiastical government of the Lutheran Churches. But in the days of Queen Elizabeth, the doctrines of Calvin were highly esteemed, were taught in the English universities, and were the belief of the clergy who prepared the thirty-nine articles, which are the Confession of Faith of the Church of England. The seventeenth article of the creed of the Episcopal Church is strongly Calvinistic, and was drawn up by Calvinistic ministers. I will quote a part of what it says:—"Predestination to life is the everlasting purpose of God, whereby (before the foundations of the world were laid,) he hath constantly decreed by his counsel, secret to us, to deliver from curse and damnation those whom he hath chosen in Christ out of mankind, and to bring them by Christ to everlasting salvation, as vessels made to honor. Wherefore, they which be endued with so excellent a benefit of God, be called according to God's purpose, by his spirit working in due season: they through grace obey the calling: they be justified freely: they be made sons of God by adoption: they be made like the image of his only begotten son Jesus Christ: they walk religiously in good works; and at length, by God's mercy they attain to everlasting felicity." Still, many ministers of the Protestant Episcopal Church maintain that this language is not inconsistent with Arminianism.

About the beginning of the seventeenth century, Arminius, Professor of Divinity in the University of Leyden, began to write against the doctrines of Calvin. He was a man of great ability, eloquence, and learning. His mind was clear, strong, and comprehensive. He was not disposed to rest in the opinions of others. He thought for himself. Though educated in the Calvinistic faith, he early entertained doubts of its truth. When he became professor of divinity, he taught the system opposed to Calvin's, and reduced it to a scientific form. It took, therefore, the name of Arminius, and is called Arminianism. It spread among the Lutheran churches. After the death of Arminius in 1609, the hold which his opinions had taken on the minds of men, and the zeal with which they were propagated, immediately produced great excitement. The controversy was mingled with politics. Many conferences were held between the Calvinists and Arminians to reconcile

their differences, but without effect. At length in the year 1519, deputies from several countries, Germany, Britain, and others, met at Dort, a town in South Holland. This assembly is known in ecclesiastical history, as the Synod of Dort. The learned and eloquent Episcopius, the successor of Arminius, undertook the defence of the Arminians. Episcopius and his adherents were dissatisfied with the course of procedure which the Synod proposed to pursue, and in consequence, refused to submit to the direction of that body. They were, for this reason, excluded from the sitting of the assembly. After many meetings, the Arminian creed was formally condemned as heretical. In consequence of this judgment of the Synod, the Arminians were excommunicated, and, at first, obliged to leave their possessions in the United Provinces. They were afterwards permitted to return, and they are now allowed several churches in different cities of Holland. The British divines gave their assent to the decrees of this Synod. This proves that the clergy of England were at this time Calvinistic in their creed. Soon, however, a great change was produced among the ministers of the Church of England. In those civil commotions which began to occur about this time, *Calvinism became identified with republicanism*. The Puritans, who brought about the great revolution in England in favor of free institutions, were strong Calvinists. *Their Calvinism and republicanism went together*. The clergy of the English church were devotedly attached to monarchy, and violently opposed to a republican form of government. They generally became Arminian, the more completely to separate themselves from those whose love of civil liberty and the Calvinistic faith went together. Thus, in that great revolution which did so much to gain and secure that political freedom which England now has, *Calvinism was identified with republicanism, and Arminianism with monarchy*. The Puritans, driven away by religious persecution, crossed the ocean, and landed on the rock of Plymouth. They brought with them their Calvinism and their republicanism. They planted both together in the soil of New England. These took deep root, and grew up into a mighty tree, like New England's own magnificent elm. They have made her what she is, the most intelligent, the most moral, the

most religious, the most prosperous, the freest country on earth.

During the commotions of the seventeenth century, the Episcopal form of Church government was abolished in England. An assembly of divines was called in June, 1643, "for the purpose of settling the government and liturgy of the Church of England, and for indicating and clearing the doctrine of said church from false aspersions and interpretations." This distinguished body met at Westminster, in the city of London. It is known, in history, as the Westminster Assembly of divines. It was composed of the greatest ministers and laymen of that age of great men. They were an assembly, as a whole, never before, or since equalled for learning, experience, talent and piety, by any uninspired body. They continued their sittings for five years, and the Confession of Faith and Catechisms of the Presbyterian Church, were the result of their long and great deliberations.

In closing this brief history of Calvinism, I will enumerate those denominations which hold the Calvinistic creed. They are Congregationalists, Presbyterians, the Scotch Church with its several branches, the Dutch Reformed and the Baptist.

I will close this article with three reflections, suggested by this hasty sketch.

1. Calvinism is *the devoted friend of education and learning*. It has always made human science the hand-maid of religion. Of men, the first great expositor and defender of our peculiar faith, was the apostle Paul. He was the only educated man among the apostles, and one of the best educated men of his age. His learning and mental training formed no unimportant part of those qualifications, which made him the chief of the apostles, and the great writer on the Gospel, the one best fitted to explain and defend its doctrines. When, some centuries after Paul, our creed was reduced to a more systematic form, it was systematized, illustrated, and supported by Augustine, one of the most learned and able ministers of the church in his age. From that time onward to Luther, Calvin, and Knox, Calvinism was distinguished for the learning and education of its advocates. How well-educated and learned these three great men were, and how they labored to promote human knowledge, I need not stop to show. Look at the Westminster

Assembly of divines; look at the Calvinistic ministers of England, Scotland, France, and America; look at the *amount of education among the masses of the people* who hold our faith; look at the collegiate and theological training which our churches require in our ministers; look at the schools, academies, colleges and theological seminaries which Calvinists establish wherever they go—and you must admit that Calvinism is everywhere, and always has been, the devoted friend of education and learning.

2. We are also led to observe that our belief has been equally the friend of *civil liberty and free institutions*. The republics of antiquity had well nigh expired before the Gospel had begun to be propagated by the apostles. It was not until the time of Calvin, that the world was again in a state to admit of political freedom. Then, the Reformation was breaking the chains which had enslaved the people for so many ages. Then, men began to demand liberty in church and state. Calvinism at once responded to this call. She re-echoed the demand wherever she went. She established free institutions at Geneva under Calvin. She promoted political freedom in Switzerland. She gave to Great Britain, by means of the Puritans, much the largest share of that liberty, civil and ecclesiastical, which she now has. Calvinism also prepared our fathers for our Revolution. She sent her Witherspoon to plead the cause of American freedom on the floor of Congress, and sign the Declaration of Independence. She inspired her Davies, with all his powerful eloquence, to kindle the patriotism of our citizens against British oppression. She commissioned others of her ministers to share with our soldiers the privations of the camp, and go with them to the field of battle. She called upon all who ministered at her altar to plead for American liberty in the sanctuary, before the throne of the God of armies. Thus has the Calvinistic creed been identified with civil liberty and free institutions.

3. A third reflection is, that our peculiar faith has always been the devoted friend of true piety, of *genuine heart-religion*. We fearlessly challenge a comparison between christians of our belief and those of any other sect, in holiness of life, in efforts to save souls, and convert the world. We have had our times of declension, but we were the last to decline, and

the first to revive. Our religion may not glare before the world—it may not show itself, by sound and tumult, as much as that of some, but, when the times call for it, when principles are at stake, then, as in the case of the Free Church of Scotland, our religion bursts forth like a volcano, and shakes nations, and startles the world by its resistless power and heavenly splendor. We go back to Paul and Augustine; to Luther, Calvin and Knox; we go back to Baxter, Howe, Bunyan, Whitefield and Martin; we come to Edwards, Elliot, Brainerd and Payson, as examples of our piety. I would ask, who were the originators of foreign missions in these latter days? who are now prosecuting them with the greatest vigor and success? who are doing the most for genuine revivals at home, our benevolent institutions, and the world's conversion? If the calculations which, for one, I have made, be not greatly erroneous, the answer to these questions will show that Calvinists need fear no fair comparison between themselves and other sects, as to *true piety and heart-religion*.

I will now ask, must not that system of belief which has so fully these three elements, such an affinity and alliance to education and learning, to civil and ecclesiastical freedom, to vital godliness—must not that system of belief be the one best calculated to develop the human mind and heart, to raise man to the highest perfection to which he can attain on earth?—Must it not be the system which is destined to wield the greatest influence in regenerating the globe? Must it not be the *conservative power*, among our many jarring sects?

Progress of Christianity in Calcutta.—It is thought that there are nearly a thousand young men in Calcutta, who are convinced of the evils of idolatry, and who in secret worship one Supreme Being; and some of them, it is supposed, acknowledge the claims of the Lord Jesus Christ. Until recently their sentiments have been comparatively unknown to each other; but the late discussion in that place has made them better acquainted. Should the lines be drawn among the different religionists, it is hoped that this interesting class of persons would range themselves under the banner of Christianity.—*Dayspring*.

Dr. Armstrong.

The death of this eminent servant of the Lord, has filled thousands of hearts with anguish, and made the ways of Zion mourn. The heavy tidings have gone through the length and breadth of the land, causing multitudes who knew him only by character, to weep over his loss, as for a dear personal friend. The sad news is now on its way to the ends of the earth, yet to cause tears of sorrow to drop on heathen soil from the eye of the toil-worn missionary. A great man has fallen in Israel; still, we trust, his fall will be the rise of many. He has fallen, yet he has triumphed. He fell suddenly, but he was ready. He fell, but it was with his armor on. He fell, returning to his home from his arduous labors as one of the Secretaries of the Board. He fell, doing his utmost to prepare the bodies, and above all, the souls of his fellow-passengers for the awful catastrophe of the wreck. Though he is no longer with us, he is not lost to the church. He is only taken above, to render her better service there. Though we see him no more, his bright light is not put out, is not dimmed. It has merely been transferred to another and higher sphere, to send out a more resplendent brightness. It may be that it will shine the longer and brighter on earth, from his sudden and melancholy death. Our friend and brother, with his large soul, his burning missionary zeal, and in the midst of his usefulness, has gone, but God can more than fill his place. May he guide by his wisdom those to whom it belongs to choose a successor. He has gone, but he has left behind a bereaved wife. May she be comforted by the promise, "thy Maker is thy husband." He has gone, but his fatherless little ones remain. May the God of their father be to them "the father of the fatherless."

To the junior editor of this Magazine Dr. Armstrong was well known, and a particular personal friend and counsellor. Often has his mind been relieved and his heart cheered by his paternal councils. We had intended taking some extended notice of the subject of these few thoughts. This is now rendered superfluous by the sermon of Mr. Taylor, which we are happy to be able to lay before our readers. The esteemed au-

thor of this discourse was intimately acquainted with Dr. Armstrong, as they were associated for a number of years as pastors of the two Presbyterian Churches in Richmond, Va., and lived and loved like brothers.

"The Manifold Wisdom of God,"

A Sermon occasioned by the death of the Rev. WILLIAM J. ARMSTRONG, D. D., Cor. Sec. of the A. B. C. F. M., who perished in the wreck of the steamboat Atlantic, Nov. 26, 1846, preached in High Street Church, Petersburg, Va., Dec. 6, 1846.

—
BY THE REV. STEPHEN TAYLOR.
—

"To the intent, that now unto principalities and powers in heavenly places, might be known by the Church, the manifold wisdom of God."—Eph. 3: 10.

It is a doctrine of our divine religion, that the providence of God embraces in it's unerring controll, the fall of the sparrow and the number of the hairs of our heads, as well as the rise and revolutions of states and empires. It is no less the duty than the privilege of the christian habitually to feel this, and reverently observe the passing events. Such events only as are of a public and general interest can with propriety or profit, be made the theme of admonition and instruction from the sacred desk.

Every death which is announced in the public prints, or by the tolling of the bell, should remind us of our own mortality, but there are deaths which seem to overleap the limits of domestic and kindred relations, and thrill through a wide range of reflections and sympathetic feelings.

It marked a most depraved state of moral sensibility in the Church of God, when the Prophet complained that "the righteous perisheth and no man layeth it to héart." Those were inflamed with wine, and intoxicated with their pleasures, "who regarded not the work of the Lord, neither considered the operations of his hands."

The past week, my beloved hearers, has brought us intelligence of a dispensation of Providence, which, irrespective of

its deeply afflictive bearing upon members of this Church and congregation, and my own intimate and fraternal relation and fellowship in the ministry, of many years standing, with the particular subject of it, you will agree with me, has a claim upon our special consideration.

We have become so familiar with reports of steamboat disasters, that we scarcely pause to contemplate the horrors of the scene, or the number and sharpness of the arrows which are shot forth in every direction to pierce and agonize the hearts of thousands of surviving friends. In this instance, however, there is one individual who rivets our attention—one, about whom, all our affections gather with the deepest, the most solemn emotions. In numbering the Rev. W. J. ARMSTRONG, D. D., among the lost in the wreck of the steamboat Atlantic, God has touched a chord which will be responded to with sighs and tears and prayers by hundreds of Churches, and thousands of christians, not only in our own country, but at all the Missionary stations which are scattered through Europe, Asia, Africa, and the Isles of the sea. . Occurring as it has, at a time when God is, in a special manner, reviving and edifying the Mission Churches—when the spirit of primitive persecution too is reviving—and the greatest attainable amount of energy, wisdom and experience in the management of the Missionary concerns is needed, and when he was in the full possession of these qualifications, and in the vigor of life to apply them, it confounds our reason, and casts us upon the resources of revelation for consolation and confidence.

We open the volume containing the lively oracles of God, and there we read of the “mystery which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ,

“To the intent, that now unto principalities and powers in heavenly places, might be known by the Church, the manifold wisdom of God.”

The whole scheme of creation, providence and redemption, is a scheme devised in the counsels of eternity, for displaying the glory of God, and swelling the ocean of created happiness, wide as his dominions in immensity, and enduring as immortality. The creation and the arrangements of the material existences have this for their ultimate end. We see variety eve-

rywhere. "There is one glory of the sun, another glory of the moon, and another glory of the stars, for one star differeth from another star in glory." On earth too, there is variety in the animal and vegetable kingdoms—in the scenery which is spread over its surface—in the infinitely variegated trees of the forest and flowers of the field. But not a mote in the sunbeam, nor a star in the firmament is without its peculiar use. "O Lord how manifold are thy works, in wisdom hast thou made them all!"

Yet more gloriously is the character of Jehovah displayed in the works of providence and redemption. Their influences are not confined to this world, nor to time and its teeming inhabitants. "These things the angels desire to look into."

Here also, we everywhere behold variety. Among all the sons and daughters of Adam, no two can be found, whose complexion, features, countenances and statures are perfectly similar. In the structure of their minds, there is an equal diversity. The history of every individual is made up of a distinct and peculiar cluster of incidents—vicissitudes of wealth, rank and occupation—of joys and sorrows—of moral influences through the agency of mercies and afflictions. This world, then, is a mighty laboratory, where God is prosecuting a series of experiments, every one of which is developing grand and distinctive results, through which "is made known unto principalities and powers in heavenly places, the manifold wisdom of God." Materials for thought and reflection are here accumulating, which, as they may be better understood, so they may acquire new interest, and be reviewed with additional wonder and praise, as the ages of eternity roll on. Small indeed, is the amount which we now know, but there is much which we shall know hereafter. Especially are we taught by our text, to turn our attention with deep interest to the dealings of God with his Church, which is the body of Christ, of which every believer is a member, and has his appropriate place and office and importance. The brief record which we have of the faith, patience and victories of the patriarchs, prophets and apostles, is designed to enlighten our minds and confirm our confidence with respect to his dealings with ourselves individually, and the church universally.

Let us then, my dear hearers, devoutly review one of those

great experiments which, in the providence of God, is so affectingly presented to our consideration. And here, let me freely speak my own views and feelings, as one who has had every opportunity to know him well—not for eulogy of departed worth, but for the practical influence of holy example.

The simple facts of his life and character are all the encomium which his most endeared kindred and partial friends can desire.

The child of pious parents, his father having been an able and distinguished clergyman in the State of New Jersey, his mind was early imbued with the principles of the christian religion, but it was not until his collegiate course, that he experienced the life-giving power of the Gospel. It is from this period to his recent death, in the fifty-first year of his age, twenty-six of which were spent in the work of the ministry, that we are on the present occasion particularly concerned.

The constitution of his mind, like that of his body, was sound, vigorous and buoyant. In temperament he was bold, decided, ingenuous, and in the highest degree excitable. He naturally possessed all the ingredients of a headlong and imprudent character, the very reverse and contrast of what through grace, he actually was, for though his ardent affections were easily swollen into a perfect torrent, they never seemed to find any other vent than through the ever open channel of christian love and universal benevolence. In every place and station which he occupied throughout his life, he was loved, confided in, caressed and flattered, yet throughout, humble, unassuming and meek.

As a preacher of the gospel, he was devoted,—an example of diligence, fidelity and zeal in the discharge of his pastoral duties. He loved his office, and went from his closet to his public services with a manner which rarely failed to indicate the flame of devout affections, which was burning within. In the pulpit and at the meeting of benevolent effort, as you well know who have listened to him, he was always interesting and instructive, and as might be expected from his impulsive temperament, often eloquent to a degree which is rarely surpassed by any preacher in our country. It was that glowing, spontaneous and effective eloquence, which gathers its materials near the Cross of Christ, and is kindled by the love of God

abundantly shed abroad in the soul. With a mind deeply imbued with the word of God, and little trammelled by the creeds, confessions, or human systems of theology, and unusually free from sectarian bias, and capable of a strong grasp upon great schemes of benevolence, he possessed rare qualifications, both for the labors of a pastor in a commanding station, and for the arduous and responsible agency or secretaryship, which he has held for the last twelve years. Though habitually devout, and often in his public performances solemn as eternity, there was no repulsive austerity in his feelings or deportment. In his social intercourse he occasionally indulged in a vein of humor, and exquisitely enjoyed a flash of wit. He had no factitious dignity to maintain. Kind and condescending, every member of the church of which he was pastor, or of the churches which he visited, could welcome him as a personal friend.

What more than any other circumstance constituted the power of his appeals, was the incontestible consistency of his conduct with the principles which he inculcated upon others. He called upon the Churches to make self-denying efforts for the conversion of the world. He himself sacrificed the comforts of pastoral and domestic life, and spent more than three-fourths of his time abroad from his family, and in labors which few constitutions but his own could have sustained. His dress and equipage, the furniture of his house and the provisions of his table, were in keeping with the principles which he so boldly and eloquently enforced upon others. Covetousness was never laid to his charge.

Faults he no doubt had, and sins, and grievous ones too, which he confessed before the throne of grace, but I know not what they were, nor could I, if I would, enumerate them. Faults he had, for he was one of the fallen race of Adam, and by nature a child of wrath. So there are spots upon the sun, but they are concealed from the sight by the brightness which surrounds them. No one, whom I have ever known, was more ready than he to ascribe every talent and virtue which he possessed to the rich, free and sovereign grace of God, through the meritorious obedience and atoning death of the Redeemer.

He has fought a good fight. When he enlisted as a soldier of the cross, he put on the whole armour of God. The world was a great battle-field before him, where human agency was

summoned “to wrestle against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places.” He was called to stand upon an eminence, from which he could survey the desolations of sin, the ruins of the apostacy, the abominations of heathenism, the hundreds of millions of precious, immortal souls, which are carried by the swift current of time into the boundless ocean of eternity, without one ray of Gospel light to cheer, sanctify and save them from everlasting woe.

In the spirit of his Divine Master, he had a heart to feel for them—an eye to weep over their lost condition—a foot to run to their relief, and a tongue to plead their cause.

But in the manifold wisdom of God his work is now done. A burning and a shining light has been put out. In the cold wintry wave, the heart, so full of holy zeal and love, has ceased to beat—the hands, so prompt, so diligent in every good cause, have finished the work which his heavenly Father had given them to do—those feet, “shod with the preparation of the Gospel of peace,” and so swift to perform every benevolent office, are resting from their labors—the tongue, so eloquent to plead the cause of God with men, and so fervent and importunate in pleading the cause of dying men with God, is dumb. His voice, so soft, so peculiar, will be heard no more on earth, either to warn and entreat sinners, or to comfort and encourage the sacramental host of God in the trials incident to its militant state. All, all are hushed and silent in the grave, until the trump of God and the glory of the descending Judge shall usher in the morning of the resurrection. But pause here.

Silent! did I say? No. “He being dead yet speaketh.”—Dead! He lives in the memory and affections, and with a moral influence upon the hearts of millions. In the grave! His redeemed spirit has departed to be with Christ. Shipwrecked and lost! He has out-rudded the storms and tempests of a sinful world, and has safely reached the haven of eternal rest and glory.

The circumstances of his death are calculated to stir up a tumult of thoughts and emotions in the soul. We are informed by a letter from the Rev. Dr. Tyng, of N. Y., to his friends in this town, that having finished his regular monthly official business in Boston, on Wednesday the 25th, his great anxiety

to enjoy the day of public thanksgiving, Thursday, with his family, induced him, somewhat contrary to the wishes of his friends in Boston, to encounter the storm, of which the heavens already gave forth their bodings. When danger to the steamboat occurred, and consternation and distress pervaded the whole company of about one hundred on board, his peculiar and remarkable voice, recognized by only a single passenger, was heard announcing himself as a preacher of the Gospel, and ready to minister its divine instructions and blood-bought consolations to his companions in tribulation.

During the twenty-eight or thirty hours of inconceivable peril, suspense and agony, one who seems to have known little of his history or character except what he observed on this occasion, reported to a political newspaper, that he showed himself the christian indeed. The raging tempest, the piercing cold, the falling snow, the foaming tumult of the waves, broken and roaring among the rocks,—the magnificent steamer, disabled and broke loose from all human control, tossed and rocked and driven by the fury of the storm, must have formed a scene which beggars description, and can be conceived only by those who experienced it. But in the midst of the tumult and consternation, this veteran hero in the christian warfare seems to have heard the voice of the great Captain of his salvation, saying, "it is I, be not afraid." It was to him as when "Jesus arose and rebuked the winds and the sea, and there was a great calm."

Standing firm upon the rock of his salvation, he gathered the agonizing company into the Ladies' Cabin, and expounded the word of God, and in prayer conducted them to the throne of grace, and commended them to the mercy of Him "who stilleth the noise of the seas, the noise of their waves, and the tumult of the people." Thus he appears to have been employed throughout most of the time on Thursday.

The last recollections of him, and the last words which he spoke, as reported by one who stood by him at the moment when the shock occurred, which shattered the vessel, and in five minutes, probably, plunged him and nearly one half of the company into eternity, are in harmony with the christian character which he had sustained in previous life. Dr. Tyng says, "Just before they struck, Dr. Armstrong was standing in the

gangway with another gentleman who escaped, and remarked with the great composure which he had manifested through the whole, ‘I hope we shall get safe to shore with our lives, but if not, I have perfect confidence that God will do all things well.’ Immediately after the vessel struck, and they were separated, and he was seen no more.”

With some, this account may be a subject of simple and unmitigated awfulness, but to us an indescribable glory seems to invest this last catastrophe; and as we contemplate it, we spontaneously exclaim, “Thy way O God is in the sea, and thy path in the great waters, and thy footsteps are not known.”—“O the depth of the riches, both of the wisdom and the knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out.”

Manifold indeed is the wisdom of God, in his dispensations towards his church and people!! This favored servant of his was needed on board the Atlantic, in this hour of consternation and death. No one was better qualified for the place. His work was not complete till this office was performed.

Is some doubt sprung in the mind of any respecting the wisdom of Providence, that one so eminently useful—so needful to his affectionate partner and five children, one an infant—so inestimably valuable to the church and the world, should be cut off, when his strength, talents and experience were in unimpaired vigor? Let us remember that human wisdom is shortsighted and exceedingly fallible. Take one or two illustrations. After all her desires, and prayers, and preparations, and voyages, and sufferings, that she might carry the Gospel to the heathen, Mrs. Harriet Newell died at the Isle of France at the early age of nineteen, and before she had been permitted to put her hand to the work to which she had devoted herself. But Harriet Newell by her death, and the brief memoir which followed, has been instrumental of doing more for the cause of missions than the most sanguine hopes could have anticipated from her life.

The death of the pious and talented Obookiah, seemed to thwart and blast all the schemes of human wisdom to carry the Gospel to the Sandwich Islands. It, however, gave impulse and energy to that most splendid and victorious effort of christian benevolence.

"God's ways are not our ways, neither are his thoughts our thoughts." The holy influence of Dr. Armstrong's life and labors, like that of David Brainard and Henry Martyn, and of his predecessors in office, Worcester, Evarts, Cornelius and Wisner, will go down to the time and through the time, when "the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the glory of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea."

But the manner of his death was so horrible!!

"Judge not the Lord by feeble sense."

God moves in a mysterious way,
His wonders to perform:
He plants his footsteps in the sea,
And rides upon the storm."

Does the fear of the wicked "come upon them as desolation, and their destruction as a whirlwind?" But it was in a whirlwind that he translated his honored prophet Elijah, from earth to heaven. "The Lord hath his way in the whirlwind and the storm; and the clouds are the dust of his feet." The fiercest tempest cannot tear them from the embrace of his unchanging love, nor shake the foundations of their security and peace, which his exceeding great and precious promises have laid for all who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity.

Such was the confidence of this revered servant of the Most High, and in this perfect confidence he waited the summons, and finished his course. The time of his departure is past.—He has received the crown of righteousness at the hand of the Lord, a crown of victory and ineffable glory. "And they that be wise [teachers] shall shine as the brightness of the firmament: and they that turn many to righteousness, as the stars forever and ever." He has finished his course! And O, what a course!! What a contrast to that of multitudes among whom he has been pressing forward toward the mark for the prize of his high calling.

Some, wrapped in selfishness, steeled against every benevolent affection and appeal, intent only upon their own interest and pleasure, caring little for the temporal, and nothing for the everlasting welfare of their fellow-beings, live to no great or good purpose, and die unregretted, except by the little circle of their kindred and associates. Others, steeped in sensuality, inflated with pride, and disdaining the restraints of reli-

gion and sound morals, spread a poisonous atmosphere all around them, and corrupt and destroy every thing which they touch. Society, in its integrity and order, exists around them only in despite of their influence. A community of such would be a loathsome mass of rottenness.

There are the heroes of this world, who, whatever may be the issue of their doings, for ultimate weal or woe to the race of man, have reached the summit of fame, but their career left behind them a broad path of desolation, strown with the mangled bodies of the dead and dying, and moistened with the blood of their comrades, and the tears of the widow and the orphan.

Turn, now, and ponder the life of our departed brother.—For more than thirty years the energies of his body and mind were assiduously occupied in urging forward every enterprize which could ameliorate the sufferings or advance the welfare, temporal or eternal, of his fellow man—pleading the cause of education, temperance, morality and piety at home, and embracing in the arms of his benevolence and compassion, every nation, kindred and tongue, to which he could, in any way, contribute to send the Bible with its stores of wisdom, and the Gospel with its treasures of consolation and hope for a perishing world. Above all, ponder the blessings which have been, and yet will be sent down, in answer to the fervent prayers which he has offered in public and private. In heaven he will doubtless meet with hundreds, who have been rescued from perdition and made meet for the inheritance of the saints in light, through his direct instrumentality, and millions, perhaps, through the indirect influence of his labors. To God, the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, be all the glory. I seem to hear the various orders of the angelic hosts, principalities and powers in heavenly places, striking a higher note of praise, for the discoveries which they have made in his history, of the manifold wisdom of God.

In practical application of my subject, let me say, his life, his death, and the awful catastrophe in which it occurred, speak in terms of powerful and solemn appeal, to the unconverted in this assembly. There is a voice of warning here. Be ye also ready. Waste no more time—pervert your talents no longer—repent—believe on the Lord Jesus Christ—“es-

cape for your life" while the door of salvation is yet open to you.

To my brethren in Christ I would say, as we have the same throne of grace to approach—the same intercession and advocate above—the same Holy Spirit to help our infirmities—the same exceeding great and precious promises to rely upon, let us also gird on the whole armor of God, and emulate the example which, by the grace of God, he has set before us. Like him, let us cherish, habitually, a perfect confidence that God will do all things well. Let us keep nearer to the throne of grace—aim at a higher standard of christian character—at more enlarged, and active, and self-denying benevolence.—Let us seek not our own things, but the things of Christ. Let us live for the world. Let us act for eternity. Let us keep in mind, that what our hands find to do must be done with our might, for we know not what a day may bring forth. Let us not mourn for our departed friend and brother, nor speak of him as those that have no hope, but remember the record of the revelator in Patmos,—“And I heard a heard a voice from heaven saying, write, ‘blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth; yea, saith the spirit, that they may rest from their labors, and their works do follow them.’”

“Now unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God, be glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen.”

The following article came too late to be put in its proper place, as the *first* article of this number. As it was especially written for January, and we are unwilling to divide it, we give the whole at once, although we are compelled, in order to do so, to add several extra pages to the present number of the Magazine. Hereafter, the size of the work will be as usual, thirty-two pages.

THE HISTORY
OF
The Calvinistic Magazine,

BY F. A. ROSS.

DEDICATED

To all who love Presbyterian principles—in East Tennessee and abroad.

INTRODUCTION.—At the opening of another year, we, the Editors of the Calvinistic Magazine, stand before our patrons to thank them for the work they have enabled us to revive. We announced in the prospectus to this New Series, our object was “to show what Presbyterianism is, and what it is not—and to aid in the union of Churches, which in doctrine are Calvinistic and in government free.” We are encouraged to go on: and that you may cherish the Calvinistic Magazine with the more perfect faith, and hope, and love, we will give you its history. That is to say—what led to its origin—what it accomplished—why it was discontinued—wherefore revived—and what it will effect.

CHAPTER I.—What led to the establishment of this work? We reply—The Calvinistic Magazine had its origin in the assaults of Methodism. Some twenty-six years ago the Presbyterian Church, then united in one body, exhibited a remarkable spectacle of enlarged religious action. Its prosperity was hated by Methodism. In consequence, the attacks on Calvinism, which have never ceased nor intermitted in that body since commenced by Wesley, were about that time more combined than ever. A new engine of assault was brought to bear,—in the charge, that Presbyterians were aiming to effect *the union of Church and State in their denomination*. This charge was raised, for political effect, in a certain region, by infidel politicians, and then caught up by Methodism and transmitted through the electric telegraph of the itinerancy, from one end of the land to the other. The Advocate and Journal, of the city of New York, then having an immense circulation, spread the slander in a more tangible form. In East Tennessee, to which we will confine our remarks, Presbyterianism was every where assailed by all arms of Methodism, with this

battery of artillery in the front of their columns. At that time, in East Tennessee, there was much infidelity on the Bench, at the Bar, and in the high political circles.—The medical profession was also irreligious, and deeply tainted with skepticism. Here, we will state the fact, that the irreligious and infidel part of the community have usually taken sides with Methodism in its assaults upon Presbyterianism. It was so at that time.—And this union of infidelity and Methodism against Presbyterianism pervaded the politics of the day—so that, the simple *fact*, that a man was a Presbyterian—or that his *father and mother* were Presbyterians—or that his *brother* was a Presbyterian minister—nay, that his *wife* was a Presbyterian,—*was made an objection to him at the polls!* During this time, a Methodist minister wrote a series of articles in the Knoxville Register, then the leading political journal in East Tennessee. He signed himself “A Republican!” Strange name for a Methodist Preacher to assume! These essays were intended to show the people that the establishment of the Presbyterian Theological Seminary at Maryville was designed by its founders, for, and would be followed by, *evil things to the free institutions of the United States!!!* So rampant was this hostility, that Presbyterians were not safe from annoyance any where—neither at court, nor mill, nor market—by the way side—in the house—in the sanctuary of God. Nay, it was no unfrequent occurrence, that when a Presbyterian minister simply exhibited his own views, notes would be taken, and at the close of the exercises, a Methodist preacher would rise, and inform the audience he or some other minister would answer that sermon at such a time and place. The writer of this article, on a certain sacramental occasion, was arrested in the very act of dismissing the congregation, by an open attack upon the sermon which he had delivered introductory to the communion. That sermon had not been controversial at all; but gave a mere passing statement of Divine Sovereignty in the government of the world, as encouragement in the christian warfare.* Finally—To consolidate the anticipated triumph of these systematic attacks, a distinguished Methodist preacher, established, in Knoxville, a monthly magazine, the Holston Confe-

*This sermon is published in the Calvinistic Magazine, 1 vol. p. 162.

rence Messenger; and as Presiding Elder came into an upper district—sought, and had a public debate—all which was published to the world. To conclude—The Presbyterian Church, at that day in East Tennessee, was “the sect every where spoken against.” What was the result? We answer.

The first serious check to the Methodist onset was given in “a letter of thanks” to Mr. Methodist Republican, from one “Valde Timidus”—published in the Knoxville Register. Our readers cannot now properly appreciate the effect of that admirable article. It was a single flash of lightning. But it was enough. Mr. Republican never wrote, we believe, another line for the Knoxville Register.

The next decisive movement on the part of the Presbyterians, was the publication of a pamphlet called “Both Sides”—bringing up the controversy to the termination of the above mentioned debate. This tract was greatly read, and prepared the way for the establishment of the Calvinistic Magazine.—The first number of which was issued 1st January, 1827.

CHAPTER II.—What did the Calvinistic Magazine accomplish? We answer. First. The main battery of Methodist assault—the charge of “*Church and State*,” was stormed, and the guns turned upon themselves with effect so terrible, that they sunk under the fire as suddenly, and utterly, as the Austro-Russian columns went down in the lake, when Napoleon’s cannon broke the ice around them at Austerlitz. No Methodist gravity could stand the irony of “*Valde Terminus*.” No methodist “*salt*” could “*heal the waters*” wrung out to them from the leaves of “*Moore’s Life of Wesley*”—and no breastplate, no helmet, nor shield, though of seven-fold, could quench the fiery darts which flashed from the cave of “*The Western Pilgrim*.” That slander, of “*Church and State*” was killed so dead, and buried so soon, and so deep in the ground, that not even the smell of the dead body has floated past us in eighteen years.

SECONDLY.—This repulse of the Methodist assault on “*Presbyterian designs on the Government*,” was not more complete than was the vindication of Presbyterian doctrine, and the exposure of Arminianism—and so long as Presbyterians in East Tennessee shall love the Bible, so long will they go to this Magazine as to an arsenal of Calvinism.

THIRDLY.—The discussions which led to, and were carried on, in the Calvinistic Magazine, were attended by *revivals of religion*, especially in the Presbyterian Church, far and wide, in East Tennessee. Here, some man will say to us, “how can these things be?” We reply,—“Art thou a master of Israel and knowest not these things—we speak that we do know, and testify that we have seen.” Discussion, particularly with Methodism, lead to a thorough examination of the deep foundations of Bible doctrines and precepts—also the grounds of civil and religious liberty among men. Whatever, then, may be the undue excitement in some minds, there is always, at such a time, more powerful preaching, more faithful self-examination and prayer—the mass of intellect in the church and the world is thoroughly moved—while the spirit broods over it—God says *let there be light—there is light—the dead hear the voice of the Son of God; and they that hear live.*

So it was under the great controversy we are narrating. Some of the brightest minds in East Tennessee, came, at that time, to Christ. The discussion interested all classes. That Bench, and Bar—the Medical man, and even the politician, had been compelled to think—and many, who began in infidelity, and hatred of Presbyterianism, found themselves like the great Scott, led by “THE FORCE OF TRUTH” to salvation, and to Calvinism. We do not claim by any means “all the talent and all the decency,” as has been intimated. We only say—and there is the broad fact to sustain us—that the elevated body of our educated men in East Tennessee—that Bar, and Bench, the Medical profession, and truly thinking men in the community, have undergone a remarkable change, from skepticism and infidelity to piety, or to a deep regard for christianity: and what is also worthy of note, is, that this intellectual body of men [whatever may be their respect for christianity as they find it in Methodism] have, as we are very sure, *no tendency towards Methodism, in its government, its doctrines, its discipline, or its peculiar religious experience.*

FOURTHLY.—The Methodist magazine before mentioned as being established at Knoxville, after the most feeble defence, retreated across Clinch and Cumberland mountains into Kentucky, as far as Lexington. At that point, it was then sustained, for a short time, by the zeal and talents of a Methodist

minister, whom the Presbyterian Church, in this region, as a body, knew, and esteemed as a gentleman, and loved as a christian. He went from East Tennessee to find an early grave in Kentucky. *Two* at least of the editors of the Calvinistic Magazine had with him the kindest social relations—and none more than they sympathized with his family and nearer friends, over his life of worth, and death of joy and peace. *One*, of these *two*, is also no more. But the friend who lives, may be allowed to give this tribute to the memory of Rev. Oliver B. Ross.

We will only add, that the influence for good of the Calvinistic Magazine was immense. A Presbyterian minister, Dr. McDowell, of Charleston, S. C., assured us that it was the universal opinion of all who had read the work, that the Calvinistic Magazine was the best periodical which had been published for the great body of the Presbyterian Church. The five volumes of this work are preserved in hundreds of Presbyterian families in East Tennessee with the most cherished regard. How many of the Holston Conference Messenger can be found?

CHAPTER III.—Why was the Calvinistic Magazine discontinued? Answer. Not for want of patronage—for that was ample. But in part from the removal of two of its three editors—and in some degree from the fact, that to Methodism, the Magazine had, for the time, done its work. *It had conquered a peace.* Besides, the Presbyterian mind, about that time, began to be greatly agitated by the discussions which led to the division of our beloved Church, and the Arminian questions were lost sight of in that great family jar. This strife had only begun to subside in ten years.

We now slowly retire from these recollections of the things of our early zeal for the doctrines of Grace.—But we may be allowed to pause at the grave of one of the first editors of the Calvinistic Magazine—the grave of our friend—of one to whose counsel, and love, we owe imperishable affection.—That grave may have over it, nor “storied urn, nor animated bust”—it may have upon it only the green sod of Illinois, and the flowers of the prairie. Be it so. That grave needs no marble—and should it even be trodden down, and effaced, by the feet of time, until its dust shall be undistinguished from

other dust, yet a thousand wreaths of memory like this, ere they fade, shall be replaced by brighter tokens of regard. Yes, so long as "*The Cause and Cure of Infidelity*" shall be a theme to fill the mind with the fear of God, and the love of Christ, so long will the name of NELSON have place in the sanctified heart of man.

CHAPTER IV.—Why has the Calvinistic Magazine been revived? We reply, from causes similar to those which occasioned its first establishment—the assaults of Methodism. Without preamble we will give the facts in the case.—From the 1st of January 1832 up to 1st January 1843, a period of eleven years, there had been nothing from the press or pulpit, within the bounds of the Synod of Tennessee, having the character of controversial examination of Methodism. We assert this broadly—and defy its contradiction. What was Methodism doing all this time? The answer is—Methodism, with the sagacity of *aristocracy*, which political writers tell us, *never dies nor sleeps*—saw, that, while the Presbyterian Church was being divided might be its time to make a great movement. The POLICY adopted was *subtle*—and was made to work in, admirably, with the building up of Emory & Henry College, and, *to further certain designs which have been accomplished to secure the Female Seminary at Knoxville*. The policy was to lay aside the old, open, noisy, public assault upon Presbyterianism in general, and to follow, as the facts show, the following line of conduct:

1. *To take sides, in private with old and New School Presbyterians as circumstances might require—and at the same time, to have as much seeming public union, as possible, with both.*—Hence, in one place, a leading Methodist would whisper to the New School—"Why, brother New School, should there be strife between you and us? We agree nearly as to the atonement,—and what you mean by *natural ability* to come to Christ, amounts closely to our doctrine of *free agency* to improve the grace given to men. These Old School you know are fatalists." Here, New School would protest, that brother Methodist was too hard on Old School. "O! well, never mind," said Methodist. "Let us be brotherly. Let us have union meetings—and the converts can, you know, join whichever Church they please."

Another time, the whisper would be to Old School, after this fashion—"Yes, brother, these New School are really very unsound. They are Pelagians, or Semi-Pelagians, at least.—For, they say, the sinner has a *natural ability* to love God, aside from the agency of the Spirit; their doctrine of regeneration is not your doctrine, nor ours; and, besides the notion of *voluntary associations*, for collecting and paying the money of the Church, is a bad thing, compared to your, and our, plan of ecclesiastical control of Church funds!" Here, Old School would feel the flattery had gone too far, and turn upon brother Methodist, drawing down the unyielding shaggy brows of John Knox—"Stop, brother Methodist, I can't agree with you about that money matter: for when Presbyterians, Old or New School, collect money from the people, Ruling Elders, who are elected by, and represent the Church, are always present to see how the money goes;—but when Methodists collect money from their members, you, the preachers, in conference, dispose of the funds as you please, and your people have no say in the matter." "Well! well! well!" says Methodist, "I did not mean that our Conference and your Presbytery were *exactly* alike in their organization—but—but—only, that we both are opposed to *voluntary associations* for benevolent purposes, you know." "Humph," says Old School, "Good morning, sir." But notwithstanding such little rebuffs, Methodism gained the day. The Old School was flattered, although they kept aloof from great intimacy. The New School were soothed, and cajoled. They had with brother Methodist made houses, and union meetings—they sang "*The Old Ship of Zion*," and "*Land on Shore*," and there were groaning, and shouting,—and many supposed conversions. What next? Why, the converts that went with Methodism, were drilled in class-meeting, love feast, band-meeting—and made thorough Methodists, whether they fell from grace in six months or not. While the good, easy Presbyterians, [for they are the best natured souls in the world,] would take it into their heads, that after such a union meeting, it would never do to touch on Calvinism, for fear of hurting the feelings of brother Methodists. They therefore preached only "*the common christianity*." And Methodists would crowd to the church, for a week, or so, groan, and say amen! What followed? Why, some old mem-

bers grieved over this delusion,—and the young converts,— [those who did not go back to the world before the next communion,] were as Arminian as they who went into the Methodist Church.

2. While this deception was at work, publicly, *Methodism never intermitted its attacks on Old School and New, wherever such assaults were not likely to arouse discussion.* Their wide spread itinerancy preached with bitter hostility in many places where no Presbyterian ear heard, and scattered papers, and tracts, and books where no Presbyterian eye saw. Now and then, indeed, old brother *Such-a-one*, gets up in a more public meeting, and “thanks the Lord that people who have religion can shout—aye, they can shout, because they have religion, and know when they got it.” “Amen! Amen!” “But these are not the ones who expect to get to heaven because they are *elected*. Yes, *elected*, let them do what they may—and then to think of the poor reprobates decreed to be damned let them do all they can to be saved. O! what a horrible doctrine. Thank the Lord I am a Methodist!” “Amen! Amen!” The Presbyterian complains a little. But the dignified Presiding Elder smiles, and shakes hands, and says, “O never mind old brother *Soft-shell*—he is a privileged character.” The Presbyterian will be soothed. Old brother *Soft-shell* will shuffle out of the pulpit, and chuckle, knowing he has sent away five hundred people full of prejudice against Presbyterianism. Again, a box of offensive books will be sent to a safe house. A Presbyterian hears of it and complains. “Yes,” says the very man who has the books, “Yes, it is a vile affair, from what *I have heard*—it ought not to be countenanced.” But, having eased his conscience by this speech, he circulates the publication as slyly as possible.

3. The policy of Methodism, towards the close of the period whose history we are writing, seemed to be, that, *while Calvinism in every form was to be hated, the New School were to be most constantly assailed.* In conformity with this, they were in one place represented as having no confession of faith at all, and little better than infidels. Then, it was said, they were as rank Calvinists as the Old School, but hypocritically concealed their sentiments to be popular. [It will be seen presently from whence both these sentiments came.]

These assaults became more and more frequent from about 1839 up to the period before mentioned—1st Jan. 1843.

At this time some of our brethren felt that things had reached a crisis. The separation of the Presbyterian body, with all its consequences—followed by this invidious policy of Methodism, had produced unhappy results in some of our Churches. The belief was at length matured, that the time had come, once more, to defend Calvinism, and expose Methodism. The armor was accordingly taken from the wall—the stand made—assaults repelled, and the war carried home. In one word,—there were sermons—there was public discussion—and the Calvinistic Magazine was revived.—While the commencement of our work was in agitation, Methodism took occasion to propose the publication of a paper also. And before the Calvinistic Magazine made its appearance, "*The Methodist Episcopalian*" was in the field.

4. At this point, it is proper that we notice a *fact* which fell in exactly with the *policy* we are exposing—the *tone assumed by Methodism since January 1843, and especially since the establishment of the Methodist Episcopalian in Knoxville.* It is a *fact*, and a remarkable one, in the history of the Methodists, that, however they may begin, and continue attacks upon Presbyterians, yet, the moment the Presbyterian begins to preach on Calvinism and Arminianism, the cry is raised—"O! these Presbyterians are getting up a controversy. They are going to make war upon the Methodists. O! what a bad thing." So it was at the time before us. And, not only was this cry of *controversy* raised, but when certain sermons on *christian perfection*, and especially the "*Direct Witness*," had been preached, then lo! the lamentation was, "*O! we are persecuted!*" The Methodist Episcopalian, in its Prospectus, chiming in with this note, gave out that it intended "*to act on the defensive*," thus intimating the position of Methodism to be altogether that of *peace and inoffensiveness*. In conformity with this plan, it has studiously pretended to decline hostility towards Presbyterianism, and in every number bearing on the Calvinistic Magazine, there has been this same cry of *controversy* and *persecution*. Take the following as a specimen:—In the 24th No. of that paper, the editor writes—"Since I left Knoxville I have been looking over the Calvinistic Magazine for August. The editors are

for war. But what do you imagine are the objects of attack? Drunkenness? Gaming? Witchcraft? Hatred? Wrath? Strife? Envy? No—none of these. It is Methodism. Methodism is the hated Mordecai, sitting, or rather working at the gate, and refusing to do homage to the exclusive dictatorial collection of the ‘germs of Romanism’ evinced in some of the leading articles of the Magazine.” “Do these Editors know that *Papal bulls* have lost their terror in these United States?” “Who clothed these Editors with the *awful powers* which they would fain exercise? I really thought the Bible was the Protestant ‘rule of faith;’ but are we now to have a new ‘rule’—and a new process for the trial of heretics?” That there are points of difference between Presbyterians and Methodists all will agree—and these points may be the subject of discussion in the spirit of kindness and brotherly love.”

Here is the “*assumed tone.*” Here is the cry against *controversy*, if it be an examination of Methodism. Here is the cry of *persecution*. Here is the whine that the editors of the Magazine have the *spirit of Popery*, and are erecting a “rule” for the trial of “*heretics.*” The Editor of the Episcopalian, moreover, speaking in this same strain in his book of “*Defence of Mr. Wesley, &c.,*” calls the writer of this article *Bishop Bonner* and *Cardinal Richelieu*. Mr. Patton, it is true, admits “*there are points of difference between Presbyterians and Methodists.*” But these points “*may be the subject of discussion in the spirit of kindness and brotherly love.*”

Now, we will exhibit some facts, to prove that this was the Methodist *policy*. We beg our readers to bear in mind, we have affirmed that, during the long period from 1 January 1832, to 1 Jan. 1843, a period of eleven years, there was no controversial examination of Methodism in the Synod of Tennessee, from the pulpit or press. *If we are mistaken, let it be shown.* We have also said, during this time of profound peace on our part, towards Methodism, that sister denomination, while soothing us to slumber with her drugs, was sowing tares—while fanning us with her wings, was, like the vampire bat, sucking our blood—while talking of “points of difference to be discussed in brotherly love,” was scattering, broad cast, such publications as we will now notice.

First.—It will not be denied that the Methodist New York

Christian Advocate, containing series of strictures on Old and New School Presbyterianism, was circulated in East Tennessee during the first part of the time we are reviewing?

Secondly.—It will not be denied that the Nashville Methodist paper, with strong articles against Calvinism, and especially the New School, was abroad amongst us at a later period.

Thirdly.—It will not be denied that inflammatory books, and tracts, were printed during these years in East Tennessee against Presbyterianism.

Fourthly.—It will not be denied that the Methodist Doctrinal Tracts, full of the very strongest statements adapted to excite and foment anti-Calvinistic prejudices, have been spread in this region, within the period under consideration.

Fifthly.—It will not be denied that the work of Rev. Francis Hodgson, of the New York Conference, has been circulated.

Sixthly.—It will not be denied that “The Calvinistic Controversy of Rev. Wilbur Fisk”—and the sermons of Rev. Thomas A. Morris, one of the Bishops in the Methodist Episcopal Church, have also in the time before us, found their way amongst us.

We might make quotations to any extent from these publications, but we will confine our extracts to a few from only two of the writings mentioned, and as briefly as possible. We make these selections as specimens of Mr. Patton’s ideas of “*kindness and brotherly love*” in *Methodist discussion of points of difference*.

The sermons of Rev. Thomas A. Morris—Bishop, &c.,—were written “to supply to the Methodist people, especially in the West, a long felt want of a cheap volume of instructive discourses.” The work then we might suppose to be composed with the gravity of spirit, and “*brotherly love*” of a BISHOP. We shall not be disappointed. Now, turn over to sermon xx. I head, 4 paragraph, page 207. The sermon is entitled “*The Achievements of Sinners.*” Let us read. “A skeptical author is a sinner that destroys much good. Verbal sayings are soon forgotten; but printed sophistry fills with poison the veins of future generations. With poison. Yes, what better than moral poison, are the sophisms of infidels; such as Volney, Hume, and Paine? or the dogmas of Arianism, and

Socinianism;—Universalists, Hixites, and Shakers? or in the idolatrous ceremonies of Popery;—and we ask, what better than moral poison, are a few distinctive features in the system of Calvinism; such as, ‘God, from all eternity, did freely and unchangably ordain whatsoever comes to pass.’ Of a piece with this is ‘the immutable decree’ of unconditional election and reprobation. What mischief have these various doctrines done to the souls of men! by the printing or circulation of which, a man destroyeth much good, that might otherwise be effected.” The Confession of Faith, then, of the Presbyterian Church, the world over, “in its distinctive features” is *moral poison, what better than the moral poison of Volney, Hume, Paine—the dogmas of Arianism and Socinianism, or the idolatrous ceremonies of Popery?* The Confession of Faith, then, is one of the *achievements of sinners!* This is a sample of Mr. Patton’s idea of “*kindness and brotherly love.*” But it may be asked whether we, the Editors of the Calvinistic Magazine, complain of the views thus expressed by Bishop Morris? We answer. No. We only want our readers to understand the *policy* of Methodism, as exhibited by Rev. S. Patton, which is, to whine over the “*war*” in the Calvinistic Magazine, while it secretly circulates the pages of *peace* of Bishop Morris—which is to smite Presbyterians after this sort of “*brotherly love*”—and then gravely to expect us humbly to receive the rod—crying “*Let the righteous smite us, it shall be a kindness—let them reprove us, it shall be an excellent oil which shall not break our heads.*”

We will now notice the work of Rev. Francis Hodgson.—This book is controversial throughout. Its contents appeared first in the New York Advocate and Journal, and other papers—then it was recommended to be printed by various Annual Conferences, and finally published for the General Conference in 1839. The writer of this article has had a copy for some six years. The title of the book is, “*An examination of the system of New Divinity,*” &c. But while its prominent object is an assault on the New School, it is designed also to bear on Calvinism in general. The author considers the New School divinity to be based upon the doctrine of *natural ability and moral inability*, and then discourses after this way:—“It is not designed to make the impression that the New School are alone

in asserting and maintaining this doctrine of natural ability. It was maintained by the distinguished President Edwards, who is almost canonized as a theologian, by the Old School party, and also by Owen, Witherspoon, and others who are counted among the princes of Old School theology. These men, in the emergencies to which the arguments of Arminianism subjected them, sowed the wind of doctrine from which the whirlwind has grown, that now shakes and rends the Calvinistic Churches."—[Page 20.]

We will give some examples from this book of the manner in which the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church denounces Presbyterians to the world, and also as an exhibition of Mr. Patton's "*kindness and brotherly love.*" Mr. Hodgson, through one whole chapter of thirteen pages, endeavors to prove that New School ministers, as a body, (and he includes some Old School, and Baptists, in England as well as the United States,) have been guilty of *dishonesty* in the concealment of Calvinistic sentiments. Amongst these men he ranks Whitefield, Robert Hall, Dr. Samuel Miller of Princeton, Dr. Skinner, Dr. Duffield, Dr. Beecher, &c., &c. He concludes thus:—"Some may be offended with this article, supposing it charges the New School portion of the Calvinistic ministry with a want of *strict honesty* in the publication of their sentiments. This is not our object. We have stated facts, and cannot be answerable for inferences. We cannot deny, however, that the course which some of them have pursued, has often reminded us of the *dissimulation* of Peter on a certain occasion, for which Paul sharply rebuked him. Nor should *any of them* be too sensitive, *when any thing is said which implies that they have committed a sin*, since the most of them disclaim with emphasis, not only the Antinomian doctrine of perfection, which dispenses with the obligation to keep the law, but likewise the doctrine of scriptural perfection, which consists in strictly keeping the law. If they purposely and systematically teach that neither themselves nor any other merely human being, ever lived without sin, *need they be surprised or indignant if they are sometimes suspected of committing a sin, to which circumstances so strongly tempt them?*"— [Page 262.]

The writer, here, while he disclaims, in one sentence, charg-

ing the whole of the New School portion of the Calvinistic ministry with a want of strict honesty, *does that very thing*, in the next breath, and in the most insulting manner. He has selected, as his proofs, some of the noblest Christian ministers dead and living! This is Mr. Patton's "*kindness and brotherly love.*" Do we of the Calvinistic Magazine complain? No. We only want the *policy* of Methodism, as shown by Mr. Patton, to be understood,—which is to cry out—"*Methodism is the hated Mordecai sitting or rather working at the gate, and refusing to do homage*"—while, it is the fact, that Methodism, itself, is thus, all the time, exhibiting a hatred of Presbyterianism as subtle, and deadly, as that of Haman the son of Hammedatha the Agagite, when he had the Scribes called—and the letters sent by post to all the provinces—to cause to perish all the Jews—and take the spoil.

Again.—Mr. Hodgson devotes thirty-two pages, to prove that Calvinism teaches "*the damnation of infants.*" He forces his inferences of Calvinism, notwithstanding their denial upon such men, as Dr. Miller, Dr. Spring, Dr. Cox, Dr. Duffield, Mr. Barnes, the editors of the New York Observer, and upon the Confession of Faith. The writer ends his remarks thus:—"We are forcibly reminded by this doctrine of the answer of the priests and elders to our Saviour, when he asked them whether the baptism of John was *from heaven or of men. They reasoned with themselves, saying, if we shall say from heaven, he will say, why then believed ye him not? But if we say of men, all the people will stone us, for they be persuaded that John was a prophet. And they answered that they could not tell whence it was.* The advocates of the Calvinistic system perceive that if they admit all infants dying in infancy are safe, they destroy the foundation of their system. If they admit the damnation of some infants, they arouse against it one of the most powerful feelings of humanity. They therefore beg to be excused from forming any opinion on the subject. They answer, we cannot tell."—[Page 328.] This is Mr. Patton's "*kindness and brotherly love.*" Do the editors of the Calvinistic Magazine complain? No. We only want our readers to understand the *policy* of Methodism, as disclosed by Mr. Patton, which is—to persuade their people that these *Editors* are *persecuting the inoffensive Methodists*,—while Methodists them-

selves have been ever whispering in ten thousand ears, every day, this charge, about infant damnation, thereby to bring, according to their own confession, upon Presbyterians the odium of one of the most powerful feelings of humanity.

Once more,—Mr. Hodgson, in his concluding chapter, affirms that “whatever differences may exist between the Old and the New School parties, the latter have not given up Calvinism.” No. He acknowledges that the “New School hold to its fundamental principles.” What we shall now quote he applies to Old and New as one body. Mr. Hodgson is bewailing the tendency of Calvinism, and discourses after this manner—“When I hear the advocates of this system address the sinner in the language of severe warning and rebuke—when I hear them say to him, in the language of Mr. Barnes, ‘Go home this day, impenitent sinner, if God spares a rebel like you to get home—go home and reflect, that if you pass through this revival unmoved—if you resist all the appeals that are made to you from day to day, and week to week, the probability is, that you will be damned’—I am affected with indescribable emotions. If I were to address my feelings to the sinner, to whom the appeal is made, it would be in language like this: ‘Sinner, if the preacher’s creed be true, you are elected to salvation from eternity, or excluded by the decree of Jehovah, from the covenant of redemption, and eternally consigned to misery. If the former, you are safe: if the latter, there is no hope of salvation for you. Your passing through this revival unmoved will be a matter of course. You need not permit yourself to be flattered into the persuasion that there is salvation for you. I pity you, and the more so, as you are so *insulted* by those who, according to their own statements, serve God only as he *makes* them willing, and whom you would equal in every good thing, if God had only shown you equal favor.’”—[Page 400 & 401.]—Now observe, Mr. Hodgson’s book is published for the Methodist Episcopal Church. The Methodist Church, then, utters the foregoing denunciation against the Presbyterians, Old and New School. What then is the plain meaning of these words? Why, surely, that the whole Conference say, it is an *insult* to a sinner when any Calvinistic minister warns him to repent! and every Methodist minister, would, *if he were to consult his feelings*, tell the sinner, that, *he was thus insulted*. Of course

Mr. Hodgson, Mr. Patton, and every Methodist minister, holding with these sentiments of the Conference, if they ever witnessed, or heard of such a thing, as a revival of religion—or a solitary conversion under Calvinistic influence, must believe it was delusion, or the accidental finding of religion by those who were mocked and insulted in the matter of their salvation. Very well—if Mr. Hodgson, Mr. Patton, and the Conference think so, let them speak out, honestly and publicly. Do we complain? No. We only want our readers to understand that this is “*the spirit of kindness and brotherly love*” in which Mr. Patton would have points of difference discussed between Methodists and Presbyterians;—we only want our readers to understand the *policy* of Methodism, as evinced by Mr. Patton, which is, *to cant about the awful powers which the Editors of the Calvinistic Magazine would fain exercise in the trial of Methodist heretics*—WHILE THEY THEMSELVES PUT SUCH AN AXE AS THIS TO THE ROOT OF THE TREE OF CALVINISM.

Lastly.—Mr. Hodgson assures us that the New School divinity “strengthens the hands of infidelity”—“It runs into infidelity at several points:” and to sustain this, he quotes a passage from an essay of Dr. Skinner. Mr. Hodgson says farther—“There will also be found a perfect agreement between Deism and New Divinity, on the nature of *depravity, holiness and regeneration.*” His book ends with the following passage:—“Let it not be supposed that we judge of the moral and religious character of the advocates of this theory, and the members of their Churches, by its logical and *practical tendencies.* It is so operated upon and neutralized, by other and purer systems, that it has not had the opportunity of exhibiting its legitimate effects on society. Besides opposition from other quarters, *it finds in Methodism an almost omnipresent foe.* But if it were to succeed in putting down all opposition, and securing the field to itself, *it would bring on the millenium of infidelity.*”—[Page 413.]

There we have it. There is Rev. Samuel Patton’s perfect specimen of “*kindness and brotherly love.*” Listen, Presbyterians, to Methodist “brotherly love.” Listen to Bishop Morris. He tells you that your *Confession of Faith is one of the achievements of sinners, what better than the moral poison of Voltaire and Paine.* Listen to Rev. Mr. Hodgson. He tells

you that *Calvinism, and especially the New School version of it, "were it to succeed in putting down all opposition, and securing the field to itself, would bring on the millenium of infidelity."*— We again request Presbyterians to keep in mind that these things are said of us, not merely by Bishop Morris and Mr. Hodgson, but by the General Conference—by the Methodist Church as a Church. We hope also it will not be forgotten that Rev. S. Patton and the itinerants of Holston Conference have circulated these books, and preached these opinions in our midst, as we have disclosed. But it may be asked once more, whether we, the Editors of the Calvinistic Magazine complain? No. We understand Methodism too well to complain. All we want is to lead Presbyterians, Old School and New, *before it be too late*, to understand the policy of Methodism in East Tennessee as perfectly as we do.

We will conclude this chapter, by a general remark, and its application. Methodism always denounces Calvinism, openly and boldly, on the frontiers, or where Presbyterian influence is weak. But, Methodism often pursues the insidious policy we have traced where Presbyterianism is strong. Hence, before the establishment of the first series of the Calvinistic Magazine, it was overbearing and boastful,—but during the period preceding and since the present Magazine it has slyly adapted itself to circumstances. For, it is notorious, that at every point of influence in East Tennessee and around, there is a Presbyterian character so strong, that, Methodism fears openly to assail it. Hence the *policy* we have exposed. Finding that some Presbyterians were at last aroused to resistance, it was determined to establish a paper. What then? Answer. Put the press in Knoxville, where Methodists were peculiarly weak, but where at the same time *they had acquired precarious control over the most prominent Female Seminary in East Tennessee*. What next? Answer. To flatter a highly respectable portion of Knoxville, the paper must be called, *The Methodist Episcopalian*. What then? Why the following course seems to have been chalked out for the Editor, by his superiors:—that, if possible, there must be no issue made between Methodism and Presbyterianism, *especially not with the Old School, who are the strongest in Knoxville*. What then? Why, if possible, make the issue between Methodism and Presbyterian-

ism, united, against the editors of the Calvinistic Magazine! Represent them as disturbers of peace—depict *one of them* as *no Presbyterian, as no christian even, but an infidel, and hypocrite*. What then? Answer. Blow up the Calvinistic Magazine, and crucify Mr. R.! What next? Then continue the same *policy*—flatter Old School, and New, separately, to their faces—stab both behind their backs—walk softly, in flannel socks, before Presbyterians in Abingdon, Jonesboro', Greenville, Rogersville, Dandridge, Kingston, Athens, and especially in Knoxville. There, particularly, be full of bland smiles before Messrs. P. and R. and H. and K. and D. and C. and W. and J. and L. and E., &c., &c., &c. Hold union meetings in Blountville and other places—sing the children of Presbyterians into the Methodist Church wherever possible—scatter over the land, meanwhile, papers, tracts, books, filled with the *kindness and brotherly love* of Messrs. Patton, Morris and Hodgson, speaking for the Conference—build up Colleges by the help of Presbyterian money—and if a Female Seminary at an important point, is again languishing through the jealousy of Old and New School Presbyterianism, take advantage of it, once more, to extend the hand, and the *promises*, of the Conference.

We have now proved our position—we have shown that the assaults of Methodism gave rise to the New Series of the Calvinistic Magazine. We have exposed the *policy* of Methodism—it will be seen whether Presbyterians will understand that *policy* and act accordingly.

CHAPTER V.—What will be effected by the New Series of the Calvinistic Magazine? Answer, It will lead to the same results, obtained by the Old Series. The Presbyterianism of the Confession of Faith will be established on a firmer basis—and there will be a thorough exposure of Methodism. These results are showing themselves. The preaching and publications since 1st Janurry, 1843, have already exhibited much good—more oneness of spirit is beginning to exist among Presbyterians. The Confession of Faith and Catechisms have been studied with awakened interest. The true character of christian experience, as delineated in the Bible, is now being broadly contrasted with the unscriptural, false, fanatical, and mischievous doctrine of the Direct Witness of the Spirit, as

taught by Mr. Wesley. The long boast of Methodism that they know by Direct Witness, in miraculous impression, voice, a touch, when they obtain religion, is passing away forever, so far as it had a disturbing influence on the Presbyterian mind of this region. And a justifiable aversion is felt for that widespread delusion. While at the same time, the doctrine of the true *Witness of the Spirit, with our spirit in the fruits of his* EVER PRESENT AGENCY *in the Christian heart*, is being clearly understood, believed, and cherished. The public mind of East Tennessee and elsewhere will be thoroughly roused, to contrast Calvinism and Arminianism, Presbytery and Methodist Episcopacy in their bearings on the wants and destiny of a great and free people. Elevated christian character, we trust, will be the work of the spirit of truth and love in our midst.

We should here have closed our history of the Calvinistic Magazine, but we beg to add a note, upon the last No. of the Methodist Episcopalian, which has just come to hand.

The Rev. Editor seems much annoyed by our rolling "*The Great Iron Wheel*" across his path in Knoxville. He glides out of the way as fast and smoothly as possible—and tells his readers that Mr. R. published a book on the Direct Witness of the Spirit, &c.—and that the Editor of the Episcopalian exhibited a "Defence," &c.—and called for answers to certain questions. But he says *we* are "mum"—and being in a dilemma, we are out on another subject, &c. He then discourses after this way;—"Now we take it for granted, and so does public sentiment, so far as we have heard, that this file-leader of antagonism to Methodists, wishes to find solace in his mortification by drawing off public attention from a splendid failure in which he was the hero of defeat, raises the cry of murder, gunpowder, Popery, Prelacy, and Methodism, on another part of the wall. This flank movement is understood, and we have no sort of objection to it but that which arises from a share of concern for the salvation of souls."

If the Rev. Mr. Patton was a member of Congress, we should tell him—"This is good for Buncomb." Why, yes! Who knows but we were afraid to attempt to answer Mr. P.'s "Defence?" or who knows but we in our *vanity* intended at a befitting time some reply? Who knows but we really thought we could safely afford ample indulgence to Mr. Patton's book

—and in the meanwhile, introduce “*The Great Iron Wheel*” to public notice? Now, Mr. P. will of course select from these supposed motives, the one which best tickles his fancy. But if we might tell him our own reason for being “*mum,*” it would be this:—we shall answer Mr. P. at a befitting time. For the present, therefore, we will only invite Mr. Patton to accept a *luncheon* of bread and ham, or a *snack* [as we say in East Tennessee] of tongue and pickles, before the dinner we shall prepare for him.

Well, then, if we read Mr. Patton right, in his “*Defence,*” as well as in all he says, his *first* object is, to show a sort of agreement between Mr. Wesley and Presbyterian, and other Calvinistic writers—*secondly* to prove, thereby, that *Mr. R. is no Presbyterian in his “book” on the Direct Witness*—and as the result, to destroy Mr. R. and cement the Jesuitical union, desired by Mr. P., between Methodists and Presbyterians in East Tennessee. To do this, Mr. P. makes *Mr. Wesley a Presbyterian*, by a process, like the bed of Procrustes.—That is to say, he cuts off Mr. Wesley’s feet, to make him fit the bed of Calvinism: but as the bed was too short, even after that operation, Mr. P. has contrived to stretch the bed, not a little, thereby to save the head of Mr. Wesley from dropping on the floor. Then, as Mr. R. could not be made to fit the bed, why, forsooth, he is turned out of doors, and not allowed where to lay his head. In other words, Mr. Patton has tortured Wesley’s meaning to make him a Presbyterian, *for a while*—has perverted Doddridge, Henry, Scott, Chalmers, Edwards, and the Presbyterian Confession of Faith, to make them speak a stammering Methodism. The book of Mr. R. is tried by this gibberish and condemned,—and the shout then raised, “*O! Mr. R. is no Presbyterian. He stands opposed to the doctrine of the Reformation as taught by Presbyterians, and Mr. Wesley!*”

Good! Good policy Mr. P.! But, alas! as Burns said, when his plough turned up the nest of a mouse—

“The best laid schemes o’ mice an’ men,
Gang aft a-gley.”

Mr. Patton’s nest is destroyed by the plough.—We shall now confine ourself simply to the proof—*First*, that Mr. Ross’ book is sustained by living Presbyterians and Calvinists of every

grade, and highest standing, in the United States—and consequently, that *his "book" is received as exhibiting the views of Henry, Scott, Doddridge, Chalmers, Edwards, and the Confession of Faith.* Secondly, that, by necessary inference, Mr. Patton's "*Defence*" is condemned, by Presbyterians and Calvinists of every grade, and highest rank, as a *false representation of Mr. Wesley and Presbyterianism on the point at issue.*

First.—The Synod of Tennessee, with absolute unanimity, endorse Mr. R.'s book.

Secondly.—The "New Englander," a quarterly publication, which on this point speaks the entire mind of Calvinistic New England, says in a notice of our book—"The writer of a judicious book on the Witness of the Spirit does the Church a service. There is not a doctrine in the whole Bible, probably, which has been so perverted.—The author of this little treatise, has brought both care and ability to bear in the formation of his book. The evils of Wesley's system are fully exposed, and the true scriptural statement of this doctrine set forth and defended."—[Vol. 4, p. 452—453.]

Thirdly.—The Presbyterian Advocate [Old School] of September 9, 1846, contains a long article on our "book," signed "*Philalethes*"—in which the writer says:—"The doctrine as held by Mr. Wesley is shown, by Mr. R., with great and overwhelming force of argument to be 1. Unscriptural. 2. False. 3. Fanatical. 4. Mischievous in its tendency."—The writer of *Philalethes*, we now know to be Rev. Ashbel Green Fairchild, D. D. [Old School, and of the Synod of Pittsburg.] We have not the pleasure of personal acquaintance with this gentleman, nor had we previous to the notice of us in the Presbyterian Advocate the slightest intercourse with him. This movement of his was, therefore, in every way, unsolicited.—He, in his regard for our book wrote the article and sent it to us with a letter, and several subsequent communications. He writes—"Your book is the very thing we needed here," [in Pennsylvania.] Again—"I shall soon have you speaking to at least 150 families in Pennsylvania," &c., &c. Dr. Fairchild is the author of a book entitled "*The Great Supper*," which is an admirable defence of Calvinism on the points of Decrees and Election.

Fourthly.—This same Pittsburg Presbyterian Advocate, De-

ember 16, 1846, contains another notice of our book, from the pen of Rev. David Elliot, D. D., Professor of Theology in the Western Theological Seminary at Pittsburg. Dr. Elliot was Moderator of the Old School General Assembly at the great division in 1837, and stands for orthodoxy, unquestioned in that branch of the Presbyterian Church. Dr. Elliot's notice of our book is brief, and we give the whole of it. He writes:—"The author of this pamphlet is the Pastor of a New School Presbyterian Church in Kingsport, East Tennessee. His leading object is to subvert the notion of Mr. Wesley, that there is a testimony of the Spirit, by which an inward impression is made upon the soul; whereby, the Spirit of God *directly witnesses* to the spirit of the man, that he is a child of God—and that, without any regard to the fruits of his operation, and even before the existence of such fruit. The judicious reader of this pamphlet, whose mind is not warped by prejudice, or attachment to system, can hardly fail to perceive, that the ground occupied by the author on the question at issue is the only scriptural, and, for that reason the only safe one. We agree entirely with President Edwards, who had extended opportunities of observation on this subject, that, '*many mischiefs have arisen from that false and delusive notion of the witness of the Spirit, that it is a kind of inward voice, suggestion or declaration from God to man, that he is beloved, pardoned, elected, or the like, sometimes with, and sometimes without a text of scripture; for many have been the false, and vain, though very high affections that have arisen from hence. It is to be feared that multitudes of souls have been eternally undone by it.*' Those who can have access to this pamphlet, we have no doubt, will feel themselves repaid by its perusal."

Now, we believe no man will deny the Presbyterianism of Dr. Elliot, nor question the fact, that he speaks the sentiments of the entire Old School body in the United States. Let our readers also notice Dr. Elliot's quotation from President Edwards, and then remember, that Rev. Samuel Patton brought Edwards to sustain Wesley!!!! He might just as honestly have brought the Bible to sustain the Book of Mormon! And the same thing may be said with perfect accuracy of Mr. P.'s attempt to show that Henry, Doddridge, Scott, Chalmers, and the Confession of Faith support Mr. Wesley's notion. A pub-

lication more reckless than Mr. Patton's "Defence," of regard to candor, to say nothing of its personal grossness, cannot be found in the wide range even of Methodist polemical assurance.

We think, for the present, this testimony from the Old School side of the house will do. It is massive and conclusive. And as we never saw Dr. Elliot but once in our life, under all the circumstances, his affirmation of our book, is as magnanimous to us, as it is overwhelming to Mr. Patton. We will only add, that the Princeton Review is not yet to hand.

Fifthly.—We give one extract only from a private letter, and as we have not the opportunity, now, of consulting the distinguished writer, we for the present suppress the name. Mr. Patton may take the opinion, however, as that of the New School Presbyterian Church in America. The writer says, "I have just perused Mr. Patton's '*Defence*,' to give both sides fair play, and to see the progress of an important controversy. But I am so amazed at his ignorance of the subject discussed, that I cannot keep silence. When I had perused the '*Defence*,' I looked upon the production with unutterable astonishment, that the author could do no better, and I deeply feared that you would so despise the prevarication, as not fully to realize,

*That words are things—

While in delusion's ear their magic rings.'"

Sixthly.—We beg leave to inform Mr. Patton that the first edition of our book of 2000 copies is nearly exhausted. And that a larger edition will be issued in the spring,—[the money advanced, unsolicited, by friends, Old and New School,] for gratuitous distribution. Our reply to Mr. Patton will appear as an appendix in that edition, and, most likely, also in the Calvinistic Magazine.

This is the refreshment we have offered to Mr. P. We have been regarding the Editor of the *Episcopalian* while he has broken his fast, and we think he hardly will need the "dinner" we are promising. There is an air of satiety about his eyes, which seems to say—"I pray thee have me excused."

One word—and no more for the present. It is clear that Mr. R.'s book is sustained by Presbyterians and Calvinists, of every grade and rank, every where. The *issue*, then, is not between Methodists and Presbyterians on one side, and Mr.

R. on the other. The *issue* is between Methodists on one side, and Presbyterians and Calvinists on the other. And the issue is this—Is it scriptural and true, that there is a Direct Witness of the Spirit, by impression, voice, or other ways of miraculous message, telling the man, he is a child of God, before, and aside from the fruits of the Spirit, or at any time? *That Mr. Wesley affirms.* Or, is there no other testimony of the Spirit than that whereby he witnesses with our spirit, in his abiding presence in the fruits he produces? *That is affirmed by Presbyterians and Calvinists.* THAT IS THE ISSUE. And the fact that Methodists will not meet *this issue*, demonstrates they cannot meet it, and are trying to escape in fog.

We will make one quotation more from the Episcopalian, and with a comment or two bring this history to a close.—Our readers will remember that [in the last paragraph but one of the Great Iron Wheel] we said, that Methodism in its tendency was to be considered as a barrel of gunpowder, which a man might have in the same house with us. Mr. P. handles the subject after this fashion:—“If Mr. Ross as he intimates, regards Methodism as a ‘barrel of gunpowder,’ he had as well be shifting his quarters; for, if we may judge from the past, his attempts to write it down will only turn to the furtherance of the Gospel.”

The last clause of this paragraph has a double meaning. To one of the meanings we can agree. We can agree that our “attempts to write down Methodism, will only turn to the furtherance of the Gospel.” We agree to this meaning, because we really believe we may *further the Gospel*, without furthering *Methodism*. But Mr. Patton, doubtless, meant the other thing—that our attempts to write down *Methodism* will only turn to the furtherance of *Methodism*. Mr. P. was too modest or conscientious to say *that*, but delicately solicits his readers so to understand him. It is a graceful challenge, to consider, by contrast, *what Mr. Patton has done for Presbyterianism*.—We will dwell then for a moment upon his zeal for Methodism, and his “*kindness and brotherly love*” towards Presbyterians. Mr. P. and Mr. R. have been ministers near Kingsport, perhaps some twenty years. Methodism had a name here, when there were not three Presbyterians in the place. Mr. Patton has been, we believe, repeatedly the Presiding Elder, and of-

ten the stationed preacher. His labors have been earnest and faithful to build up Methodism, by legitimate ways, and he has more than once directly, and insidiously assailed Mr. R. from the pulpit, to excite against him as a minister, if not as a man, the prejudices of Methodists—in return for which Mr. R. never made the least public reply, until his article last July in the Calvinistic Magazine. What, then, is now the result of Mr. Patton's twenty years' labor in this community? We answer, Mr. Patton has left Kingsport, "bag and baggage" for Knoxville. Whether he has retreated from a point deemed by him, as occupied in too much force by Presbyterians, or merely because he is the Conference Editor, will appear by some considerations, which, doubtless, had weight in Mr. Patton's mind. Among these reflections, he remembered, that, upon an eminence, just by the road-side, there stands, exposed to the gaze of every traveler, an old brick building,—the front end facing the river, supported from falling out by a poplar log set up against it after the fashion of the trigger to a boy's trap;—and the the carpenters say, if that trigger was knocked away the house would tumble down. That building is the Methodist Episcopal Church in Kingsport, over which, directly and indirectly, Mr. P. has had charge some twenty years. So far as we can learn, the society is in nearly as dilapidated a condition as their house. Indeed, the simple fact of their having such a house, under all this watch and ward, if they are able to erect a better, [which is the case.] tells their religious state. We forbear to press this point any farther. May what has been said provoke them to a good work for themselves.

While Mr. P. has thus been mindful of Methodism, his "*kindness and brotherly love*" towards Presbyterians has not been wholly without good results. The Presbyterian congregation at Kingsport, never was so numerous—never so united and harmonious. It has settled a pastor. It has made provision for its own male and female school, *within itself*, without asking aid from any quarter. There is a religious paper in nearly every family. Domestic worship is regarded. The Confession of Faith, and the Catechisms, are studied more than ever before. The Sabbath School house, which is the Female Academy, is large enough for a respectable congregation. The old Church will, for the present serve the boys, and is an ex-

cellent building. The new edifice, is the most beautiful house of worship to be found in any village, with, perhaps, a single exception, between Nashville and Richmond, Va. One of Meneely's Troy bells calls together every Sabbath this people, whose worship shows a commendable attention to sacred music. Whether their pastor preaches Presbyterianism in his "*views of christian experience*," can be understood, by Mr. Patton's *attachment* to him, and from the esteem in which his book on the Witness of the Spirit is received by Old and New School Presbyterians everywhere.

Doubtless when Mr. P. remembers what he has accomplished at the place near which he lived so long, and recollects too, that a prophet is not without honor, save in his own country, he will be greatly gratified.

He has, we have said, retreated to Knoxville. What he will accomplish there, time will disclose. We were in Knoxville some weeks ago, and while we did not obtain satisfactory information as to the membership of the Methodist Church there, we were informed that no less than *seven* Methodist ministers with, or without families, were in the place, or drawing near. This fact called to our mind, that when Ampudia, the Mexican General, fell back from Monterey to San Louis Potosi, it was said, that although the soldiery there were not formidable, yet they had *two hundred generals*. Mr. Patton will then permit us to congratulate him on his safe arrival, and to express the hope that, if we may judge from the past, his love of Presbyterianism "will only turn to the furtherance of the Gospel" in Knoxville, as it has in Kingsport.

One word as to Mr. Patton's allusion to the "barrel of gunpowder." It is this, and we give it as advice in the premises, —if Presbyterians, everywhere, will *wet* the gunpowder of Methodism, with *showers of Calvinism*, as thoroughly as it has been *wet* in Kingsport, there will be no danger of our "house" being blown up.

Election Explained.

At our request, a little work entitled "The Great Supper," has been kindly sent us by its author, the Rev. Ashbel G. Fairchild. It is a most admirable defence of several of our distinguishing doctrines, peculiarly adapted, as it was designed, to the people. We would rejoice to see it in the hands of every Calvinist, and carefully read by every Arminian. We subjoin a short extract from these sermons, and will quote from it from time to time as we have space.

I shall now proceed to the most interesting part of the parable. The King having provided a most plentiful entertainment, sent out his servant 'to say to them that were bidden, Come, for all things are now ready.' All, however, 'with one consent began to make excuse,' and under various pretences declined the generous offer. 'The master of the house being angry,' and not willing that all this costly preparation should be thrown away, directed his servant to go out into the lanes and streets, the highways and hedges, and 'compel them to come in that his house might be filled.' He moreover declared, that those others, who were bidden and would not come, should never taste of his supper.

This whole passage affords a beautiful illustration of the *Election of Grace*, as maintained by modern Calvinists. Thus, from eternity all things were present to the eye of God. To him the fall of man was distinctly visible, even before the race was called into existence, and moved by infinite mercy, he resolved to provide a remedy. Intending to rescue a portion of the race from perdition, he would send his only begotten Son to prepare a great salvation. Through the death of Christ, he determined that an unlimited offer of mercy should be made to the human family. All should be invited to partake of the rich repast. But he well knew that this generous offer would be universally rejected, and that unless some special means should be employed to bring sinners to the Saviour, all would continue in sin and perish; and thus Christ would die in vain.

To prevent so unhappy a result, God determined to send

forth his Spirit with his special, divine influences, and thus many should be powerfully constrained to accede to the terms of salvation. In other words he *chose* or *elected* them to eternal life, and appointed all the means necessary to carry into effect his merciful design. As to the rest who should be invited, but would refuse the rich provision, he resolved to pass them by, and exclude them forever from his mercy.

These glorious purposes, formed in eternity, God is now every where carrying into effect. At his command his servants go forth, and invite all, 'as many as they find,' to come and accept the salvation provided. Yet none are found to hearken to the gracious overtures, till by the special influences of the Spirit of grace they are brought to bow to his peaceful sceptre.

Such is the doctrine of Gratuitous Election, as received by the Church to which we belong. It is true, our representation of it may differ widely from that commonly made by certain zealous Anti-Calvinists. Sectarian partisans are interested in misleading the public in regard to our real sentiments, and hence their assertions should be received with caution. Those who would understand our system of doctrine, must listen, not to the misrepresentations of its enemies, but to the explanations of its friends. From the view which has been presented you may clearly see,

1. That the doctrine of Gratuitous Election *harmonizes with the free, unrestricted offer of salvation.* And yet there are some who strangely imagine, that Calvinists are guilty of a departure from their own principles when they invite all to the gospel feast. But there is no inconsistency here. The Master of the feast in the parable, first directed his servant to invite all, 'as many as he should find.' Was this at all inconsistent with a determination afterwards carried out, to constrain a part to come, and leave the rest to the consequences of their unwise choice? Neither is God chargeable with inconsistency when he directs that all should first be invited to the Saviour; and when they all refuse, executes other determinations respecting them. We invite all to the feast of the gospel, because our divine Master has commanded us so to do. We invite them to come, because the provision in readiness is sufficient for all, and if they will come, they shall 'in no wise be cast out.'—We invite all, because it is their duty to come, and they have

no valid excuse for staying away. We urge them to come; because we hope that while we are speaking, the Lord may send down the special influences of his grace; and constrain them to yield their hearts to the Saviour.

2. We see, also, that it is not implied in the election of grace; *that if a man be elected to salvation he will be saved, let him do what he may.* This is often asserted by the enemies of the doctrine. But it is not true. Because the Master of the house determined that some should partake of his rich repast, and to that end should be effectually constrained to come, did it follow that they would partake whether they came or not? If they had stayed away could they at all have tasted his bounty? So if God has mercifully determined that some shall believe on Christ and become holy in order to their final salvation, does it follow that they will be saved whether they are true believers or not? Away with such absurdity! God never determines the end without also determining the means of its accomplishment.

3. We may see also that *the Presbyterian Church does not carry the doctrine of election farther than some other denominations do.* Our brethren of the Protestant Episcopal Church; in their Articles of Religion, publicly declare their sentiments in the following terms: "Predestination to life is the everlasting purpose of God, whereby (before the foundations of the world were laid) he hath constantly decreed, by his counsel, secret to us, to deliver from curse and damnation; those whom he hath chosen in Christ out of mankind, and to bring them by Christ to everlasting salvation, as vessels made to honor.— Wherefore they, which be endued with so excellent a benefit of God, be called according to God's purpose; by his Spirit working in due season; they, through grace, obey the calling; they be justified freely; they be made sons of God by adoption; they be made like the image of his only begotten Son, Jesus Christ; they walk religiously in good works; and at length, by God's mercy, they attain to everlasting felicity." Such are the views of our Episcopal brethren; and it would be difficult, perhaps impossible, to express the doctrine of personal, gratuitous election, in stronger or more unequivocal language.

Our brethren of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church also; in their Confession of Faith, chap. 8, sec. 1, publicly declare

their solemn belief, in the following words: "It has pleased God to choose the Lord Jesus Christ, his only begotten Son, who verily was foreordained before the foundation of the world, to be the mediator between God and man; the Prophet, Priest and King; the Head and Saviour of his Church, the Heir of all things and Judge of the world; unto whom he promised a seed, and to be by him in time redeemed, called by his Word and Spirit, justified by his grace, sanctified and glorified." This is strong language. It is true, the words *elect* and *predestinate* are omitted, but the passage contains the very sum and substance of the old Calvinistic doctrine of election. It tells us that Jesus Christ was foreordained to be a Mediator, before there were any human beings in whose behalf he could mediate. It also tells us that the Father promised the Son a seed to be redeemed and saved, before there were any sinners to be redeemed and saved. Who is this "seed?" Certainly not all mankind. Surely our brethren do not mean to affirm that all mankind are to be, by Christ, in time redeemed, called, sanctified and glorified. By the "seed" is meant only a part of the human family. Here, then, is a certain part of mankind who, according to our brethren, were given to Christ, in eternity, and whose future conversion and salvation are as sure as it can be made by a solemn promise of the Father to the Son; uttered before the foundations of the earth were laid. What is this but the good old doctrine of Gratuitous Election? The same brethren, also, in their Catechism, Answer to Question 7, tell us that "God, according to the counsel of his own will, hath foreordained to bring to pass what shall be for his own glory." Now if ever the glory of God is displayed in its brightest colors, it is when a sinner is turned to God by faith and repentance. Every such event swells a new tide of joy and praise over the heavenly world. It follows, that wherever and whenever such an event occurs, according to our brethren, God must have "foreordained to bring it to pass." And this, say they, the Lord did, not on account of foreseen goodness, but "according to the counsel of his own will." What is this but special, eternal Election?

That distinguished man, the Rev. John Wesley, in the year 1743, when in the 40th year of his age, and in the full maturity of his judgment, wrote as follows: "With regard to the first,

unconditional election, I believe that God * * * has unconditionally elected some persons to many peculiar advantages, both with regard to temporal and spiritual things; and I do not deny, (though I cannot prove it is so) that he has unconditionally elected some persons to eternal glory.”—*Works*, Vol. III, page 289. Would Mr. Wesley have said this, if he had regarded election as that horrible thing some represent it to be?

4. We may further learn, from the view which has been presented, that it is no part of the doctrine of election, as maintained by its friends, *that the non-elect cannot be saved, let them do what they may*. If all that were bidden to the feast had accepted the invitation, instead of turning away, one to his farm and another to his merchandize, they might all have enjoyed the rich repast provided. And so, if the non-elect would come to Christ, he would “in no wise cast them out.” What hinders their coming? Nothing in the universe but their own voluntary, cherished sinfulness. But if, sensible of their own weakness, they would seek the aid of the Holy Spirit, and make the effort in humble dependence upon divine grace, they would be enabled to come. But since they choose to stay away, they cannot throw the blame of their perdition upon God, and say, let them do what they will, they must be lost. Of what can they complain? That they were not invited to the feast? No. That the provision was not sufficient? No. Did they come and were refused admittance? No. Did they earnestly desire to come, but were prevented? No. Of what then can they complain, unless of this,—that they were not constrained to do what they were not willing to do. And will any one complain of that? No: be assured their mouths will be stopped, and they will forever feel that they are their own destroyers. There is no mysterious agency, no fatal necessity, no secret decree of God which drags the sinner down to perdition. I am aware that insinuations to that effect are often thrown out against the doctrines of our church; but I solemnly assure you that they are all utterly groundless. Our Confession of Faith, in accordance with the language of the Bible, says of the non-elect that “It pleased God. . . to pass them by, and ordain them to dishonor and wrath for their sin.” Ch. 3, Sec. 7. And the Larger Catechism, in the answer to Question 68, tells us that, “for their wilful neglect and contempt of the

grace offered to them, being justly left in unbelief, they do never truly come to Christ." And the Confession, in Chap. 10, Sec. 4, says, "they never truly come to Christ, and therefore cannot be saved." What is the plain meaning of all this language? What but this, that if any are not saved, it is because they do not truly come to Christ. Again; they do not come to Christ, because they are justly left in unbelief; and they are left in unbelief, and finally punished for their wilful neglect and contempt of the grace offered to them.

And here it will not be out of place to notice the sentiments of other denominations on this point. In the volume of "Doctrinal Tracts," published by authority of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, on page 139, we are informed that "God pre-destinates, or fore-appoints all disobedient unbelievers to damnation, not without, but according to his fore-knowledge of all their works from the foundation of the world." And again, on the following page, "God refused or reprobated all disobedient unbelievers as such to damnation." This is certainly very strong language. It represents God as predestinating a certain part of mankind to damnation thousands of years before they were born; and I am sure no modern Calvinist would express himself on the subject in harsher terms.

Short Practical Sermons—No. 4.

SELF-EXAMINATION.

"Examine yourselves, whether ye be in the faith: prove your own selves. Know ye not your own selves, how that Jesus Christ is in you, except ye be reprobates?"—II Cor. xiii: 5.

There is no christian duty more important than the one enjoined in the text, as our safety, growth in piety, and religious enjoyment depend mainly upon it. That it is much neglected there is no doubt, and hence the multitudes of weak and sickly christians in all our churches, who, though they may have been "born again," scarcely show signs of life—and having taken their stand on the Lord's side, seem to think it is to stand still. Many, for want of it, it is to be feared, are wholly deceived, and will so remain until, they hear the cry,

“Behold the bridegroom cometh,” or the voice from within, saying, “depart from me, I never knew you.” Among all who stand upon the left hand in the great day, this class must be pre-eminently wretched. If you would avoid it, “examine yourselves honestly—diligently—prayerfully.” Better you had never had a hope, than a hope that must perish. We are not speaking to hypocrites, but the professor, who, though he may be honest, yet may be deceived; who believes he has religion, only because he does not know what religion is, a class, we may infer from our Saviour’s frequent reference to them, quite numerous. This examination is to be made with the view to the all-important question—am I a christian or am I not?—“whether ye be in the faith?”

Many seem to regard it as a question that is to be left open—that it would be assuming too much to decide this great matter for ourselves; and because some, from weakness, or error, or spiritual pride, are proclaiming it from the house-tops, that, therefore, we are not to advance at all in that direction. If we are cherishing a mere dreamy hope, it is all we are to expect, or that can be expected of us. But this is not enough, nor ought we to be satisfied with it. Nor will there be any danger, if we arrive at the proper point, that our pride and self-complacency will rise. The poor culprit has none of this feeling while he examines the reprieve that has been sent him, and satisfies himself that it is in due form, and that he is the subject of it,—nor is he disposed to claim any pre-eminence, as he descends from the scaffold, to take his stand among his fellow-citizens. So the christian—a sinner saved by free, sovereign, unmerited grace—feels that “boasting is excluded.”—And hence, the more eminent the christian, the less he has to say about his attainments.

If a satisfactory conclusion can be arrived at on any subject, surely it is the one we are considering, where God is on the one side, and our own hearts on the other. His commands are plain, and his promises absolute. We can, and we do, understand what He means, when He tells us to believe in Christ.—He tells us to repent and obey the Gospel, and surely we can get deep enough into our own hearts to know whether we have met these requirements. Surely, if he tells us what we must do to be saved, He means to be understood—and having un-

derstood, we can decide whether we have complied. To take any other view of the Gospel, renders it of no avail as it regards our final salvation.

Nor would I be understood as teaching that man, independently of God, can embrace and obey the Gospel, any more than that the man at the pool could, of himself, rise up and walk. But when the command is given, the power is imparted. It was not in his own strength the cripple rose, but he believed, and the strength was given.

So far we have only reasoned on this subject, but what are the teachings of the Bible? What says the text? "Examine yourselves whether ye be in the faith." The examination, then, is with the view to ascertain this very fact, of your being in a state of grace. "Prove your own selves. Know ye not that Christ Jesus is within you, except ye be reprobates?"—Know ye not, in other words, that ye are christians or sinners; and to settle this point we are required to examine ourselves, But John is still more explicit: "Hereby we *know* that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren." "We *know* that we are in Him because we keep His commandments."

And now having shown, as I think, both from reason and Scripture, that something more than a mere peradventure—a mere flimsy hope, may be reached—nay, that "a lively hope," "a strong hope," a hope that shall be as an anchor to the soul, may be attained to, who that does not enjoy it, will not at once set about the work, and "examine himself" to see what is wanting to give him this comfortable, this soul-rejoicing assurance?

May I not hope that some who hear me are ready to begin, and that I hear them ask, how shall I go about it? How shall we test the matter, whether we are children of God or not?

I would say, in answer, not by reverting (as too many do) to your *experience*, and the scenes and exercises through which you then passed—and because you have always thought that they were the work of God—therefore conclude you are *now* a christian. I would not do this, for the same reason that in establishing the fact of my present natural existence, I would not think of going back to the incidents of my natural birth. I have testimony nearer at hand, and more conclusive. My

heart beats, my lungs heave, I act, I feel. So as to spiritual life. If the principle was ever imparted, it still lives—borne down—torpid—stupified it may be, by indulgence in sin—as in the case of David, but it still lives—and we no sooner become conscious of our state, than, as in his case, the principle revives—and resumes its proper place. And whilst strong consolation may be drawn from the consistency and faithfulness of past life, I would not place my chief reliance upon that, any more than I would conclude my present health to be good, because I had enjoyed general good health.

The *present state* of the heart and the affections, is the safe criterion. Do I love God *now*? Do I love my brother *now*? Is my *present course* onward and upward? Am I reaching forth to the things which are before? This seems to have been Paul's course. In his conversion and subsequent history, he had more of this kind of testimony to appeal to, than any man whose life is upon record, "Yet," he says, "I count not myself to have attained,"—"forgetting the things that are behind, I press towards the mark," &c.

It may be asked, how often is this duty to be performed? I answer by asking, how often do you want to know that God is your friend, and heaven your home? How often does the rich worldling want to know that he is rich? Would he ever be unconscious of it? Then let this examination run along the whole current of your life, and become the daily habit of your mind. Let this be your language—"Search me, O God, and know my heart; try me, and know my thoughts; and see if there be any wicked way in me, and lead me in the way everlasting."

And I would say to every professor of religion, beware how you compare yourselves with others, though they may be elders or preachers, or those, the fame of whose piety has spread over all the country. Christ Jesus is your example, and upon him your character is to be formed. You are commanded to "be perfect as he was perfect, and holy as he was holy," and though you will never reach the perfection of his adorable character, you will yet make higher attainments by aiming at it.

Beware, too, how you make resolutions of *general amendment*. They usually amount to nothing, or worse than nothing, quieting the conscience, and thereby putting us more off

our guard. The veriest sinner solaces himself upon this ground—he intends to *do better*. There is no difficulty in getting the lax professor to promise the same thing. But come to particulars, and he recoils. Ask him if he will pray in his family? He says no, he cannot promise that. Nor in public? No. Will you admonish your children? No, I cannot talk to them. Nor your impenitent neighbor? No, he will say, “physician heal thyself.” Will you give more to benevolent purposes—to the Bible, the tract, the missionary cause? I cannot promise. What of temperance—will you make a speech, or contribute something to circulate temperance publications? Cannot do either. And so with the whole catalogue of christian duties. There is not one that he is ready to take up, and yet he intends to *do better*.

General resolves, we repeat, avail nothing. Come up at once to particular duties. You have been neglecting the family altar. Set it up at once. You have never warned your children of the danger of living and dying out of Christ. Do it now and continue to do it. Begin to be faithful to your neighbor. No longer forget that God requires you to send the Gospel to the heathen—to distribute the Bible, the tract, and the pious book to those around you. Foster the Sabbath-School, as the nursery of the Church. Let the Temperance cause feel, and rejoice in your weight and influence. And last, not least—strengthen the hands of your minister. In short, take up every neglected duty—and do it with method and decision. Having done this, turn upon the other hand, to your known sins:

Are you covetous? Do you love money for its own sake? Remember, it is the root of all evil. And do not cloak your sin under that text of Scripture which says, “He that provides not for his own household,” &c., for it has nothing to do with it, and simply refers to what is due from us to widows and indigent relatives.

Do you bear malice? Is there enmity in your heart? Root it out, and do not justify it because the injury has been wilful and palpable. If it were not so, there would be nothing to forgive—and the injunction would be useless.

In short, find out your besetting sins, (for all have them,) and extirpate them.

Examine yourselves—not only with the view to seeing whether your hope is well grounded—but in God's strength to make it so, and let it not be said of you—"One thing thou lackest." And remember, that one thing, small though it may seem to you, may finally shut you out of heaven.

In conclusion, I would say, do not understand me as teaching that works are the ground of your salvation. They are evidences only of the soundness of your faith. They are the streams that will flow from the "well of water that is in you," if you have ever been truly converted to God. J. K.

Missionary.

RESULTS OF THE YEAR.

THOSE who have contributed to the funds of the American Board during the past year, may ask, "How has the money been expended?" "What machinery has it kept in motion?" "What results has it secured?" Perhaps the following answers to those inquiries will be satisfactory.

1. *Number of Laborers.*—There are twenty-six missions under the care of the Board, embracing ninety-five stations.—The ordained missionaries, at the present time, amount to 140, eleven of whom are physicans. In addition to these there are 5 other physicians, 31 teachers, printers, &c., and 187 female assistant missionaries. To this number we must add 20 native preachers, and 128 other native helpers. Thus we make the whole number of laborers connected with the missions, and sustained by the Board, *five hundred and eleven.*

2. *Schools.*—To prepare natives to engage in the missionary work as preachers, teachers, &c., 7 seminaries are in operation, containing 487 pupils. Besides these there are 34 boarding schools; in which 854 male and 833 female pupils are brought directly and constantly under the influence of Christian instruction. The number of day-schools—including those at the Sandwich Islands, which owe their existence and efficiency to the mission, and are still in part sustained and directed by it—is 602, containing 29,171 scholars. Thus the whole number of pupils, more or less under the care of the missions, is 31,045.

3. *The Press.*—The missions have also under their direction 15 printing establishments; connected with which are 32 presses and 40 fonts of type, prepared to issue publications in 27 different languages. At eleven other missions printing is executed by presses not owned by the Board, making the whole number of languages, in which printing is done for the missions, exclusive of the English, 37. The works printed during the last year, including tracts, amount to 460,000; the whole number of pages printed during the year is not less than 40,000,000.

4. *Results.*—When we ask for the fruit of missionary labor, recently expended, the first and obvious answer is, “The harvest is not yet come.” Who would think of estimating the benefits which our religious and educational institutions have conferred upon this country, during the last year, by the fruit already gathered? The seed-time is but just gone; the joy of the reaper is yet to come! Who can say how much good these 40,000,000 printed pages will hereafter accomplish! Who can tell how much better and happier these thirty-one thousand children and youth will become, in consequence of the instruction which they have secured! Who can foretell the number of those who will hereafter trace their spiritual life to the exhortations and warnings, which these five hundred and eleven missionary laborers have uttered within the last twelve months?

And yet there are some visible and known results. There has been a very interesting revival among the Nestorians; and more than one hundred are reported as hopeful converts. The Choctaws have been greatly blessed, and more than two hundred have been received into the churches. Among the Armenians four new churches have been organized; and many, it is hoped, have been recently born again. At the Sandwich Islands, at Ahmednuggur, at Madura, there have been considerable additions to the churches. To say nothing of other missions, where the success has been less striking, are not these results of the past year sufficient to call forth our gratitude, and to excite us to new and more vigorous efforts?—Who will maintain that he has given too much?—*Day-spring.*

“A Link Broken”—Preaching in India.

I ONE day preached on the general corruption of mankind, and the impossibility of being saved by our own works. A person present expressed his surprise at my assertions, and thought it strange that I should enforce the necessity of our keeping the whole law, if we desired to be saved by our own merits. It was unjust, he urged, to consider a man cursed who confirmeth not *all* the words of the law to do them, and cried out, “How can this be true, that *whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all?* How can this be? If I keep six of the commandments, and break four, have I not kept the majority? And is not God in justice bound to give me heaven, because I have kept two more than I have broken?”

In explaining these truths we can easily make ourselves understood to cultivated minds; but I could never make the common people understand me without a parable. Instead of entering into an argument, I have often replied by describing a scene on the Ganges: “The day was dismal, the wind roared, the thunder pealed, the lightning was vivid, the waves of the Ganges raged, the stream was swollen, and the current rapid; the infuriated elements threatened destruction to every vessel on its waters; no boat could outlive the storm for any length of time. But, see, what is that? It is a boat in distress, filled with people, rapidly hurried along by the waves. Between the peals of thunder the shrieks of the people are heard; they fear the rocks on the shore to which the current is driving them. What can be done for them? Could they but be drawn into this creek they would be safe. Those on the shore look anxiously around, and discover a chain lying near them. A man instantly fastens a stone to a rope, binds the other end to the chain, and flings the stone into the boat. The rope is caught; the people eagerly lay hold on the chain; while those on shore begin to draw them, amid the raging elements, toward the creek. They already rejoice at the prospect of deliverance; but when they are within a few yards of the land *one link* of the chain breaks; I do not say *ten* links, but *one link*, in the middle of the chain. What shall these distressed people do

now? Shall they still cling to the unbroken links?" "No! no!" exclaimed one of my hearers: "overboard with the chain, or it will sink them the sooner." "What then shall they do?" "Cast themselves upon the mercy of God," exclaimed another. "True," I replied; "if one commandment be broken, it is as though all of them were broken; we cannot be saved by them; we must trust in the mercy of God, and lay hold on the almighty hand of Christ, which is stretched out to save us." I have frequently used this parable, and always found it to answer.—*Rev. C. B. Leupolt.*

The Daughter of John Knox.

ELIZABETH, a daughter of John Knox, the distinguished reformer, appears to have possessed more of the spirit of her father than his other children; and her life, through a variety of the most trying vicissitudes, bears a strong resemblance to his. Her husband, Mr. Welch, was one of those patriotic clergymen who opposed the tyrannical and arbitrary measures with which King James endeavored to destroy the power and freedom of the Scottish church.

The king was so exasperated by certain lawful steps taken by Welch and five of his colleagues in opposition to himself, that he laid the question before the secret council; and when the clergymen declared that they could not consider the council as their competent judges, they were arraigned for high treason. Their trial at Linlithgow was carried so far, through the shameless influence of the court, that the sentence of death was pronounced upon them. But Madam Welch, who had followed her husband to his prison, not merely received the sentence as calmly as he himself, but invited the wives of the other five clergymen to unite with her in thanking God, that he had given their husbands the strength and resolution to sacrifice themselves to the cause of their Lord and Master.

When the sentence of death was changed to that of exile, she followed her husband to France, where they resided for sixteen years. Here Mr. Welch applied himself with so much zeal to the acquisition of the language, that after the lapse of fourteen weeks he was able to preach in French, and was im-

mediately chosen pastor of a Protestant congregation in Nerac, but was soon called from this place to St. Jean d'Angeli.

After the outbreak of war between Louis XIII. and his Protestant subjects, this city was besieged by the king in person, and Mr. Welch, by his exhortations, not only incited the inhabitants to the boldest resistance, but was himself constantly to be seen upon the walls, where he united his efforts with those of the garrison, for the defence of the city.

When, at length, a treaty was concluded, after which the king made his entry into the town, Mr. Welch returned to preach in his presence, and go through with the Protestant services; with which the king was so incensed, that he sent the Duke d'Espernon, with a company of soldiers, into the church, to bring the preacher from his pulpit. At the entrance of the duke into the house, Mr. Welch requested his hearers to give place to the Lord Marshal of France, and invited him to be seated and listen to God's word. The duke, surprised by these words, and the tone in which they were uttered, accepted the seat offered him, and listened with serious attention to the entire discourse.

At the close of the services, he led the clergyman into the presence of the king, who asked him how he dared to preach when it was a law recognized throughout the kingdom, that the services of the reformed church should be held in no place where the court resided. "O sire!" answered Mr. Welch, "if your majesty knew what I preached, you would not only come yourself to hear me, but would wish all France to do so; for I preach not as those men you have been accustomed to hear. First, I preach that you can be saved only through the merits of Jesus Christ, and not through your own; and I am sure, your conscience tells you, that you will never merit heaven through your good works. Next, I preach that, as you are king of France, no man should have power over you; but the ministers you are accustomed to hear, subject you to the Pope of Rome, which I will never do." His majesty, whom this reply had pleased, jokingly answered; "Very good, you shall be my minister!" and addressing him as "father," assured him of his protection. Louis proved true to his word; for in 1621, when St. Jean d'Angeli was conquered by the king's military, he particularly commanded Lord de Vitri, one of his generals, to

provide for the safety of Mr. Welch. This officer caused him and his family to be brought to Rochelle, after which, in the king's name, he provided him with the necessary means for continuing his journey.

As Mr. Welch found his health rapidly failing, and was told by his physicians that the air of his native land alone could restore him, he returned, in 1622, to visit England; but its reigning prince was too narrow-minded a man to treat him with the generosity of the French monarch. James feared the influence of a man in the last stages of consumption, and refused him permission to return to Scotland. Madam Welch, through the influence of a number of her mother's relations, obtained admission at court, to intercede for her husband; when the following conversation took place, which will best show her spirit.

When she, in reply to the king's inquiry who her father was, spoke the name of Knox, James exclaimed, "Knox and Welch! the devil never made that match!" "Very like, sire," she dryly replied, "for we never asked his advice." He wished particularly to know how many children her father left; and whether they were lads or lasses. At her reply, that but three children yet survived, and those were all lasses, he raised both hands, and exclaimed, "God be praised! for if there lived three sons of Knox, I could never enjoy my three kingdoms in peace!" When she again endeavored to obtain his permission for her husband to return to Scotland, and he, with his habitual rudeness replied, "Give him his native air! give him the devil!" "Give that to your hungry courtiers!" said she, offended at his profaneness. But when he at length said, that her husband might return to his native land, provided he would promise submission to the newly appointed bishop of the country, Madam Welch, quickly raising her apron towards him, retorted in the true spirit of her father, "With your leave, sire, rather would I receive his head in this apron!"

Madam Welch died at Ayr, January, 1625.—*American Messenger.*

WE commend to the prayerful consideration of our churches, both ministers and people, the following instances of christian principle and self-denial, taken from the Home Missionary, that they may feel more deeply how much our western missionaries need our prayers, our sympathies, and *our contributions*, and how *worthy* they are of them all.

A Noble Position.

From a Western Missionary.

THE sober truth in regard to many of us is, we have adopted the West as our home under a *deep conviction of duty*, as servants of Christ. We understand *Him* to require us to live and labor here where we must literally "endure hardness as his good soldiers." And the longer we endure the evils incident to such a choice or perform the duties assigned us, the more we feel the importance of the arrangement, and the more firmly have we resolved to abide the consequences, rather than abandon fields that have already nearly gone to waste for want of earlier cultivation. And could we command pleasant locations, or such as would be even more desirable, in some respects, in older sections of the country, I do not believe our ranks would be thinned by the hope of better society or more conveniences. So long as we can be sustained in such a manner that we can "give ourselves wholly to our work," I hope we shall feel most cordially disposed to do so.

But I know the question has been seriously agitated by one, whether duty to himself and family did not require some different arrangement, to secure, if possible, a more sure support. We rely with the most *perfect confidence* upon *the sum guaranteed by your Committee*; but beyond this, disappointment has been so often experienced that we look upon a considerable portion of what is promised, as either very doubtful when due, or entirely worthless. This has been true more especially for some time past, and to such an extent, that we cannot make our contracts for the necessaries of life with any thing like a feeling of dependence upon the stipulations of our people. And they can find pretty good ground for an apology, when many

of them are in debt, and money is so scarce that it is supposed there is not enough in these counties to pay the taxes. But if this deficiency on their part arises measurably from a want of more fixed moral principles, they certainly *need* the Gospel, and withholding it will not be very likely to bring them up to their duty.

A Servant of the Church.

BEFORE I close this, I am under the painful necessity of saying a few words in relation to my support, which I would most gladly avoid. My family numbers nine, including myself and wife, with five daughters from the age of one year upwards. The health of my wife has been for some years so poor as to require assistance. * * * In our house, barely sided up with clapboards, one outside door, with some pieces of carpeting for inside doors, and some temporary partitions; we are trying to be comfortable, contented and happy. We have denied ourselves many of the necessaries of life to do thus much to our house. In order to render our habitation more comfortable, and to purchase a horse, (for the want of which my labors are much hindered in destitute neighborhoods, in and out of my parish,) requires an addition to my income. And now with a sense of my obligation for aid already received, and without which I could not have avoided great suffering in my family; permit me to inquire if your Board can do any thing for me in my present extremity? To avoid this question, I have gone through cold and wet with only about half the clothing I used to deem necessary and even indispensable to health. I think I am ready to endure privations with my brethren, as long as any without murmuring. But situated as I am, what shall I do? What *can* I do!

Notice.

OUR subscribers will perceive that we give the January and February Nos. together. This is done in order that the third article need not be delayed to a future No., nor be divided, as it was too long to be put into the January No. after the two articles which we were obliged to print before the third article came to hand. We at first thought of printing extra pages in the January No., but finally concluded to adopt the plan which has been followed.

THE
Calvinistic Magazine.

[NEW SERIES.]

"Earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints."

Vol. II.

March, 1847.

No. 3.

The Atonement.

"Now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself.—Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many."—Heb. IX. 26—28.

THE sacrifice of Christ in which he bore the sins of many, constitutes the atonement. We propose to consider,

I. The scriptural facts in relation to the atonement.

II. The adaptation of the atonement to the principles, nature, and design of the divine government.

I. The scriptural facts in relation to the atonement.

An atonement is somewhat offered to the protector of law, in the place of the punishment of the transgressor, which somewhat must be calculated to answer the end of punishment. It must be offered by one who sustains the office of High Priest by divine appointment; and the lawgiver must have agreed to accept it as an atonement, and the act of offering must be an act of obedience to the command of the Supreme Governor.

1st. When Israel was exposed to punishment for the sin of the golden calf, Moses said, "Ye have sinned a great sin, and now I will go up unto the Lord, peradventure I will make an atonement for your sin."—Exo. 32: 30. Moses hoped he might offer somewhat to the Lord, on the ground of which he might pardon their guilt.

2d. The atonement must be a somewhat, that the guardian of the public interest had agreed to accept. If the Supreme Ruler had not agreed to accept the somewhat as an atonement,

he could not be under any obligations to accept it, or to remit the punishment due to the transgressor. He might say, your oblation is vain, "who hath required this at your hand?"

3d. He who offers an atonement must sustain the office of high priest by divine appointment. "Every high priest taken from among men, is ordained for men in things pertaining to God, as was Aaron; so also Christ glorified not himself to be made an high priest. Called of God an high priest after the order of Melchisedec."—Heb. 5: 1, 4, 5, 10.

4th. The act of offering must be an act of obedience to the Supreme Ruler of the universe. Christ says, "Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life, that I might take it again. No man taketh it from me; but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down; and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father."—John 10: 17—18.

5th. The Gospel atonement consisted in the sufferings of Christ on the cross. "It is of necessity that this man have somewhat to offer."—Heb. 8: 3. "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us; for it is written, cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree."—Gal. 3: 13. "How much more shall the blood of Christ, who, through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge our consciences from dead works to serve the living God."—Heb. 9: 13—14. "Nor yet that he should offer himself often, as the high priest entereth into the holy place every year with the blood of others, for then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world; but now once in the end of the world he hath appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." "Christ hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust."—1 Pet. 3—18.

6th. The sufferings which Christ endured were not the penalty of the law; nor was the act of offering himself an act of obedience to any requirement of the moral law, for the following reasons:

1st. Christ made an atonement as high priest; but the moral law contains no provision for the office of high priest, nor for an atonement. Its only language is, he who obeys shall live, he who sinneth shall die.

2d. If the law appointed a high priest, and provided the

atonement, then the scheme of redemption was a legal scheme. No one well instructed in the law and testimony will venture to advocate so unscriptural a sentiment.

3d. The law could not command Christ, until he "was made of a woman, and made under the law." But Christ came under the law, to do a work that he agreed to do from eternity, before the law was given, and before he came under the law. "Lo, I come: in the volume of the book it is written of me; I delight to do thy will, O my God; yea, thy law is within my heart."—Ps. 40: 6—8.

4th. The ceremonial law was typical; yet it could not be typical of the moral law, as the moral law preceded the ceremonial; and a type points to something yet future. Then, of what was the ceremonial law typical? We answer, of the Gospel plan; and was a pattern of the heavenly plan, laid in the covenant of redemption. Accordingly Aaron was appointed a priest, not by the moral law, but by the ceremonial law; and the sacrifices were typical of the sufferings of Christ; and these sacrifices were instituted by the ceremonial law, and not by the moral law. Paul says, "There are priests who offer gifts, according to the law, who serve unto the example (*hupodeigma*, a typical exhibition, or representation,) and shadow of heavenly things, as Moses was admonished of God when he was about to make the tabernacle; for see, saith He, that thou make all things according to the pattern (*tupon*) shewed to thee in the mount."—Heb. 8: 4—5.

"It was therefore necessary that the pattern (*hupodeigma*) of things in the heavens should be purified with these; but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these."—Heb. 9: 23. The ceremonial law, not the moral law, was "purified" by the blood of bulls and goats; but the *law of faith*, the plan of redemption, with the priceless sacrifice of Jesus Christ.

5th. In a just government, the penalty of the law cannot be inflicted until trial is had before an authorized court, guilt proved, and the court passes sentence; then the sentence must be carried into execution by a legal officer. Was Christ tried before any authorized court? Was guilt proved on him? Did any legal officer of the divine government inflict the sentence

of the moral law? Every reader will feel he is at no loss to answer these questions correctly.

6th. Chrst himself is the only authorized judge in the court of God's moral government, he will raise the dead and preside in the day of judgment. "The Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son."—John 5: 22. He will say to the righteous, "Come ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world."—Matt. 25: 34. "Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire."—Matt. 25: 41. Paul says, that "he shall descend in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the Gospel;—who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power."—1 Thes. 1: 7—9. This is the penalty of the law, and this only. Was Jesus Christ ever brought before the court and judge, (himself,) tried and condemned, and "*punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power?*"

7th. If Christ suffered the whole penalty of the law, it would be more suffering than the whole race of man will have suffered throughout the ages of eternity. For no period will come in eternity, in which it can be said, the whole penalty has now been endured. Then whatever amount Christ suffered more than could ever be suffered by those who finally perish, is so much loss to the universe.

8th. If Christ suffered the penalty for mankind, then it would be unjust to inflict it on any of mankind. If the whole debt has been paid, it is unjust to exact it again or any part of it.

9th. The atonement was made for all mankind. Isaiah says, "The Lord laid on him the iniquity of us all."—53: 6. Paul says, "He that spared not his own son, but delivered him up for us all."—Rom. 8: 32.

In his second letter to the Corinthians, he says, "We thus judge if one died for all, then were all dead." It follows, if there is a part of mankind for whom he did not die, then that part was not dead; but the apostle's design was to show that all were dead, by the fact, that Christ died for all. He adds, "And that he died for all, that they which live, should not

henceforth live to themselves, but unto him which died for them."—2 Cor. 5: 14, 15.

In his second letter to Timothy, he says, "One Mediator—the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all."—2 Tim. 2: 6.

In his epistle to the Hebrews, "Jesus—crowned with glory and honor, that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man."—2: 9.

John in his first epistle says, "He is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only; but also for the sins of the whole world."—1 John 2: 2.

The plain and obvious meaning of these texts cannot be misunderstood. The attempt to alter the obvious meaning of these texts, by saying they mean *all the elect*, and *the elect world*, is rebuked by every just principle of interpretation.

The appointment of Christ to the priesthood; his agreement to make an atonement for all mankind; the agreement of the Father to accept his sufferings on the cross as an atonement, must be traced to the covenant of redemption, and not to any provisions or requirements of the moral law.

The three persons of the Godhead being co-equal, and co-essential, there exists no inherent right in one person to command another; the right must necessarily be founded on covenant agreement. For the same reason, one person had no right to send another, as the Father sent the son, only by agreement. Nor could the son claim from the Father the acceptance of his sufferings as an atonement, nor a reward for his obedience unto death, only on the ground of covenant agreement.

We have now given some of the leading scriptural facts in relation to the atonement—facts that will fill heaven with delight, and praises to the triune Jehovah—facts that ought to be hailed with acclamations of joy and praise by all on earth, who may hear them from the Gospel.

II. The adaptation of the atonement to the principles, nature, and design of the Divine government.

1. God must have had some motive worthy of himself, in creating the universe, and in instituting a moral government over intelligent creatures. This motive alone gives the true principles and design of God's moral government. No motive

more worthy of Jehovah can be conceived of, than that he might have a vast theatre on which he could exercise his almighty power, his infinite wisdom, his boundless goodness, his justice, truth, and mercy; and in the exercise of these glorious perfections, he might perpetuate his own infinite felicity. This is the highest possible motive that could move the mind of the eternal Jehovah. Connected with this motive, is the design to make his intelligent universe as holy, as happy, and as extensive as almighty power could make it under the direction of unerring wisdom, and just such a universe as would fully satisfy infinite benevolence. These objects taken together, make up the idea, *the public good*; God and his universe are the whole public; and the only conceivable motive in the Divine mind, may be expressed by the words, **THE PUBLIC GOOD**. This comprehends,

1st. The perpetuation of God's infinitely full felicity, by the exercise of his glorious perfections.

2d. The highest amount of creature holiness and happiness.

3d. The clearest manifestation of God's being and perfections, for the advantage of his vast intelligent system.

4th. The intelligent system must have indubitable evidence that God has a regard for the *public good*, as intense as the object is great. That he has an infinite abhorrence to all opposition to the public good, and is disposed to punish such opposition with adequate punishment, and make the malignity and turpitude of sin manifest to all; and is determined to accomplish the design and *end* of his government without fail.

When God had created the universe, and organized the best possible government, he, as became him, took the place of Supreme Governor—published a law founded on his own supremacy, the capacity of his creatures, and their relation to him as Creator, Preserver, and rightful Lord and Sovereign. The law was calculated to secure the public good, in every particular, and was therefore "*holy, just, and good.*" The government was not instituted for the sake of the law, but the law was enacted for the sake of the *end* proposed by the government. If the law fails to secure that end, the fault will be entirely in the subject; as infinite wisdom and goodness could make the law no better. But the subject transgresses the law, and falls under its curse. If the penalty is executed, one of

two consequences must follow. 1st. The transgressors must be sent forthwith to hell. Had God sent our first parents to hell, it would have been the end of the human race. 2d. Had they been permitted to propagate the species, it would have been propagating sin and misery. Either of these results would have thwarted God's design in creating the universe.—But as the object of the government was the *public good*, and the design of the law was to be the means of effecting the object, if these means fail, because of sin, such is the design of the government, as to allow of any means that will secure the end. And this fact is the very principle where the atonement finds its appropriate place—its rationale. And it is essential to an atonement, that it secures the end of the government in such a manner as to make it safe for the Supreme Governor to pardon the transgressor, and to make the punishment of the penitent sinner unnecessary. Here it may be proper to state an objection to this view of the atonement, that exists in many minds, namely:—If the work and offices of Christ had their origin in the covenant of redemption, and not in the moral law, then it would follow, that Christ neither obeyed the law nor suffered as a legal substitute. Of course the law has not had its claims, either in obedience or penalty, on the sinner's behalf; yea, it has had no hand in the Gospel scheme. Yet Christ honored and magnified the law. How, then, can his atonement be a proper ground of pardon for sin, which is a transgression of law? Or can the sufferings of an innocent person, who is not a legal substitute, impress the minds of the subjects, that God hates sin, and that he will punish the sinner? Or, that God has the highest regard for the *end* of the government, and will secure it in the best manner; seeing the law that was designed to effect it is overlooked and left out of sight entirely?

Many, to avoid this supposed difficulty, allege that Christ, as a legal substitute, obeyed the law for his people, and suffered the penalty. In this way the law was satisfied, having had its literal and full claims—the whole debt having been paid by the substitute.

There are insuperable objections to this theory. 1st. The moral obligation we are under to God, does not admit of a substitute. 2d. If the debt is paid, the penalty suffered, it

would take away all ground of pardon, and of the exercise of mercy on the part of God the Father.

1st. Moral obligation does not admit of substitution. All rational creatures are under moral obligations to love and obey God; but if Jesus Christ, as a substitute, rendered all the love and obedience that were due according to law, the original party would be released from the obligation, both in law and in reason. Law cannot demand again that which a substitute appointed by its own authority has rendered, and which the law has accepted. But can a rational creature be released from the obligation to love and obey God? Can a child be released from the obligation to love and obey a kind and good parent, by engaging a substitute to love and obey the parent in his stead? The supposition is absurd.

2d. That Christ made an atonement by suffering the penalty as a substitute, is adding absurdity to absurdity. Suppose you were drafted to serve a tour of duty, but a substitute is accepted in your place according to law. This substitute performs every duty of a soldier faithfully, he does not fail in one jot or tittle. Yet the government determines to punish you for not rendering the service yourself, although the substitute was legally accepted; no reason will be heard; the rulers have the power and you must suffer. Your substitute is moved with compassion, and agrees to suffer the penalty in your room.—He suffers the penalty. You are then told, if you will fall on your knees before the governor, and with a penitent heart plead for mercy, you will be pardoned; if not, you must suffer the penalty yourself. Why suffer the penalty? All has been done that the law required. Still they inflict on you the penalty. Such a procedure would be condemned by the common sense of mankind, as a tissue of folly, madness, injustice, and savage cruelty. And yet this is the view given of the atonement, and called orthodoxy.

Whatever secures the public good, especially in the 4th particular, will honor and magnify the law; and may be accepted as an atonement, according to the principles and design of the divine government, and according to the dictates of reason. This may be illustrated as follows:

At the time that Goliath of Gath defied the armies of Israel, let us suppose it was discovered that Jonathan, son of Saul,

had been the guilty cause of all the distress—he had held a secret correspondence with the lords of the Philistines, and had laid his treasonable plans with profound cunning, to betray the Israelites into the hands of their enemies. When David arrived at the camp, Jonathan had been tried, condemned, and was about to be executed. David loved and pitied him; and proposed to die in his place. The proposal was rejected for the best of reasons. The *public good* would not be promoted by the sacrifice of a valuable life, instead of the life of a traitor. Nor had David any right to dispose of his life in this way.—Moreover, the law did not admit of a substitute.

David makes a second proposal; That he would take chosen men of Israel, and, sword in hand, attack the Philistines, and do what he could to defeat them. This is also rejected as an atonement for the supposed treason of Jonathan; because this might be the duty of David anyhow; and there would be nothing in this course, to impress on the minds of the people the baseness of treason, and the justness of the punishment threatened by law; and so far as atonement was concerned, it would have no bearing on the public good.

David, still intent on Jonathan's deliverance, again proposes; I can defeat Jonathan's treasonable designs, and deliver Israel by speaking a word, or waving my shepherd's crook. This is also rejected, on the ground, that if Jonathan were pardoned for a thing so easily done, it will leave the impression on the public mind, that the guilt of treason is a small thing, and that the legal punishment is unjust and cruel, of course produce an effect the very reverse of *public good*, without effecting one thing stated in the 4th particular.

David makes a last proposal, namely:—if the King, with whom is entrusted the public good, will commission and appoint me to the office and work, I can entirely counteract Jonathan's treason, subdue the enemy, and so break their power, that they can invade the coasts of Israel no more; but it will be at immense toil and sacrifice; and just as I am about to finish my work, I must fall into the hands of the enemy, and suffer an ignominious death. Saul, advised by the prophet Samuel, agrees to this last proposal, and reasons as follows:—I am the guardian of the public good; if Jonathan is executed, it will be for the sake of this good; and the public good, by

his death, is secured, simply because the law is honored, and treason stamped with infamy, and the subjects will be solemnly warned to shun the crime of treason. But the treasonable plan has been so well laid with the Philistines, that they will execute it, even if Jonathan dies, and Israel will be ruined.—But if I accept of David's proposal, the treason will be defeated, the enemy conquered, and Israel will dwell in perpetual safety; while the clearest evidence will be given that the *public good* is my sole object; and if Jonathan repent and is pardoned for the sake of David's suffering and death, no countenance will be given to treason; nor the claims of the law laid aside;—yea, it will be honored. And as the object of the law was to secure the public good, but a case has occurred where the public good cannot be secured by the execution of its penalty, except to a comparatively small extent, the law will rejoice to see that good secured, by means it could not reach.

But if David's mediation is rejected, all Israel will say, that I have been regardless of their interest, and it is no longer fit that I should be entrusted with the public welfare. Every heart and every voice of all Israel cries out, let David's proposal be accepted as an atonement, although there is no legal substitution; yet there is propitiation and atonement, which answers an unspeakably higher good, than the execution of the penalty.

It may still be said by some, we can easily see that the supposed work of David might be a safe ground of pardon, for the supposed treason of Jonathan, and by pardoning him for the sake of what his mediator had done, that neither the law, nor the rights of the government, nor the public interest was sacrificed,—but honored and secured. But we do not yet see how Christ's sufferings, those of an innocent and holy person, would show God's abhorrence of sin, its turpitude and ill-desert, or defeat the treason of sinners, or honor the law, or secure the public good. Nor do we see "how sin may be pardoned for Christ's sake, without giving such conceptions of God's character, as would encourage disobedience, and thereby weaken the influence of the divine government."—*Watson*. He adds, it "is a problem very difficult of solution."

The turpitude of sin was always seen in transgressing a law holy, just, and good. The practical language of transgression

is—God, in proposing his own glory as the supreme object of his law and government, proposed an end unworthy of a God—also, the law he gave, as the means of effecting the end of his government, is unjust, and not fit to be obeyed. Every sinner feels that his own interest is properly his supreme object, and hates and opposes that good that God has said is the supreme object of his government, and would overturn God's government, were it in his power. Had the Saviour proposed to atone for such guilt by miracle, or by example, or by instruction, or by them all, it could not have been accepted as an atonement, for the plain reason, it would not have shown the four things included in the public good. But he proposed to become incarnate, and live among the traitors, so that he may embody the glory and excellence of the Godhead in his own person, so that the divine character and law may become, as it were, visible and tangible to the race of man. This very exhibition of the divine character in the person of the Son of God; and the disinterestedness and holiness of the law as seen in his life and doctrines, excited the enmity of man to rage and madness, to defame and persecute; and to inflict tortures and death. His holy life had a direct tendency to promote the public good in some respects; and prepare him to come to the cross as the spotless Lamb of God, to be a sacrifice for sin. The rebellion of the heart led man so to treat the Saviour, that he was "a man of sorrow, acquainted with grief, his visage was more marred than any man." While he displayed the spotless purity of God, the perfect holiness of humanity, and ardent devotion to the law of God, and the *public good*, the rage of his enemies became implacable. A vile traitor is bribed to betray him—he is mocked—scourged—crowned with thorns—a mock trial is had—his judgment taken away, and he condemned to the cruel lingering death of the cross. Can it be doubted, whether sin has the ill-desert that the penalty of the law makes it have, by threatening, as a punishment, *eternal death*? Would not the same wickedness that thus treated the Son of God, dethrone Jehovah, and put an end to his existence, had it power? Can such guilt be forgiven, on any ground except an atonement of infinite merit? And how will God show his infinite abhorrence of sin, and that his re-

gard for the public good is as intense, as the object is great and worthy?

It pleased the Father, the guardian of the public weal, by the instrumentality of wicked men, to bruise his well-beloved Son, and put him to grief.—Isaiah, 53: 10. “Being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken and by wicked hands have crucified and slain.”—Acts, 2: 23. But his agony in the garden, his exclamation on the cross, showed that he suffered more than the mere instrumentality of men or devils could inflict; as many of his feeble followers have endured the cross triumphing; while the Saviour cried out, “My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?”

We may not be able to explain in all respects how the Father forsook him; yet we offer a solution in part not unreasonable.

By the atonement, a theatre was to be erected, high as the throne of God, broad as immensity, and lasting as eternity, on which Jehovah might put forth all his wisdom, benevolence, justice, power and mercy, and so perpetuate his own infinitely full felicity. O, what consequences of inconceivable glory are pendent upon the sufferings of the man Christ Jesus! On his sufferings depend the questions, whether the universe is to enjoy the clearest displays of God’s perfections? Whether divine power, goodness and mercy will have opportunity to produce the greatest amount of creature holiness and happiness, which in heaven will ever be approximating to the holiness and happiness of God? His death is the only hope of the world. Numbers are now in heaven on the faith of the atonement. Unnumbered millions are to be redeemed from sin and ruin if his work is accomplished according to covenant; and the ruin of the finally impenitent unspeakably aggravated. If the human soul of Christ had clear and extensive views (as there can be no doubt) of these infinitely weighty consequences depending on the way he would endure the sufferings on the cross; and, at the same time, he had no such evidence of divine aid, as imparted preternatural courage, and holy triumph, that would raise him above the effects of the foregoing views; but feels, that all these effects and results depend on the sufferings of a human soul and body, well might he pray, “if it be possible let this cup pass from me!”—and is it any won-

der that his sweat was, as it were, great drops of blood falling down to the ground; or, that he should exclaim on the cross, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" Who can conceive the intensity and the amount of sufferings the Son of God endured, when he bore the sins of our race in his body on the tree! The Supreme Ruler of the universe could not have pardoned sin for sufferings less intense. It required the whole of the bitter cup to be drunk to the dregs, to express God's infinite opposition to sin—to justify the fearful penalty of the law—to shew the hell-deserving nature of sin, and to stand as an eternal witness for God, that he would maintain his government, and produce the greatest amount of *public good*.

We have now taken a brief view of some of the leading Bible facts in relation to the atonement, and shown, that the design and object of God's moral government was the *public good*;—and we have shown what the *public good* comprehended. And also, we have shown, that, as the law failed to secure the public good, because man had transgressed, the design and object of the Government was such, as to admit an atonement that answers all the ends of government, as well as the punishment of the transgressor would answer these ends;—and we think the sufferings of Christ clearly answered these ends in the best possible manner. This view of the subject relieves it of all the difficulties arising out of the debt and credit plan, and out of the theory of legal substitution, which, Symington admits, is liable to great difficulties,—and we would add, unanswerable difficulties. The brevity we were obliged to observe, has confined us to a mere statement of facts, almost without comment or illustration. Yet enough has been said to show that the atonement is the greatest of God's works; it encircles all his other works with a *halo* of light and glory.

"God in the person of his Son
Has all his mightiest works outdone."

The atonement is the only hope of a lost world;—ample enough for the salvation of the whole race—yea, for the salvation of ten thousand such worlds. How sure a foundation for the hope of every penitent believer! But how shall the impenitent sinner escape, who neglects so great a salvation?

C. N.

For the Calvinistic Magazine.

The Anti-Calvinist's Liturgy.

—
BY ANTI-CALVIN.
—

WHEREAS, it is known that we Anti-Calvinists have often been charged with "preaching one thing and praying another,"—with "telling one story to man and another to God:" And whereas it cannot be denied that our prayers in too many instances have appeared to contradict our sermons: And whereas it is asserted by our opponents that we cannot pray in strict accordance with the principles we maintain; as an evidence of which they allege that no forms of devotion have ever yet appeared in which those principles have been carried out: Now, therefore, in order that all these reproaches may be forever rolled away, BE IT KNOWN, that I have with great care and labor, excogitated a complete system of devotion, suited to our creed, by the aid of which our prayers and our sermons, our hearts and our heads will hereafter be brought into delightful harmony, and the mouths of our adversaries be forever stopped.

Anxious to communicate the fruits of this important discovery, I hasten without further preamble to produce a few choice specimens from the new Liturgy, accompanied with explanatory remarks.

SPECIMEN 1.—It is one of our favorite notions, that all persons possess sufficient ability, both moral and physical, to repent, believe and become holy,—in a word, to do all that God requires. Now it may at the first view appear difficult to frame a prayer which will exactly coincide with this doctrine. For as our opponents allege, "it is worse than idle to ask the Lord to *enable* us to perform any duty, if we already possess all the ability that is needed. On the other hand," say they, "to pray for an increase of spiritual strength, is a plain admission that we have not all the strength that is necessary."—Such is their reasoning, and the worst of all is, that the people begin to think they are more than half right. Therefore, instead of encouraging sinners to pray for ability, our new Liturgy will teach them to address their Maker in the following language:

“Lord! Thou hast already bestowed upon each and every one of us sufficient ability to will and to do all that thou requirest. We need not therefore ask thee for more. In this respect we are rich and increased with goods, and have need of nothing.”

This will cut the matter short, and let the people see that we sincerely believe what we profess. If any one object, however, that this prayer does not agree with the Scriptures, I answer, that is altogether a different affair: Our present business is to make our prayers agree with our creed.

SPECIMEN 2.—Our Calvinian opponents, as is well known, believe in Effectual Calling. That is, while they admit that there is a common call, by which all are invited to the gospel feast, they also believe in a special internal call, by which sinners are effectually influenced to come. We on our part deny the existence of any such distinction. We maintain that God has called all men alike, and that it depends on themselves whether the call prove effectual or not. Now, a prayer that will nicely adapt itself to this part of our creed has long been a great desideratum in Anti-Calvinistic literature. For want of a suitable form to guide “young beginners,” some have almost prayed themselves into Calvinists. Indeed it is quite common with our friends to follow up a solemn sermon, with earnest prayer to God that he would “send the truth home to the hearts of sinners, and by the mighty power of the Holy Spirit, give *effect* to the call of the Gospel.” Now what is all this, but asking the Lord to make the call effectual? And if He grant the request, he will *effectually call* some of the sinners present.

To guard us hereafter against all such mortifying mistakes and inconsistencies, our new Liturgy presents the following form, to be pronounced by Anti-Calvinists after sermon:

“Lord! These sinners have now heard the Gospel call; and we do not ask Thee to give it efficiency, since that would be ‘effectual calling.’ We thank Thee that Thou hast called all men alike, and hast left it to themselves whether the call prove effectual. Therefore, all we have to ask of Thee is, that Thou wouldst let these sinners alone, to act according to the self-determination of their own wills. Amen.”

If any one surmises that this prayer will not be relished by

our good people, I will only say, that if their hearts are as Anti-Calvinistic as their creed, we shall have nothing to fear on that score.

SPECIMEN 3.—The Calvinists believe in what they call *victorious* or *Almighty* grace, by which they mean that the grace of God is sufficient to overcome the utmost resistance of the human heart, and make the most obstinate sinner “willing in the day of His power.” For our part we abhor the sentiment as leading to “irresistible grace,” and as involving the destruction of the supremacy of Free-will. We boldly maintain that sinners may, and often do, make such powerful resistance to the grace of God, that the Holy Spirit cannot subdue their hearts by any means consistent with their free moral agency. This being the case, our Calvinian opponents tell us that we cannot pray for all men. For say they, “if there are sinners who cannot be subdued by the power of Divine grace, it is useless and absurd to pray for their conversion. On the other hand, to pray that the Lord would convert sinners, plainly implies that He can do this, in full consistency with the principles of his moral government.”

I confess I would not know how to refute this reasoning; and so the only alternative left, is, to straighten out our prayers to the line of our creed—using the following form prescribed by our Liturgy:

“Lord! we beseech Thee to bow the hearts of these rebellious sinners, and bring them to the foot of the cross, provided Thou canst do so without an infringement of their liberty, of which we have very serious doubts. But, Lord, we would rather see them go on in impenitence, than that Thou shouldst touch our darling idol, the self-determining power of man’s will. Lord! we will not ask Thee to convert and save all sinners, for we believe there are many whose obdurate hearts cannot be overcome by any influence of Thy grace. All we ask, therefore, is, that those may be converted who do not make too great resistance. Amen.”

This will be very clear and explicit.

SPECIMEN 4.—We Anti-Calvinists hold, that if God had not bestowed upon all men, in their fallen state, grace sufficient for their salvation, He could not, without gross injustice, have held them accountable for their conduct. In other words, we

hold that justice required that grace should be conferred on all men, in the circumstances in which they were left by the fall. Now, if this be true, we should not give thanks for divine grace; for why give thanks for that which is a mere debt due to justice? Accordingly, our new Liturgy will teach us to pray as follows:

“Almighty God! we adore Thee for the equity of Thine administration. Impelled by a sense of justice to our race, Thou didst bestow upon us that grace which was due to us in the condition in which we were left by the fall, by the faithful use of which we attain everlasting salvation.”

This will show the people that we are consistent.

SPECIMEN 5.—Every body knows how strongly we object to the Calvinian notion, that salvation is entirely the work of God. We hold it as an established principle, that man does a very great part of the work himself; for he effects his salvation, or “gets religion,” by the faithful use of that grace which God could not justly have withheld. Hence, we should not, like the Calvinists, give all the glory to God; seeing a large share is due to ourselves. Our new Liturgy provides for this emergency, by teaching us to pray as follows:

“Lord! we thank Thee that Thou dost not claim all the glory of our salvation. We thank Thee that Thou dost leave us to accomplish a large (if not the largest) part of the work ourselves. Unto ourselves, therefore, be glory forever and ever. Amen.”

Thus, we should not be afraid to give glory where it is due.

SPECIMEN 6.—We Anti-Calvinists teach, that whenever sinners improve *native grace*, by making the first movement toward the Lord, then, and not till then, will He bestow more grace. It follows that it is useless to pray for sinners till they have done something toward their own conversion. And there are doubtless many in our assemblies, who have done little or nothing. On the other hand, there are some who have done considerable toward their own salvation. They have, for instance, kneeled, or lain down on an altar of straw, or have given up their names to serve the Lord on trial. If, therefore, we would adhere to our creed, we must not pray for all men, but carefully distinguish the different classes of sinners, thus:

“Lord, we beseech Thee to look down upon these misera-

ble sinners. Many of them, Thou seest, have made no movement toward Thee, but are still altogether careless. As they have done nothing for themselves, we cannot ask Thee to do any thing for them, for Thou wilt not bestow more grace upon men, till they improve what they have. But, Lord, here are other sinners who have done much to render themselves fit objects of Thy mercy. As they have well improved what was given them, therefore we beseech Thee now to convert and save their souls. Amen."

If it be said that the poor careless sinners are in greater need of our prayers than any others, I answer, we must pray as we preach.

SPECIMEN 7.—It is held by our Calvinian opponents, that God, in his election of some to life and glory, was prompted by his own spontaneous mercy, and not by any goodness in the creature. On the contrary, we hold that God chose, or elected some rather than others, because he foresaw in them a predisposition to faith and good works;—in other words, that the ground of our election was something good in ourselves. Of course the praise of our election belongs to ourselves. And yet Paul directs us to give thanks to God for our election.—2 Thess. 2: 13. Who would think it possible to get over this difficulty? Yet our new Liturgy masters it easily. Look at the following form:

"Lord, Thou didst elect us to salvation, because Thou didst from all eternity choose to know that we would not be as other men are. We thank Thee that Thou didst choose to foresee that we would improve native grace better than others. Thou didst choose to see something in us which would lead us to faith and holiness, and on account of this superior goodness in us, Thou didst elect us in preference to other sinners. Unto ourselves, therefore, be the praise of our election, world without end. Amen."

And here we see the advantage of Dr. Clarke's theory of fore-knowledge.

SPECIMEN 8.—We Anti-Calvinists contend that the Lord, on the whole, bestows as much upon one man as on another.—We believe that if God should grant to one sinner such a measure of grace as would secure his conversion, and not bestow the same upon all, he would be acting from a principle of par-

tiality and arbitrary injustice. Now, the Calvinists allege, that, holding these sentiments, we cannot pray for the conversion of any man. "For," say they, "if you pray for the conversion of one sinner, and God shall grant your request, but shall not convert all other sinners, He will make an immense difference among men. He will renew one soul and leave others unrenewed, which is the very thing you denounce as partiality. So again," say they, "if you pray for all the present inhabitants of the earth, and God, in answer to your petition, brings all men to Christ, He will be doing infinitely more for the existing, than for the former generations of men; and that is what you call arbitrary injustice. And how can you ask God to act upon a principle which you profess so much to abhor?"

To obviate these serious difficulties, I have, after much study, hit upon the following form, which chimes in delightfully with our creed:

"Lord, we will not ask Thee to bestow upon some, what is not equally bestowed upon all: be it far from Thee to be influenced by such partiality! We will not, therefore, ask Thee to convert these sinners, unless Thou shalt also convert all other sinners. We will not even ask Thee to revive Thy work here, unless Thou shalt revive religion in all other places. Much less would we ask Thee to convert all the present generation of men, for that would be partiality on the largest possible scale. All we request is, that that Thou wouldst bestow upon these sinners just so much as in similar circumstances Thou hast bestowed upon all other sinners, in all ages of the world, but not a particle more. And this we know Thou wilt grant at any rate. Amen."

SPECIMEN 9.—The Calvinists say, that the number of the finally redeemed, ultimately depends on the will of God. "If," say they, "it had depended on the will of man, not one would have accepted salvation, and thus, Christ would have shed his blood in vain. It therefore devolved upon God Himself to decide whether any, and if many, how many, should be subdued by the power of his grace." Against so horrible a conclusion we Anti Calvinists solemnly protest. We boldly maintain that the number of the redeemed depends upon the will of

man. Accordingly, our new Liturgy, in the true spirit of Anti-Calvinism, teaches us to pray as follows:

“Lord, we thank Thee that Thou hast left it to Thy rebellious creatures to decide the most important questions that ever can arise under Thy moral government. We thank Thee that it is left to the depraved wills of sinners to determine whether Thy son Jesus Christ shall ever see of the travail of his soul, and whether Thou shalt have a people on earth for Thy name’s glory. We praise Thee for this wise constitution of things, for we believe that thus the number of the redeemed will be greater than it would otherwise have been.”

SPECIMEN 10.—We abhor the Calvinistic notion of Reprobation, according to which God passes by sinners in their unbelief, and ordains them to dishonor and wrath for their sin. This, in our view, would be a proceeding worthy only of an “inhuman, merciless tyrant.” Yet, some of our party, as sure as they attempt to pray, will confess to God, “that if He had long ago passed them by in the open field of rebellion, it would have been just and right.” Nay, they will sometimes wonder “that God had not long since left them to go on in impenitence and sink into eternal woe.” Expressions like these, evidently involve all the horrors of Calvinistic reprobation. Therefore, for my sake, for your own sake, for your party’s sake, put a full stop to such confessions, and make use of the following form, contained in the Anti-Calvinist’s Liturgy:

“Lord, we adore Thee that Thou hast dealt with us according to principles of equity and justice. Thou didst not pass us by in our unbelief, but hast kept us to this day the objects of Thy mercy, because Thou art just and holy.”

SPECIMEN 11.—Our Calvinian opponents say, that the perseverance of believers is rendered certain by the promised grace of God ever continued to them. We denounce this doctrine as soul-ruining in its tendency. We maintain that our perseverance depends on our own faithfulness, and that any thing that removes the uncertainty of man’s salvation, is injurious to practical Godliness. Now, the Calvinists assert, that on these principles we cannot pray for persevering grace at all. “On the one hand,” say they, “if your perseverance depends on yourselves, then you must not look to God for it, but to yourselves. On the other hand,” they add, “if you pray that

you may persevere, and God, in answer to your request, makes it certain that you will persevere, then what becomes of the 'glorious uncertainty' of salvation, when the Calvinistic principle is fully realized in your case?" To obviate this difficulty, I have, with great labor, excogitated the following form:

"Lord, we will not ask Thee to keep us from falling, for our standing depends on ourselves. We thank Thee that the "Direct Witness" assures us merely that we are pardoned, not that we shall certainly be saved. And we do not ask that we may certainly persevere in holiness, for that would be carrying out the soul-destroying doctrine of the Calvinists. We thank Thee that it depends upon our own faithfulness whether we are finally saved. Therefore, all we ask is, that Thou wouldst keep those who keep themselves. Amen."

SPECIMEN 12.—The Calvinists believe that God worketh all things after the counsel of His own will;—in other words, that He possesses a perfect control over all his creatures, and all their actions, insomuch, that nothing can take place which He has not willed to do, or to permit. For our part, we detest this doctrine, as involving all the horrors of fatalism. Yet, many Anti-Calvinists, as soon as they begin to pray, slide into the doctrine of their opponents, and betray the grossest inconsistency. For why should we ask God to restrain the power and malice of the wicked, if God cannot control their actions? Why pray that He would put a stop to the progress of iniquity? Why, indeed, ask the Lord to impose any restraint whatever upon wicked men or devils, if he cannot control them at pleasure? To guard us effectually against these inconsistencies, let us use the following form, in which the whole subject receives a true Anti-Calvinistic touch:

"Lord, we rejoice that thy dominion over the moral world is so limited that Thou canst not work all things according to Thine own will. We rejoice that Thou canst not control the actions of Thy creatures without doing violence to their wills, which we have no fear that Thou wilt ever do. We do not, therefore, ask Thee to restrain the wrath of wicked men and devils. We do not even ask Thee to keep us from sinning against Thee. All we have to ask is, that Thou wouldst send the doctrine of our opponents, the Calvinists, to the pit, whence it came."

I had intended to furnish a prayer for the use of "perfect

Christians," but owing to the spreading leaven of Calvinism, so few of that sort of beings can be found, that such a prayer would seldom be called for. For the present, let me say to such Christians, whenever you have occasion to use the Lord's prayer, be sure to omit the words, "and forgive us our trespasses."

A. G. F.

A Narrative of the state of Religion

WITHIN THE BOUNDS OF THE SYNOD OF TENNESSEE.

THE SYNOD OF TENNESSEE

To the several Churches under its care—Greeting:

VERY DEAR BRETHREN IN THE LORD:—We are grateful to God, that being again assembled "with one accord" in annual Synod, we have the privilege of laying before you a brief narrative of the state of religion within our bounds. You will readily agree with us, that it would be as gratifying to our own hearts as it would be a source of rejoicing to you, could we come before you in the form of this narrative, with the cheering tidings that the last year had been "a year of the right hand of the Most High" in our Churches—of the remarkable outpouring of his Spirit—of the signal and general displays of His saving power—of the great enlargement of His spiritual kingdom;—yea more, of the absolute triumph of His cause over the present generation of men in our extensive boundary. The fact, however, that we are not permitted *thus* to visit you, and to rejoice with you over the completion of our mutual work, in co-operation with Him who is "mighty in power and excellent in working," and "who worketh all things after the counsel of His own will," is no sufficient reason why we should not contemplate together, with devout gratitude, to the Author and Finisher of all good, the progress of the year, and thus gather strength from the experience of the past, for the labors of the future.

Until it shall be proclaimed in heaven that "the kingdoms of this world have become the kingdom of our Lord and of his

Christ," it will always be true that the devout child of God, in contemplating the state, and inspecting the doings of men, will find enough of stupidity, carnal security and forgetfulness of God in the world, and of spiritual death and devotion to forbidden objects and pursuits in the Church, to cause his heart to sink within him; while it calls for self-examination, abasement of soul, and a quiet, holy, and active "waiting upon God." In view of the much that has been amiss in us during the past year—of the comparatively inconsiderable progress which we have made, and of the much that yet remains to be done before it shall be announced that "the tabernacle of God is with men," it becomes us all to mantle ourselves in sackcloth and sit in ashes. While we trust all will do this, we, as office-bearers in the Church of Christ may be permitted, in reply to the question which comes up from the thousands of Israel, "Watchmen, what of the night?"—to lay before you a few of the more prominent items of progress during the last year. They are such as the following:

The organization of new Churches; an addition to the number of our Ministers, and candidates for the sacred office; a growing sense on the part of our people of the duty and importance of erecting large, permanent, neat and convenient places for the worship of the Great King;—(the Churches at Kingsport, Strawberry Plains, Jonesborough, and Dhlonega, are worthy of special commendation for their example in this particular;) the general and faithful administration of the word and ordinances. The cause of Temperance, Sunday Schools, and Bible distribution, has been prosecuted with commendable zeal and encouraging success. The claims of benevolence have been heard, and in several of our Churches an increasing spirit of liberality is apparent;—the Churches under the care of Holston Presbytery are entitled to the precedence in this particular. Encouraging, and in many places increased attendance upon, and interest in, the means of grace have been observed. In a few instances we are permitted to record the more remarkable displays of Divine power, in the awakening of numbers, and the hopeful conversion of many. The Churches most signally favored with seasons of refreshing and enlargement, are, New Prospect, Sinking Creek, Mount Zion, Timber Ridge, and Meadow Creek. We would also

notice an increased sense of the importance of having Ministers regularly installed over their respective charges, according to an original element of Presbyterian order, based upon the word of God, and upon the mutual relationships and dependencies of men—the rights and interests of ministers and people—and, by the test of centuries, proved to be the only way of developing, maintaining, and defending those great truths and principles which are “in order to Godliness,” and of applying that system of order which Christ has established in his Church. We would most earnestly recommend that the several Churches under our care, which are regularly supplied by the Ministers of their own choice, reduce this leading feature of Presbyterianism to as speedy practice as convenient. The completion of a subscription of more than fifteen thousand dollars, for the purpose of founding a Professorship of Sacred Literature in the College under the care of Synod, is another mark of progress. By the success of this truly noble and christian effort, (a result which contributes equal honor upon the indefatigable Agent, and upon the friends of literature and of Presbyterianism in the bounds of our Synod,) greatly increased advantages will hereafter be afforded to all who may wish to fit themselves, at our College, for the high functions of the sacred office.

We mention farther, as not the least encouraging evidence of our onward progress, a growing love for the great doctrines of the Bible, sometimes called “The Doctrines of the Reformation,” “The Doctrines of Grace,” or, more familiarly, “The Doctrines of the Calvinistic System,” or simply “Calvinism.” A reviving sense of the divinity and paramount importance of the great and precious doctrines which compose this system, gave rise to a memorial from the last Synod to the General Assembly, in behalf of an issue of Doctrinal Tracts for general circulation;—and subsequently, to the revival of the Calvinistic Magazine in our own bounds, that every family might “eat that which is good, and delight itself in fatness.” Permit us, dear brethren, to encourage your adhesion to this work, and your united influence in extending its circulation, and increasing its usefulness. It is now in its infancy. Its revivers have manifested a highly commendable love for much that is dear to us all, in its resuscitation. They have incurred consi-

derable personal expense. They have a right to expect our hearty co-operation. The cause of truth demands that we sustain it. Denominational consistency requires it. The united action and zeal of the patrons of counter publications, call us to this work. And more than all, our oath of allegiance to the King of Zion. The God of free, unmerited, sovereign grace and mercy, demands it at our hands. The work *can* be made as valuable and interesting as the former series, and if liberally patronized *will* be. But what if it should not? Have the friends of religious truth in all this country determined to sustain *no* publication that is not, in all respects, *just what* that series of passing excellence was? *We will not believe it.*

In connection with this item of influence, we would not omit to mention, and still farther to encourage in our bounds, the labors of the Colporteur, in circulating the highly evangelical and spiritual publications of the American Tract Society. We would rejoice to know that every family was furnished with these cheap, interesting and invaluable publications.

In view of this brief and very imperfect review of the past, dear brethren, let us enter upon the coming year with greatly increased purpose of heart, *to live for God.* The last year removed two of our beloved ministerial brethren, and, by a disease of unusual malignity, many others dear to us, to their reward. If we, their survivors, would be ardent and active, provided we knew the present year would be our last, how much more, when any moment may remove us hence.

Let us, then, enter upon the duties of a new year, deeply imbued with the resolution of the holy prophet, "For Zion's sake will I not hold my peace, and for Jerusalem's sake will I not rest, until the righteousness thereof go forth as brightness, and the salvation thereof as a lamp that burneth."

[NOTE.—This narrative appears so late in the Magazine, because of the delay in sending it to us. We have inserted it as soon as we could make room for it since it was received.—Eds. MAG.]

For the Calvinistic Magazine.

Hermeneutics.

THE term at the head of this article may not be understood by every reader. For the benefit of such, a definition may be necessary. It is derived from a Greek word signifying Mercury, who was the heathen god of eloquence and wisdom; and, according to Dr. Webster, "The *art* of finding the meaning of an author's words and phrases, and of explaining it to others." This is sufficient for our present purpose, except that there are certain *rules*, almost indispensable, to be observed by him who would be a skilful interpreter of language, and these rules or principles constitute the *science* of interpretation.

Almost all works, however careful their authors may have been to avoid being misunderstood, are liable to be perverted and tortured, by the ignorance or wickedness of men, or both, so as to establish doctrines and principles not only *undesigned* and not *hinted* at by the authors themselves, but, in some cases, *directly* contrary to their *known instructions* or teachings. We see the truth of this observation exemplified in the different interpretations given to that most excellent political document, the constitution of the United States. And this variety of interpretation has given rise to the different political parties that have existed since the organization of the government in 1789, by the adoption of the constitution. If this be true, with regard to a document of, comparatively, but very recent date, how much more may we, in the nature of the case, expect it to be so, with regard to one that has come down to us through the roll of centuries, having experienced several transcriptions, or editions and translations; and, withal, having been written in a foreign language, and one not spoken as their vernacular tongue by any nation on earth? This, and more than this, is true of the books composing the Old and New Testaments. It will be seen, then, that the art of interpretation is difficult, and requires the mind of the interpreter to be divested of all pre-conceived opinions and prejudices.

God has, in his wisdom and goodness, provided for man a revelation of his will, which revelation is contained in the

books now received as the Sacred Oracles, or Book of God. And as God has seen fit thus to favor the race of man with these written instruments that declare his will, they become subjects or documents to be interpreted, like all others of any importance, especially those of ancient date.

Words, in any language, are capable of misconstruction—because, from the barrenness of language, they must have different senses or meanings assigned them, in different constructions. Perhaps there never was, and never will be, a language so full and copious, as to express, by *different words*, all the varied shades of thought and conceptions, and the different biases, or volitions of will, as well as all the objects to be seen in the physical world. A language of this sort would be almost a miracle.

But, notwithstanding the perversions to which all written language is liable, and the necessity, arising from the barrenness of language, that one word should be made to bear a variety of senses, or applications, still, the rules and principles of interpretation, if skilfully and properly applied, will greatly facilitate the acquisition of sound Biblical learning, and make the Minister of God, and the student of the Bible, *feel an agreeable consciousness*, an exquisite pleasure, that they have certainly found the “mind of the Spirit.” How many have felt this pleasure, after rising from the investigation of a difficult text, *satisfied* they have the true interpretation? We hope many.

God, in making a revelation of His will to man, has employed men, speaking two or three different languages, of different tastes and habits of minds, living along a series of nearly two thousand years, having a variety of conditions in life, but all agreeing in one great, essential point—“They spake and *wrote* as they were *moved by the Holy Ghost.*” Consequently, each wrote the mind and will of God in his own way; or rather, God inspired them all to write and speak according to each one’s own genius, temperament, or peculiar character. Thus, in the Bible, every possible variety of taste and sentiment may be gratified. Good poetry and good prose are both found there, as to all their essential qualities.

But, in the midst of this variety of style, such as to please every taste, lies one element of difficulty to interpreters, be-

cause poetry must be interpreted as poetry, history as history, moral precepts as such, etc., with respect to every variety of composition. An interpreter, therefore, must not interpret all works by the same rule. For instance—figurative expressions, (which abound in poetry,) must not be interpreted as the argumentative, metaphysical reasoning of the Apostle Paul.

In this age of theological controversy, who does not see the importance of thoroughly understanding the rules of interpretation, so as to be able to silence the opposer of sound doctrine, by arguments drawn from the great fountain of truth? Witness the controversies at the present day, in the Christian world, respecting what doctrines the Bible really teaches, and what it does not; and also, respecting the kind of Church government and discipline our Saviour and his apostles instituted for the regulation of the Church on earth. These controversies are to be lamented, because they are evidence that the Bible, and the Bible alone, has not been made the authority of final and decisive appeal, in the settling of disputes and differences of a theological character. The minds of the disputants, (some at least,) it is evident, have not been led to inquire, candidly and honestly, what does the spirit of inspiration teach on this particular passage? This question ought to be present to the mind of the interpreter at all times. For upon it the decision of every disputed point in theology turns. And to misinterpret, and to adopt as true that which the Bible does not teach, can do no mortal any conceivable good. And would that all disputants of the present age, were deeply impressed with the truth of the preceding remark!

If the watchmen on the walls of Zion are to see eye to eye, and if christians are to *mind the same things*, to be of *one mind*, to love one another as brethren, etc., surely every means that tends to promote that happy state of the church, is to be prized and diligently applied to its proper purpose. And we would rejoice and take courage in the belief, that the time is approaching when men will be more disposed than they have been in previous ages, to decide their differences by a direct appeal to what the *mind of the Spirit* is, and not to what the Church says, or, (what is more common in some Protestant Churches,) “the faith of our fathers;”—as if *our fathers* were infallible, and had a key which perfectly unlocked every trea-

sure of wisdom in the Holy Oracles. It is this kind of blind attachment to the *tradition of our fathers*, that keeps some branches of the great Protestant family from uniting with their brethren of other branches, in worshipping their common God and Saviour—because, forsooth, the latter, in singing the praises of God, do not use Rouse's version of David's psalms. As if Rouse was inspired any more than Watts, and as if there was a "*thus saith the Lord*" for the former's *version*, any more than for the latter's paraphrase.

Others, again, will not unite with their brethren of the same general Protestant faith, in celebrating the Lord's supper, because they have not been plunged all over under water, in order to admission into the visible church. These two classes, especially the one so partial to Rouse's *harmonious* and *original* (?) metre of the psalms would be celebrated for having a "*thus saith the Lord*" for all they do and teach. But not a word, we are right sure, can they find for singing Rouse, in all the Sacred Book. Consistency, thou art a jewel! More anon.

J. S.

The Way to be Happy.

A story is told of two travellers in Lapland, which throws more light on the art of being happy than a whole volume of precepts and aphorisms. Upon a very cold day in the winter, they were driving along in a sledge, wrapped up in furs from head to foot. Even their faces were mostly covered; and you could see hardly any thing but their eye-brows; and these were white and glistening with the frost. At length they saw a poor man who had sunk down, benumbed and frozen, in the snow. "We must stop and help him," said one of the travellers. "Stop and help him!" replied the other; "you will never think of stopping on such a day as this! We are half frozen ourselves, and ought to be at our journey's end as soon as possible. "But I cannot leave this man to perish," rejoined the more humane traveller; "I must go to his relief;" and he stopped the sledge. "Come," said he, "come and help me to rouse him." "Not I," replied the other, "I have too much

regard for my own life to expose myself to this freezing atmosphere more than is necessary. I will sit here, and keep myself as warm as I can, till you come back." So saying, he resolutely kept his seat, while his companion hastened to the relief of the perishing man, whom they had so providentially discovered. The ordinary means for restoring consciousness and activity, were tried with complete success. But the kind-hearted traveller was so intent upon saving the life of a fellow-creature, that he had forgotten his own exposure; and what was the consequence? Why, the very effort which he made to warm the stranger, warmed himself! And thus he had a two-fold reward. He had the sweet consciousness of doing a benevolent act, and he also found himself glowing from head to foot by reason of the exertions which he had made. And how was it with his companion, who had been so much afraid of exposing himself? He was almost ready to freeze, notwithstanding the efforts he had been making to keep warm!

The lesson to be derived from this little incident is very obvious. We are all travellers to a distant country. At every step of our journey we find other travellers, who need our friendly aid. Nay, God has brought them around our path in great numbers; and, far as the eye can reach, we see their dense and gloomy ranks. Now there are two ways of meeting these objects of Christian sympathy and brotherly regard. We can go forward with the stern purpose of a selfish and unloving spirit, saying, in reply to every appeal which is addressed to our better feelings, "Depart in peace; be ye warmed and filled;" or we can say, with the warm-hearted traveller, "I cannot see this man perish; I must hasten to his relief." And the rule which we adopt for our guidance in such cases, will determine the question, whether we are to be happy or unhappy. The man who lives only for himself, cannot be happy. God does not smile upon him; and his conscience will give him no peace. But he who forgets himself in his desire to do good, not only becomes a blessing to others, but opens a perpetual fountain of joy in his own bosom,—*Dayspring*.

Dr. Nettleton on Perseverance.


SAID an individual to him, "Do you believe in the doctrine of the saint's perseverance?" "It is my opinion," he replied, "that that doctrine is taught in the Bible." "I should like then," said the individual, "to have you explain this passage—Eze. 18: 24, 'But when the righteous turneth away from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity, *and* doeth according to all the abominations that the wicked *man* doeth, shall he live? All his righteousness that he hath done shall not be mentioned: in his trespass that he hath trespassed, and in his sin that he hath sinned, in them shall he die.'" Said Dr. N., "You have imposed upon me a hard task. That is a difficult text to explain; and what renders it the more difficult, is, that the Commentators are not agreed as to its meaning. Some have supposed that by a righteous man, in this passage, is meant a self-righteous man." "I do not believe that," said the individual. "Neither do I," said Dr. Nettleton, "for in that case, it would seem to teach, that if a self-righteous man should persevere in his self-righteousness, he would be saved. Some have supposed that by a righteous man, is meant one who is apparently righteous." "I do not believe that," said the individual. "Neither do I," said Dr. N., "for in that case, the text would seem to teach, that if a hypocrite should persevere in his hypocrisy, he would be saved. You suppose, do you, that by a righteous man in the passage is meant a true saint?" "Certainly I do." "And you suppose that by a righteous man's turning away from his righteousness, is meant falling away, as David did, and as Peter did?" "Certainly I do." "And you believe that David and Peter are now in hell?" "No, no, by no means. David and Peter repented, and were restored to the favor of God." "But," said Dr. Nettleton, "When the righteous turneth from his righteousness: in his trespasses that he hath trespassed, and in his sin that he hath sinned, in *them shall he die.*' IN THEM SHALL HE DIE. Now, if David and Peter did turn from their righteousness, in the sense of this passage, how can you possibly believe that they were saved?" The individual now found the laboring,

oar in his own hands, and after toiling away awhile, Dr. N. said—"If there is any difficulty in explaining this text of Scripture, I do not see but you are quite as much troubled with it as I am."—*Dr. Nettleton's Memoirs.*

Nestorians.

THE intelligence from this mission continues to be of a very interesting character. Mr. Stocking recently spent a Sabbath in Geog Tapa; and he found that the revival in that large and important village had produced a wonderful change in the habits and conduct of the people. "The Sabbath has a stillness and quiet which strongly remind one of a New England village." The following extract from Mr. Stocking's letter, dated September 19, will give some idea of the reformation which has been wrought:

"While the prevailing sentiments of the people are decidedly evangelical, about seventy, including those who are connected with our seminaries, furnish decided evidence of regeneration, and exert a happy Christian influence over the whole place. Some of the pious but illiterate villagers are spoken of by those who best know them as eminent for godly and prayerful lives, and are regarded as examples in every thing lovely and of good report. Not a few of those who are considered as without evidence of the new birth, are believed to be in the habit of secret prayer; and even the threshing floors and small cabins in their vineyards are known as places consecrated to prayer and communion with God. During the past summer from two to four meetings for preaching, religious conference and prayer, have been regularly maintained by the pious ecclesiastics and readers, from three to five evenings in a week. These meetings have been well attended by the people, after the fatiguing labors of the day were over, and at an hour when most require repose."—*Dayspring.*

 POST-MASTERS are requested to notify the Publishers *officially* if the January and February Nos. are not taken out of the office, and to do it as soon as is proper.

THE
Calvinistic Magazine.

[NEW SERIES.]

“ Earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints.”

Vol. II.

April, 1847.

No. 4.

Methodism as it is.

OUR Methodist brethren sometimes tell us, that Luther, and Calvin, and Wesley, were reformers. Why Luther and Calvin were called reformers, we all understand. And these brethren tell us, that Wesley is entitled to this appellation, because that, when he came, he found the established church of England, (the Episcopalian, of which he lived and died a member,) from its connexion with the State, so encumbered with sinners, so much secularized, so formal, and so almost entirely lost to the spirit and power of vital christianity, that he felt it to be his duty to attempt its reformation, and that God so far blessed him in this endeavor, as to entitle him to be ranked among the most illustrious reformers. Without saying yea or nay to all this,

The charge which we have to prefer against modern Methodists, both Episcopal and Protestant, is, that by their measures, or church policy, they are fast bringing about a worse state of things, than that which they tell us Wesley came to reform.

This is a heavy charge, and, if true, ought to alarm every lover of vital piety, especially if he be within the pale of either of these churches, and cause him immediately to strike for reform.

‘And I here declare, that it is more with the hope of exciting to reformation the christian members of these churches, than with the desire of exhibiting to the public gaze their deformities, that I attempt this exposition.

To see “Methodism as it is,” it would be necessary to survey minutely its doctrines, its discipline, and its measures.—

For all this we have not time or space. Suffice it to say, that in doctrines, the Episcopal and Protestant Methodists are understood to agree, and are Arminian. In discipline, which more nearly concerns us all than peculiarities of doctrine, the Episcopal Methodists are confessedly anti-republican—the Protestants are republican.

Passing these, with this brief notice, it is my purpose to dwell more at length upon their measures. Nor do I intend to speak of all these. I am aiming to speak of their practice of receiving seekers to the church, and afterwards confirming these seekers members of the church.

The Episcopal Methodists receive seekers on six months' trial—the Protestants on four. Both receive every body, whether saint or sinner, upon probation. The christian, whether he join the church for the first time, or whether he be a proselyte from some other church,* is required to undergo the same trial as the sinner, and to receive a recommendation from his class-leader, before he can be confirmed a member of the church.

There is no warrant in the word of God, either from precept or example, for keeping the christian back, or bringing the sinner forward, after this manner. The practice is an innovation. In apostolic times, believers were added to the church "the same day" on which they believed. "If thou believest with all thy heart thou mayest" be baptized, said Philip to the eunuch. Avowed unbelievers were not added at all, nor is there any propriety in adding them now. Are they not free agents? and has not God said, they that seek shall find? "Ask and it shall be given unto you, seek and ye shall find, knock and it shall be opened unto you." But when shall they find? So soon as they seek aright. "To-day if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts." Now, then, is God's time, and by allowing four or six months to the sinner to repent in, they who do it, do virtually alter God's time, and thereby assist the sinner

*The writer of this article, to whom we are much obliged for this favor, and from whom we request similar ones, is, we believe, mistaken as to the admission of members from other churches into the Methodist Protestant church. Their discipline (page 36) says, "persons coming from any church of a different denomination may * * * be admitted to full membersip." What the writer says is all that we know about the practice of the Methodist Episcopal church as to the reception of members from other denominations.—JUNIOR EDITOR.

in the soul-ruining practice of procrastination. But I am too fast.

The time is allowed him, not so much to seek religion in, as to try whether he would like to be a Methodist. Thus, while God would put the sinner to seeking *Him*, they set him to seeking *them*. This is evident from the fact, that the christian is required to undergo the same trial as the sinner, and that the sinner is confirmed at the end of his probation, without even a profession of religion. The christian needed not to seek for religion, for that he had already, and the sinner is received without it. It is not a trial for religion then, so much as a trial for church membership, that is required of the seeker. One unacquainted with this fact, would naturally suppose, that the seeker must necessarily turn into the finder, within the time of his probation, or stand aside, or stand back, but not so; he is urged forward into full fellowship, (I do not say communion, for he enjoyed that before,) and made entitled to all the privileges and immunities of the church, while he proclaims himself unregenerate!

The distinction between the righteous and the wicked, is no more regarded during the state of confirmation, than that of probation. The christian member and the sinner member are on a perfect level throughout. If any one doubts this, he may satisfy himself of its truth, by inquiring of the members of the Methodist churches within his acquaintance, and he will find that three-fourths, more or less, of the regular members of these churches, will frankly own that they never had religion. Ask not if they love God and their neighbor, or if they believe and have repented, for all this they are taught they may do, while in an unrenewed state;—but ask plumply, have you got, or do you believe you ever had religion? Or notice, if you please, what becomes of the multitudes of seekers who join these churches from year to year, and inquire at the end of their months, if they have professed religion, and you will soon learn that what I say is true. Many of them will pass from the state of probation to that of confirmation, as silently, as unobservedly, and with as little change, as one period of time passes into another. If, however, any deny this, let them put me upon the proof of it.

But our Methodist brethren are impatient to ask, are there not hypocrites and self-deceived souls in all churches? Yes,

and therefore in yours also. But these are not the classes of persons of whom I am speaking. I am talking about that large class of persons who enter regularly into your churches, and whose presence is approved there as life members, without even a profession of religion. They have laid aside the business and character of seekers, and are Methodists; not, strictly speaking, hypocrites, nor self-deceived, nor the fallen from grace, but simply Methodists.

Paul asks, and we repeat, "What part hath he that believeth with an infidel"—an unbeliever, as the term signifies—"or what concord hath Christ with Belial?" Luther wrote to Melancthon at the Diet of Augsburg, "I learn that you have begun a marvellous work, namely, to put Luther and the Pope in harmony; but the Pope is unwilling and Luther begs to be excused. And if, in spite of them, you succeed in this affair, then after your example I will bring together Christ and Belial." Melancthon failed to produce harmony between Luther and the Pope, and Luther was relieved from showing concord between Christ and Belial; but our Methodist brethren have succeeded in harmonizing the believer and the unbeliever, the world and the church, the children of Christ and the children of Belial,

You ask again, did not Christ suffer publicans and harlots to become his followers, and are we wiser and better than he?—True, he *suffered* such to walk about after him. He only suffered this, he did not encourage them to believe that they were worthy disciples. So far from it, he frequently drove them from him, by the breath of his mouth, as chaff is driven before the wind: "Ye follow me . . . for the loaves and fishes." "My kingdom is not of this world." "The foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests, but the son of man hath not where to lay his head." "He that forsaketh not all that he hath, cannot be my disciple." On hearing such language as the above, many, from time to time, turned back from him. Even his disciples seem to have started back with the multitude, who were not called his disciples, when he called to them, "will ye also go away?" He made no effort to detain the unworthy. Christ's object seems to have been, to suffer as few sinners as possible to be numbered among his disciples proper; while the object of our Methodist brethren

seems to be, to receive and detain in the church as many sinners as possible. David's heart moved him to go number Israel, and God gave him, as a punishment for his ostentation, choice between war, pestilence, and famine. Are you better than David? Not so good, if the above report be true, for David sought only to number Israel; but you number the Canaanites also.

Such conduct is disorderly. He who would please God, must not only obey all of his commandments, but must obey them in the order in which they are enjoined. There is a first, second, third, &c., duty; and he who, from dislike to the first, should busy himself about the second, would not only displease God, but would labor in vain. Especially would this be the case, if the right performance of the second, depended upon the previous performance of the first. The farmer who should busy himself in the spring season of the year, in hoeing his fields, or in making motions, as if he were gathering his fodder or his corn, while he had neither broken up his ground nor planted his corn, would be, to say the least, thought very much out of order. Much more so the too-hasty sinner. His first and most obvious duty is, to repent scripturally; after that, join a church; then celebrate the sacrament of the supper; but if he skip over the first duty, and attempt the performance of following ones, he will find himself in the awkward and sinful predicament of one attempting to do, while a sinner, those duties which the christian alone can rightly perform.

To encourage sinners to such a course of conduct even *temporarily*, is extremely irregular; but to make it the *permanent* order of the church, is monstrous. We could easily forgive our brethren for the former practice, but the latter is next to unpardonable in a church, who seem to make so much of christian experience, and to arrogate to themselves almost all the religion that is going in the land.

You interpose once more, that multitudes have joined your churches as seekers, who have afterwards been converted, and become burning and shining lights in the church.

This can prove no more than that joining the church as a seeker, is not the unpardonable sin. Greater multitudes who have joined your churches as seekers, have received confirmation without conversion, and afterwards became stumbling blocks in

the church, over which multitudes of sinners have, in all probability, stumbled into hell. And yet greater multitudes who have joined your churches as seekers, have soon turned, like "the sow that was washed to her wallowing in the mire, or like the dog to his vomit again." Multitudes, I may be permitted to say, have been converted before they joined any church, and have afterwards become burning and shining lights in other churches. This we think a far more excellent way, for the following additional reasons. Because,

The practice which we are combatting, is fraught with incalculable evil to sinners themselves, to the Methodist churches, and to all other churches who receive to their communion, those only who have made a credible profession of religion.

1. It is often ruinous to sinners.

When the sinner is awakened he begins anxiously to inquire, not what he must do to be saved, but what he can do to make himself better, and thereby render himself worthy of salvation. The poet has told him,

"If you tarry 'till you're better
You will never come at all;
Not the righteous—
Sinners Jesus came to call."

This he remembers and thinks upon. God urges him. He hesitates. God commands him to submit immediately. He trembles. At this critical moment (for this is the best time to make members) a time-serving church approaches, and proposes a truce of four or six months between the pertinacious sinner and his inflexible sovereign. Come join the church, say they, and, at the end of your probation, we will receive you whether God does or not. This is an *understood* fact. The sinner will do any thing rather than give God his heart *now*, and he flies to this relief. He gives them his hand, when he ought to be giving his heart to God, and this affords temporary relief. This, he is told, is the first step. Several other steps, seeming to rise one above another, are now pointed out to him, which, he is told, it is his duty to take. Some of these, and the most important, are, taking the sacrament, attending class-meeting, &c. The seeker sets about this service in as good earnest, perhaps, as poor Luther did when he attempted to ascend "Pilaté's Stair-Case" upon his bare knees, and for the same purpose, namely, to obey his spiritual instructors,

and to fix up a righteousness of his own, that will merit salvation. These steps, if taken, will conduct him safely into a Methodist church, but if God in mercy do not interpose, and teach him as he taught Luther, that "the just shall live by faith," and cause him to come down from his *laborious* exaltation, and cry, with the publican, "God-be merciful to me a *sinner*," he will soon take one of two directions, either of which will prove equally fatal to him. Either he will grow tired of his penance and leave the church, feeling that he has tried it and does not like it; treat the temperance society the same way if he had joined it; for a time, during camp-meeting season, take religion by fits and starts, like a balky horse on a slippery hill, and, after a while, like the sullen ox, refuse to go at all. This is *one* way, and the number and the name of those who travel in it is "legion." Or,

As he has been given to understand that religion is not necessary to church membership, and, as he has been "in the line of his duty" thus far, all that remains for him to do is to persevere in the use of the Methodist means, and at the end of his probation he takes an another step, and finds himself snugly seated in a Methodist church. Preach to the *sinner* now, and you do not touch him, for he is in the church, and in the line of his duty, only he has not yet done enough of good works to lay God under obligation to convert him. Preach to the *probationer*, and you do not hit him, for he has stood his trial and been approved. Preach to the *christian*, and you are farther from the mark than ever, for he makes no pretensions to christianity. Preach to the *back-slider*, and he is not the man, for he could not slide back from that to which he never attained; and he holds on to his name and his place in the church as ever. In fact, few of those who preach to such, either from shame or policy, will venture to designate them, and so they get little or no preaching. What a munition is this for the sinner! This is the *other* direction, and of all the ways to hell it is the smoothest and the broadest, and many there be who go in thereat.

2. This practice will ultimately prove ruinous to the Methodist churches unless they speedily abandon it.

A visible church is an organized body of professing christians, that has officers and ordinances. An organized body,

all of whom were non-professors, would not be entitled to be called a church of Jesus Christ. If the greater part of its members were non-professors, its claims to this appellation would be proportionally weakened. Therefore, the practice of admitting the non-professing element is suicidal, and will speedily prove the ruin of those churches unless abandoned. For, so low are their terms of membership, that nothing but general persecution, and a want of popularity, could preserve them from an immediate inundation of sinner members. Perseverance soon overcomes these, in a republican government, and when, by the operation of the seeker system, their numbers swell into political importance, the designing and the ambitious, together with the "drift wood of circumstances," will flow in at every avenue and gorge every "class." These will import into the church the spirit and maxims of the world, and convert it into a politico-ecclesiastical establishment, mighty to boast, and to execute vengeance upon all who oppose its self-aggrandizing spirit. For it is sinners in the different churches that cause them to persecute and sin, and thus bring disgrace upon themselves among men, and finally deavouring wrath from God. Those churches, therefore, which have in them the greatest number of sinners, will be the most bigoted, the most sectarian, and the most persecuting; and those churches which invite and cordially entertain non-professors within their bounds, will be sure to gain more of that element than those who do not. When a church is once full of sinners, it is an apostate church, and if it exist at all, it will be with but a name to live while dead: its succession will be henceforth "apostatical"—not apostolical. Again,

If the non-professing element is entitled to all the privileges and immunities of the church, it may ascend, without molestation, from the lowest to the highest grade of office in the church. There is no obstruction to this so far as consistency and practice are concerned. The circuit inveighs against our practice of examining men on experimental religion preparatory to their admission into the church; and consistency would forbid it from interposing any "impertinent questions" to, or "sitting in judgment on," its candidate for orders. If he entertain "good desires," and express a willingness to serve God in this way, the church has high authority for permitting

it. John Wesley confesses that he had no religion until after he had been preaching several years as a Methodist preacher, had come to America and established his system of doctrines and discipline, and returned to Europe. His brother Charles professed religion about the same time. With such examples before them, and no obstacle to impede them, being allowed without religion, and without much education, to officiate in the church, is there not great danger that those who wield the terrific power of the "Great Iron Wheel," will, at a day not far distant, be composed almost entirely of the unregenerate? "If the blind lead the blind both shall fall into the ditch."

The ordinances of the church, baptism and the Lord's Supper, must, in the meantime, partake of the general disorder. Of this we have all had ocular demonstration. We have seen the unworthy invited to the table of the Lord. We say unworthy, for such are all who are not capable of *discerning* the Lord's body. This none can do without saving faith, and this the unregenerate have not.

Baptism, the scriptural door into the church, is already woefully desecrated. It is administered without discrimination, to the children of those who are church members, and of those who are not. And yet sinners are admitted to seeker's orders, and afterwards to confirmation, without it. Multitudes of these live and die in the church without ever having been baptized. And yet baptism is, in the order of time, and nature, and Scripture, and their church too, when they are theorizing upon it, admitted to be prior to the sacrament of the supper, to which these unbaptized unbelievers are freely and constantly admitted!

Such a policy tends directly to destroy the members, the officers, and the ordinances of the church; and thus to bring about a worse state of things than that which we have been told Wesley came to reform. The reformation needs reform, for it possesses all the evils of an established church, without any of its advantages, and many facilities and incentives to evil, which the church of England effectually guarded against. It is so constructed and conducted, that popularity (that after which it so ardently pants) will speedily prove its ruin, unless it heed the admonition of the Saviour, "Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine, lest

they trample them under their feet and turn again and rend you.”

3. This practice is productive of immense evil to all those churches which receive to their communion those only who make a credible profession of religion. This evil manifests itself in three ways.

1. It deprives them to a great extent of the power of doing good to that very large class of sinners who are, or have been, seekers in these churches. In general, such persons act towards all other christians and ministers as if they felt that they had no right to preach the gospel to them. We have frequently witnessed this, even in the case of those who have received their convictions among others, and who have, up to the time of their becoming seekers in a Methodist church, been perfectly accessible by them. The very ministers who had been the means of their conviction, no longer possessed the power of doing them good. Knowing that the seeker system was condemned by them, and probably feeling guilty for having suffered themselves to be drawn into it, they shy off, and consort with those who give them encouragement and comfort in their self-righteous scheme of salvation. They act as if their bargain with the Methodists, like a bill of injunction, forbid all process against them by others, until time shall have dissolved it. When this happens, they are confirmed, either with or without religion, as the case may be, and are farther removed from extraneous influence than ever; or have turned back to where they were, with the feeling, that if they ever should be any thing they mean to be Methodists. The credit system pleases the *sinner*. Still more is he delighted with the idea, that if, at the end of his indulgence, he should prove a moral bankrupt, it would be no obstacle to a further and greater indulgence.

2. It exerts an indirect and deleterious influence upon other churches—causing them sometimes to be too hasty in receiving members to their communion. It would be strange if this were not the fact. Their work has been so often snatched from their hands before they were perfectly satisfied with it, that they have been compelled, in very self-defence, to fasten it sooner than they otherwise would have done. If in this they have erred, the guilt must lie principally upon those who

have forced them to it. I say principally, for it is not right to do evil that good may come.

3. It greatly hinders free and profitable communion between the Methodists and those of us who preach intercommunion. When we invite them to commune with us, we are compelled, by our principles and consciences, to debar from our table all who do not believe that they have met with a change of heart, whether in the church or out of it, whether seekers or church-confirmed sinners. This mortifies, and probably nettles the professing part of these churches, and generally keeps them away from our communion. This in turn mortifies us. And when they ask us, the case is little altered. We know that the same characters that we refused a place at our table, will be with them at theirs; and we are in a straight to determine whether to go forward for the sake of the christians, or to stay back for the sake of the sinners, that are made welcome there. And here is another mutual mortification, and probably recrimination, at a time when all ought to be concord and peace.

Permit me, in conclusion, to entreat my Methodist brethren, for the sake of sinners, for the sake of christians, for the sake of the perpetuity and perfection of their own churches, for the comfort and prosperity of other churches, for the sake of Christ's honor, to put an end to this practice. A REFORMER.

Presbyterianism.

(Continued from page 279, Vol. I.)

In the present article I propose to inquire into the relative rights and duties of ministers and elders in the Presbyterian church. These, I am aware, are delicate points. When one undertakes, however partially, to define the rights and prescribe the duties of others, he is not only liable, from the intricacy of the subject, to fail distinctly to draw the lines, but is in danger of exciting the warmest feelings of those whom his undertaking respects, as they may suppose him to entrench upon claims, on the one hand, which they regard as sacred, or to prescribe duties on the other, from which there is a natural

disposition to shrink. Important points, however, are not to be overlooked because they are delicate. Indeed, the importance of investigating them is, in general, in proportion to their delicacy. Sensitive as points of right and duty are, there are none less generally understood, and consequently none more generally abused. It is especially important that these points be clearly defined and well understood in their application to the offices in question. It is notorious that objections to Presbyterian church government generally respect these points, and it is believed that they generally result from a failure clearly to perceive the distinction, rights, &c., of these offices. Indeed, such is the genius of Presbyterian church government, that there is danger, where the subject is not well understood, of obliterating all distinction between the office of minister and that of ruling elder, and of bringing the respective officers to operate promiscuously in the same sphere. This tendency to coalesce, is favored by the statement, too frequently made in rather general terms, it is true, that there is no distinction between these offices. If this be true, if there be no distinction between them, there can be no difference; and if no difference, they must be identical; and if identical, their rights and duties must be the same. If there be no difference between the office of a general and that of a captain, their rights and duties must be the same, and it would require a new canon of nomenclature to determine whether they should both be called generals or both captains, and a new law of etiquette and finance to determine their respective honors and emoluments.

The statement that there is no difference between the office of minister and that of ruling elder, besides being unscriptural and unphilosophic, has a tendency to cramp and degrade the ministry on the one hand, and to puff up and destroy the usefulness of the eldership on the other. There is a clear distinction between these offices, and between the rights and duties of those who fill them, and the perfection of the government they administer will be in proportion to the clearness with which this distinction is perceived, the correctness with which these rights are understood, and the faithfulness with which these duties are performed. By the natural working of Episcopacy, in the early age of the church, this distinction was

measurably, if not entirely, lost sight of or disregarded. Ministers, leaving their appropriate spheres, claimed for themselves prelatical distinction and authority, and the eldership, by an easy and natural transition, advanced forward and occupied the places vacated by the ministry, thus abandoning their own office, and for centuries, during the dark ages, almost, if not entirely, merging it into the ministerial office, and assuming the weighty responsibilities of the ministry without any suitable qualifications or regular process of induction. And it is to a similar want of distinguishing perception, that we are to attribute the now too common disposition to invest the eldership with important functions of the ministry;—functions which they do not seek, which they are conscious do not belong to their office, which in general they would assume, if at all, with great reluctance, and which, if pressed upon them, would go far to destroy their office altogether, as in the dark ages. What these are, will appear in a future number.

Before I proceed farther, I wish here to state, (1.) That any rights and duties that may belong to either of these offices are wholly moral and spiritual, or ministerial and declarative. The kingdom of Christ is not of this world. (2.) They are *official* not *personal*. Personal merit gives right and inspires duty, and is an essential pre-requisite here, but is not to be pressed under the garb of official sanctity.

Of the ministry. (1.) The Bible makes the ministerial office the first in the church.—Ro. 11; 13. 1 Cor. 4: 1. (2.) It represents the minister as sustaining the *same* relationship to the *whole* church, including its rulers, and requires the *same* homage to him from all.—1 Cor. 16: 16. 1 Thes. 5: 12, 13. Heb. 13: 7, 17, 24. (3.) All the titles which it applies to him are expressive of official superiority. The terms bishop, pastor, minister, presbyter, angel of the church, ambassador, steward of the mysteries of God, are all applied *exclusively* to ministers. Because, (1.) it is agreed that *some* of them are, and (2.) That they are correlative and interchangeable terms: therefore *all* are so applied. All the rights and duties, therefore, implied by these several titles, belong exclusively to the ministerial office. The principal official duties of the minister are comprehended under the following particulars:

It belongs to him (1.) to pray.—Acts 6: 2—4. 20: 36. Jas.

5: 14, 15. 1 Cor. 14: 15, 16. (2,) To read the scriptures. (1,) The priests did this.—Deut. 31: 9—14. Neh. 8th. (2,) Ministers have the same power and are so called.—Is. 66: 21. Mat. 23: 34. (3,) To feed the flock or teach the people.—1 Tim. 3: 2. 2 Tim. 3: 16, 17. Tit. 1: 9. (4,) To rule them.—Acts 20: 17, 28. 1 Thes. 5: 12. 1 Tim. 5: 17. Heb. 13: 7, 17. (5,) To catechize.—Heb. 5: 12. (6,) To dispense other divine mysteries.—1 Cor. 4: 1, 2. 13: 2. (7,) To administer the sacraments.—Mat. 28: 19, 20. 1 Cor. 11: 22—25, with 10: 16. (8,) To take care of the poor, especially those of the household of faith.—Acts 4: 34—37. 6: 2—4. 11: 29, 30. 1 Cor. 16: 1—4. Gal. 2: 9, 10. (9,) To bless the people.—Num. 6: 22—27. Deut. 10: 8. Is. 66: 21. 2 Cor. 13: 14.—NOTE.—He may receive assistance from any suitable person, in the discharge of such of these duties as do not manifestly belong exclusively to his own office.—2 Chr. 29: 34.

2. The Confession of Faith clearly points out the distinction between these two offices, and fully accords the Bible pre-eminence to that of the minister. According to it, (1,) “The pastoral office is the first in the church, both for dignity and usefulness.” (2,) By virtue of his office he is to be Moderator of the General Assembly, Synod, and Presbytery—which bodies cannot exist at all without ministers—and of the session also, except “where it is impracticable, without great inconvenience,” to procure a minister, and imperious to proceed without one. (3,) While the elder is to be ordained “by prayer” only, the minister is to be “solemnly ordained according to the apostolic example, by prayer, and with the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery.” (4,) While the elder is to be tried, in case of an offence, if need be, like any other private member, by the session of the church to which he belongs, the minister is to be tried before the Presbytery of which he is a member,” and with a higher degree of solemnity and security, answering to the greater dignity and importance of his office. (5,) The elder is a “private member” of the church, (Disc. ch. v. sec. ii, with preceding sections,) and is called to his office “for the purpose of exercising government and discipline, *in conjunction* with pastors or ministers.”—Form of gov't. chap. v. NOTE.—These distinctions are recognized by

the civil law, and by the law of custom, wherever the offices exist.

Thus I have endeavored, with brevity and perspicuity, to point out the distinction between these two important offices, and to designate the leading official duties of each, from which their respective rights and privileges flow. The distinction is clear, the duties momentous, and those of the minister highly diversified. There is no need that the minister and elder should intrench upon each other's province. They meet only in the single point of government, and here only to encourage each other's hearts, and strengthen each other's hands in promoting the peace, unity, purity, edification, and enlargement of the church, and the glory of God. From this point they diverge to move in their respective spheres, and do their Master's work, in vigilant supervision and ardent laboring in word and doctrine.

The prudent minister will not assume to himself the entire government of the church. He will not seek to lord it over God's heritage. He will respect the rights and responsibilities of the elder, remembering that he is the representative of the church, and clothed with all the authority which it possesses. He will remember that his great business is *to preach the Gospel*, and will seek to administer government only as a means to this end.

Nor will the prudent elder seek to assume the entire government of the church. He will remember that, while his appropriate business is to administer government and discipline, he is to do it *in conjunction* with the minister. He will regard his office, as it really is, as a handmaid to the gospel, as a means of rendering the gospel efficient in saving souls, and himself as a co-worker with the minister, as the minister is with God. He will labor, therefore, to strengthen the hands, sustain the authority, and extend the influence of the minister. He will be careful not to interfere with the *preaching arrangements* of the minister. He may give counsel, but he has no authority here. Ministerial responsibility is too great, and too sacred, to admit of interference. He will not seek to assume any of this responsibility. He will concede to the minister the entire control of the preaching department—as well the selec-

tion of ministerial correspondents, as the arrangement of his own personal labors.

While he is thus guarding the rights and responsibilities of the minister, on the one hand, he will see to it that he interfere not with those of the church on the other. As the minister stands between the living and the dead, so he stands between the church and the minister; not to place the minister a remove farther from the church, but to bring him in closer union with them, and help him to develop their resources, and enlist their energies—remembering that he is himself one of their number. He is to be an important medium of communication from the minister to the church, and if need be, a mediator between them. If devoted and faithful, the minister cannot enjoy a more efficient “help;” but if worldly, thoughtless, and unfaithful, he cannot easily be trammelled with a more irksome curse. He may, indeed, well nigh destroy the influence of the minister altogether. Let no one, therefore, suppose his office to be unimportant, or lightly esteem his responsibility.

In case of both minister and elder, there are many personal duties that are not strictly official, but which official station will greatly increase the opportunity of discharging for the glory of God, the honor of religion, and the good of mankind.

PRESBUTEROS.

Short Practical Sermons—No. 5.

THE MODERN ATHENIANS.

ACTS 17: 21.—“*For all the Athenians and strangers which were there, spent their time in nothing else but either to tell or hear some new thing.*”

MEN usually have a great pride in being able to trace back their lineage to a high antiquity. It is strange that so many should have overlooked the fact, that their sires were of the Athenian race,—that in their veins courses the blood of the sons of Athens.

Two enquiries are naturally suggested by this passage of Scripture.

I. Who are the modern Athenians?

II. What are they doing?

I. Who are the modern Athenians?

1. General news dealers. They of Mar's Hill spent their time in nothing else, but either to tell or hear some new thing. Their descendants have not degenerated in this respect. They are real gleaners of gossip. Every day finds them busy in the field; and their bundle of straws, and stubble, and trash, feeds a hungry multitude, depending on them for sustenance. When they gather much, they have nothing over; and when they gather little, there is no lack, for a fertile invention supplies what is wanting.

2. The lovers of new doctrines are the modern Athenians. They run mad with every new thing. They are children tossed to and fro, and carried about by every wind of doctrine.—If they join a church, and they are most certain to do so, they are scarcely in one church, before they are out at the back door. Somehow they “always manage, so as not to strive against wind and tide, and are more zealous when religion goes in silver slippers.” If any where there is a stream of religious excitement, they are there, and on the topmost wave, bear them where it may.

3. Runners after new preachers are the modern Athenians. They have itching ears. A new voice suits them nicely.—When they have tried all the new preachers within their bounds, they are ready to meet every new comer; and ere he is hard at work, they are away to give the right hand of fellowship to one from another quarter. The arrival of a Rev. Mr. Hard-Shell, descanting upon the virtue of going under the water, or the miscellaneous herding together of men, women, and children, under the auspices of the Rev. Messrs. Billingsgate, Ironsides, and Boanerges, the Younger, are powerful magnets on these Athenians, and they yield to the influence readily. They change the Scriptures, and make them read:—Any man having drunk old wine, straightway desireth new; for he saith the new is better.

II. Turning from these modern Athenians to their works, we ask, What are they doing?

1. They are feeding themselves on a great deal of useless stuff. They prefer sound to light. If now and then they get a grain of wheat, there is ten times as much chaff as wheat. Certainly they must need a gizzard to digest such a mass of all things.

2. They are winking at deception. There are quacks among preachers, as well as in the medical profession; and some of them would save men by pure steam. With no other qualification than ability to make a noise, they put on the clerical robe, and vociferate. Now, every man who gives countenance to them, is guilty of conniving at deception. And can it be any less a sin to do this, when undying souls are concerned, than when a few dollars, or days of life are at stake?

3. They are sowing seeds of dissension. And every one of these kernels will sprout up, and bear fruit an hundred fold. Broad cast they scatter fire-brands, arrows, and death, and the community must reap a great harvest. Do you see yon happy family? There is "paradise regained." The tongue of slander is still. If scandal comes, it dies of pure neglect, and is buried in oblivion. But let a news monger enter there, and find one open ear, and a blight will thenceforth settle upon that household. The whirl-wind crop ripens, and is waving for the sickle.

4. They are violating many plain precepts, and principles of the Bible. Thou shalt not go up and down as a tale-bearer among thy people. Put them in mind . . . to speak evil of no man. Let no corrupt communication proceed out of your mouth. Shun profane and vain babblings. If any man among you seem to be religious, and bridleth not his tongue, but deceiveth his own heart, this man's religion is vain. Speak not evil one of another, brethren. He that will love life, and see good days, let him refrain his tongue from evil, and his lips that they speak no guile.

APPLICATION.

1. Avoid a tale-bearer as you would a viper. You can have a budget of news spread out in your family circle every day, if you choose; but it would be as wise to have a box of rattlesnakes opened there. No man is troubled with the tales of rumor, unless he wishes to be. If you ever can put on a frown,

or give a deserved, faithful reproof, do it when the retailer of gossip comes to your house on his errand of infamy.

2. Let it be one of the greatest crimes in your family, to speak ill of another, save when the ends of justice require it, or innocence must be shielded, or the good of the offender demands it. Where scandal is tolerated at all, home, the dearest spot on earth, becomes desolate. It is turned into a slaughter house of character, instead of being the centre of every thing pure and lovely. The social affections are rudely trampled on, where they should share the choicest culture. The murky atmosphere of hell surrounds it, and the fragrant gales of paradise do not flow to it. The angel of peace spreads his wings, and leaves it in the possession of fiends, that prowl by day, and encamp about it by night.

3. Above all, beware of your example. If the father of a family is always speaking ill of others, his little son will think it is the surest way to become a man, to do so also; and he will so far improve upon the pattern given him, that the father will be a pigmy in comparison with him. If a mother returns from an evening's visit with her stock of neighborhood stories replenished, and these are the talk for the next two weeks, soon the little daughter will come back from school, or a social play, freighted with rumors, a perfect copy of her mother, only very much enlarged and improved. You may detest the dealer in scandal—beware lest your example may be forming such a character in every one of your children. In a word, by example, and precept too, make them any thing but modern Athenians—to be always desiring to tell or hear some new thing,

R. P. W.

A Gem.—Selected.

The salt preserveth the sea, and the saints uphold the earth;
 Their prayers are the thousand pillars that prop the canopy of nature.
 Verily, an hour without prayer, from some terrestrial mind,
 Were a curse in the calendar of time, a spot of the blackness of darkness.
 Perchance the terrible day, when the world must rock into ruins,
 Will be one unwhitened by prayer,—shall He find faith on the earth?

[*Tupper's Proverbial Philosophy.*]

"The Great Iron Wheel."

No. II.

—
BY F. A. ROSS.
—

The Methodist Class Meeting compared with the Roman Catholic Confessional.

IN the first number of the Great Iron Wheel, we invited every man who loves religious and civil liberty, to examine for himself the DESPOTISM of the Methodist church government. We repeat the call to the lovers of liberty. We invite every man to go with us to day and examine the *cog*, or the *attachment*, by which the Great Iron Wheel acts upon, and controls the people in the Methodist church,—THE CLASS MEETING. Our readers will remember that we copied from the Methodist Episcopalian the following description of the Great Iron Wheel: "First—There is the great outer wheel of episcopacy, which accomplishes its entire revolution once in four years. To this are attached twenty-eight smaller wheels, styled annual conferences, moving round once a year; to those are attached one hundred wheels, designated presiding elders, moving twelve hundred other wheels, termed quarterly conferences, every three months; to these are attached four thousand wheels, styled travelling preachers, moving round once a month, and communicating motion to thirty thousand wheels, called *class leaders*, moving round once a week, and who, in turn, being *attached* to between seven and eight hundred thousand wheels, called *members*, give a sufficient impulse to whirl them around every day. What a machine is this?"

The eight hundred thousand wheels CALLED *members*, are *attached* to the thirty thousand *class leaders*. The *manner* of their *attachment* is seen in the *class meeting*. That meeting, including its inner wheels of band meetings and love feasts, constitutes the *link*, the *cog*, the *attachment*, which whirls the membership of the whole Methodist Episcopal church, fast or slow, in absolute and perfect subserviency to the Methodist ministry. *The class meeting is the drill muster ground of Methodism*—and it is in *principle*, and *tendency*, and *actual results*,

the Roman Catholic confessional. We design, now, to show the RESEMBLANCE between the two, and to point out in what they DIFFER.

I. *What is the Roman Catholic confessional—its nature and effects?*

Dr. Wiseman, who is perhaps the ablest living Roman Catholic divine, in explaining and defending the whole subject of the confessional, says—“We believe that the sacrament of PENANCE is composed of three parts—*contrition, or sorrow;—confession, or its outward manifestation;—and satisfaction,* which is in some respects also a guarantee of perseverance in that which we promise.” Confession is “a full, sincere and humble declaration of our sins to a priest to obtain absolution.” “Every mortal sin must be confessed as distinctly as it can be remembered, together with the time, place and circumstances in which it was committed.”

The authority for such confessions to a priest, is found in the exhortation given to believers, “Confess your faults one to another.”—Jas. 5: 16. The authorized Roman comment upon this passage, has been well said, to be a curiosity in the way of exegesis—“Confess your sins one to another; that is to the priests of the church, whom [v. 14] he had ordained to be brought in to the sick.”

Now, let us keep fully before our minds—what is the GREAT DELUSION taught by Roman Catholics in this matter. It is this—THE PRIEST IS ENTHRONED AS GOD. And occupying that throne, he causes the Romanist to make an awful and fatal mistake, in attempting to satisfy the *great want of human nature*. The *great want* of human nature is, RELIEF FROM THE BURDEN OF SIN. Now, “confession,” with *true sorrow* of heart, to God, does secure relief from the burden of sin—its *pardon* through Christ, and *purification* from its pollution through the influence of the Holy Spirit. But the moment you substitute the *throne of the priest, or ANY OTHER PLACE OF CONFESSION*, for the throne of God—then the soul has found relief from the burden of sin, not by confession *with sorrow* of heart—but confession *without* sorrow of heart. And that difference is just as wide as the difference between repentance which is unto life, and repentance which worketh death—as great as the difference between confession which saves the soul, and

confession which destroys it. The depraved nature of the soul is such that it will never confess sin, with contrition, to the one against whom the sin has been committed, if it can by any possibility be avoided. The child will lie ten times rather than confess in any form to its offended father—he will confess ten times to his mother, his brother, his sister, or any body rather than to his father;—nay, when he must confess to his father he will excuse himself ten ways, in his confession; and the very last thing he will do will be to confess, *with honest sorrow*, that he did the thing, and that *it was all wrong in the sight of his father*. This is true, to the same extent, of the grown-up man. He will not confess he has done wrong to the man he has wronged, so long as he can help it. He will rather confess to all the world besides,—and when he does make confession to his injured fellow-man, how hard to say, and to *feel it*, and *show* that he feels it, *sir, I have done you wrong. O! how much harder to make right confession to God*. Any confession made of wrong done to man, may be made, and the soul still feel sustained in its pride, by the remembrance that it has much self-righteousness left. The man may remember that he has committed, perhaps, but one sin against his neighbor, and that even he may still esteem him for virtues acknowledged. But when confession is made to God—truly made—the penitent stands covered with sin, and sin *against God*. *The heart*, in all its imaginations—*the life*, in all its speech and actions, sin against God, never to be answered or excused. Man will avoid the confession if he can—*he will risk hell rather than make it*. How welcome, then, the confessional—how welcome the penance—how welcome the ear of the Virgin Mary—how welcome the intercession of every saint—how welcome the priest—how welcome the penitential cord dropping with blood—how welcome every mummery of torture, rather than stand like the publican, and say, *God be merciful to me a sinner!*

This is the GREAT DELUSION Rome has practiced. She gives the soul relief from the burden of sin by *naked* confession, and that, *not to God*, but to and through *some other being*. Rome, we know, requires in its discipline, sorrow of heart from its penitents—but this amounts to nothing in the practical working of Popery. *Relief from the burden of sin upon mere con-*

fession to a priest, *is felt* by all under her mighty mystery of iniquity. The effect of this *delusion* of Rome is two-fold.

(1.) *It hardens the conscience, and leads to all sin.* Confession to God with sorrow, softens the heart—makes it meek and lowly—and turns it from sin. Confession even to God, without contrition, hardens the heart. The true christian himself is even in danger of incurring this guilt, and experiencing this injury. But when the confession is made to the priest, the hardening process is ever going on. THE VERY FACT OF TELLING SINS AGAINST GOD TO MAN *gradually obliterates the sense of guilt, extinguishes remorse, and leaves the soul prepared to draw iniquity with cords of vanity, and sin, as it were, with a cart rope.* This is the history of the heart as it has developed itself every where, and at all times, under the Romish confessional.

(2.) The Romish confessional makes the mind *submissive to priestly control.* This follows as a matter of course. Once bring a man to believe that his eternal welfare depends upon the confessional—and that that confessional is under the control of a priesthood—and there is nothing to which that man will not submit in the orderings of that priesthood. We need not enlarge upon this position. Of all despotisms, that of Rome over the body and the soul, has been, and is, the most perfect and terrible.

II. We will now consider wherein the class-meeting resembles the Roman Catholic confessional.

We will give our readers the desired information upon this subject, from the Book of Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal church, and from the authorized works of John Wesley. The discipline says, “That it may the more easily be discerned, whether they are indeed working out their own salvation, each society is divided into smaller companies, called classes, according to their respective places of abode. There are about twelve persons in a class, one of whom is styled *the leader.* It is his duty—I. *To see each person in his class once a week at least;* in order, 1. To inquire how their souls prosper; 2. To advise, reprove, comfort, or exhort, as occasion may require; 3. To receive what they are willing to give, towards the relief of the preachers, church and poor. II. To meet the ministers and the stewards of the society once a week; in order, 1. To

inform the minister of any that are sick, or of any that walk disorderly, and will not be reprov'd; 2. To pay the stewards what they have received of their several classes in the week preceding.—There is only one condition previously required of those who desire admission into these societies, "a desire to flee from the wrath to come, and to be saved from their sins." [Book of Discipline, Gen'l. Rules, chap. 1. sec. 1.] Again. *Section II. Question 1. How may the leaders of classes be rendered useful? Ans. 1. Let each of them be diligently examined concerning his method of meeting a class. Let this be done with all possible exactness, at least once a quarter. In order to this, take sufficient time. 2. Let each leader carefully inquire how every soul in his class prospers; not only how each person observes the outward rules, but how he grows in the knowledge and love of God. 3. Let the leaders converse with those who have the charge of their circuits, frequently and freely. Question 3. How shall we prevent improper persons from insinuating themselves into the church? Ans. 1. Give tickets to none until they are recommended by a leader, with whom they have met at least six months on trial. 2. Give notes to none but those who are recommended by one you know, or until they have met two or three times in a class. 3. Read the rules to them the first time they meet. Ques. 4. How shall we be more exact in receiving and excluding members? Answer 1. The official minister or preacher shall at every quarterly meeting read the names of those that are received and excluded.—Ques. 5. What shall we do with those members of our church who wilfully and repeatedly neglect to meet their class? Ans. 1. Let the elder, deacon, or one of the preachers, visit them, whenever it is practical, and explain to them the consequence if they continue to neglect—*Exclusion. 2. If they do not amend, let him who has charge of the circuit, exclude them, (in the church,) showing that they are laid aside for a breach of our rules of discipline, and not for immoral conduct.*"*

"Section III. *Of Band Societies.* Two, three, or four true believers, who have confidence in each other, form a Band.—*Only it is to be observed, that in one of these Bands, all must be men, or all women; and all married, or all unmarried.* [Rules of the Band Societies, drawn up, Dec. 25, 1738.]

The design of our meeting is to obey the command of God,

Confess your faults one to another, and pray one for another, that ye may be healed.—James 5: 16. To this end we agree,
 1. To meet once a week at least. 2. To meet punctually at the hour appointed; without some extraordinary reason prevents. 3. To begin exactly at the hour with singing or prayer. 4. To speak, each of us in order, freely and plainly, the true state of our souls, with the faults we have committed in temper, words, or actions, and the temptations we have felt since our last meeting. 5. To end every meeting with prayer suited to the state of each person present. 6. To desire some person among us to speak his own state first, and then to ask the rest in order, as many and as searching questions as may be, concerning their state, sins, and temptations.

“Some of the questions proposed to one before he is admitted among us, may be to this effect: 1. Have you the forgiveness of your sins? 2. Have you peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ? 3. Have you the witness of God’s spirit with your spirit, that you are a child of God? 4. Is the love of God shed abroad in your heart? 5. Has no sin, inward or outward dominion over you? 6. Do you desire to be told your faults? 7. Do you desire to be told all your faults, and that plain and home? 8. Do you desire that every one of us should tell you, from time to time, whatever is in our heart concerning you? 9. Consider! Do you desire we should tell you, from time to time, whatsoever we think, whatsoever we fear, whatsoever we hear concerning you? 10. Do you desire that in doing this, we should come as close as possible; that we should cut to the quick, and search your heart to the bottom? 11. *Is it your desire and design to be on this and all other occasions entirely open, so as to speak without disguise, and without reserve.*” Any of the preceding questions may be asked as often as occasion requires, the four following at every meeting.

1. *What known sins have you committed since our last meeting?*

2. *What particular temptations have you met with?*

3. *How were you delivered?*

4. *What have you thought, said, or done, of which you doubt whether it be sin or not?*—[Book Discipline, chap. 2, sec. 3.]

Now we affirm, that, here we have the Roman Catholic confessional in bud, and flower, if not as yet in its perfect fruit.

Just examine the working of this class meeting system. The class leader [who is the mere tool of the travelling preacher] *must see each person in his class once a week at least—to advise, reprove, comfort, exhort—carefully to inquire how every soul in his class prospers—not only how each person observes the outward rules, but how he grows in the knowledge and love of God.* Again, while the class leader is *obliged to see each person in his class once a week at least*, the members of the church are under the *same obligation to meet the class leader—WITH THE PENALTY HANGING OVER THEM OF EXCLUSION FROM THE CHURCH IF THEY DO NOT.* The class leader may meet the members in private, or in the class.—[Mr. Wesley's works, vol. 5, p. 187.] He may ask them any questions he pleases touching their religious state. Again, the class leader may be one of any band meeting, of single men, or married, as the case may be—and being the class leader, he would naturally, and obviously, be the leader of the band, as the band is only a more secret class.—In that band *he must ask*, and each member *has bound himself or herself, beforehand, to answer* such questions as these—1. *What known sins have you committed since our last meeting?* 2. *What particular temptations have you met with?* 3. *How were you delivered?* 4. *What have you thought, said, or done, of which you doubt whether it be sin or not?* Look there! *These questions do cover the whole ground occupied by the Romish confessional.* THERE IS, ABSOLUTELY, NO QUESTION, BY POSSIBILITY, WHICH A ROMAN CATHOLIC PRIEST MAY ASK, BUT MAY BE ASKED BY THE BAND LEADER!! No. Not one. The vilest questions to be found in Dens' Theology, and which the priest is required to ask, may be put to every member of a band meeting, and they have bound themselves to answer!

Once more. The very fact that the class meeting is subdivided into bands of all men, or all women, and all married, or all single, and the pledges to make a clean breast exacted of all who enter these more secret class meetings, is *proof positive that the most searching confession was sought to be had from every member.* Yet again, let it be noticed. This class leader, thus empowered to receive the confessions of so many members, as to their most secret thoughts, words, and actions, is also the person who is to ask these same members for their *money*, for "*the relief of the preachers, church, and poor!*"—

How remarkable that confession in the Roman Catholic and Methodist churches should be connected with the payment of MONEY!! Lastly, in this connection, it is the duty of the class leader to meet the minister [the travelling preacher] and the stewards of the society once a week—to inform the minister of any that are sick—or of any that walk disorderly and will not be reformed, and to pay the stewards what they have received of their several classes in the week preceding.

To complete this perfect drill of supervision and confession, the travelling preacher in charge of the circuit appoints all the class leaders, and changes them when he sees it necessary—he sees that every band leader have the rules of the band, and he meets the men and women *apart* in the large societies, once a quarter, wherever it is practicable, &c.—[Dis. chap. 1, sec. 9.] From this summing up of the testimony in the case, it is plain that the Methodist church in its class meeting system, *does as distinctly require the confession of sins from its members, as that thing is required in the Roman Catholic church.*

This position will be yet more abundantly established, by considering the lame and impotent defence made by Mr. Wesley, when he was charged, again and again, with having introduced the Romish confessional into his class meeting system. Mr. Wesley was one of the greatest cavillers that ever lived, and yet made the poorest out in dodging, when hard pressed and cross-questioned. He says—“An objection much more boldly and frequently urged, is that ‘all these bands are mere Popery.’ I hope I need not pass a harder censure on those [most of them at least] who affirm this, than that they talk of they know not what; they betray in themselves the most gross and shameful ignorance. Do they not yet know, that the only Popish confession is the confession made by a single person to a priest? *And this itself is in no wise condemned by our church; nay, she recommends it in some cases.*—Whereas, what we practice, is the confession of several persons, conjointly, not to a priest, but to each other. Consequently, it has no analogy at all to Popish confession. But the truth is, this is a stale objection, which many people make against any thing they do not like. It is all Popery out of hand.”—[Wesley’s works, vol. 5, p. 184.]

And this was the way Mr. Wesley shuffled out of the charge,

made "boldly and frequently," by some of the first men in England, that "*all these bands were mere Popery.*" It was thus he trifled with such men as Bishop Lavington of his own church, and with Dr. Erskine of the Presbyterian church of Scotland, both of whom held and charged on Mr. Wesley "*that the leader of a class acted like a Romish priest.*"

This reply of Mr. Wesley is a mere cavil. It is frivolous, fallacious, and foolish. The *great delusion* of Rome, we have shown, is, that she has erected *some other throne than that of God*, where *confession* is to be made. Now, as to the point before us, it does not make a jot of difference, whether that *other throne* be the *confessional of a Romish priest*, or the *class meeting system* of Mr. Wesley. For, the *same actual and perfect confession* is DEMANDED at both;—and it does not make an iota of difference, as to the practical results upon character, *except in degree of evil*. Whether a man confesses to Priest *Ever-mum*, or there be a mutual confession between brother *Tommy Love-to-tell-it* and brother *Christopher Cant-keep-it*, or between sister *Sally Slander-wink* and sister *Susan Slack-twisted* in a band meeting, the *great delusion* of Rome is the very error of Methodism. That is to say, it encourages the soul of man TO FIND RELIEF FROM THE BURDEN OF SIN by *naked confession of sin* at ANOTHER PLACE than the throne of God. It was, therefore a mere cavil—a trifling with the *great principle* involved in the confessional—for Mr. Wesley to say, that the confession he demanded had "no analogy at all to Popish confession."

We have said that Mr. Wesley made, with all his cavilling, the poorest out at dodging. For frequently, in trying to twist himself free of his difficulties; he somehow acknowledges the very thing charged upon him. So here. Look! When he says that his system is that of the confession of several persons conjointly, while that of Popery was the confession of a single person to a priest—yet he acknowledges that *this itself*, [the Popish confession] *is in no wise condemned by our church; nay, she recommends it in some cases.*" Now, what is the meaning of this? Why, Mr. Wesley here tells all who objected to his system, that while it was *not* Popish confession, yet, *if it had been*, it would have been *in no wise condemned, but recommended in some cases by his church!* Truly, Mr. Wesley,

your denial that your class meeting system is Popery, is nothing; but your confession, that if it had been Popery it would have been *in no wise condemned, nay, recommended in some cases by your church*, is every thing. It shows that you were a true churchman, *and in this particular, willing, if needs, to be a Roman Catholic.*

But it may be asked just here—whether ABSOLUTION from sin is granted at the Methodist confessional? We answer. Yes. Just as really as at the Roman Catholic confessional. The absolution granted at the Roman confessional, is, the fact, distinctly taught, that the penitent there, *may find relief from the burden of sin* BY LAYING IT ON THE BOSOM OF THE CHURCH, there representing Christ, *in the person of the priest.* The absolution granted at the Methodist confessional, is the fact directly taught, that Jesus Christ requires us "*to confess our faults one to another,*" and that this confession is truly made in the class meeting. The penitent goes from the Romish confessional *relieved from the burden of sin.* The member goes from the Methodist confessional *relieved from the burden of sin.* The relief is as *perfect* in the one case as the other, *whenever the confession has been as perfect in the one case as the other.* The *formal absolution* granted to the priest is only the perfection of the delusion. The *real absolution* is granted by the fact that the church in the name of Christ requires us to confess our sins to its ministers or members. We have said, *the great want of human nature is relief from the burden of sin.* And while man will brave hell rather than confess to God, he will welcome any medium of access to God *rather than to come right to God himself through Christ.* The sinner will therefore welcome confession before the silken robes of the Virgin. He will welcome confession before the bloated face and leering eye of the priest. He will welcome confession before the class or band. He will confess *there*, if needs he must, because he may confess *there*, and be relieved *there*, of the burden of sin, by *such a confession as leaves his pride, and every lust as unsubdued as before.* This fact, that confession *any where else* than to God, through Christ alone, *leaves pride unhumbled and lust unsubdued,* IS THE SECRET OF SECRETS why the depraved heart of man has found these many inventions of confessionals.

We may be questioned once more, whether there is any

thing in Methodism resembling the PENANCE which the Roman Catholic system imposes upon its lax members. We reply, that Mr. Wesley's class-meeting system led to that result according to his own concession. Speaking of healed backsliders in his classes, he says—"By applying both the threats of God to these real, not nominal penitents, and crying to God in their behalf, we endeavored to bring them back to the great 'shepherd and bishop of their souls;' not by any of the *fopperies* of the Roman church, *although in some measure countenanced by antiquity. In prescribing hair shirts, and bodily austerities, we durst not follow even the ancient church,* although we had unawares, both in dividing the oi pistoi, the believers from the rest of the society, and in separating the penitents from them, and appointing a *peculiar service for them.*"— [Works, vol. 5, p. 184.]

Alas! how hard it was for Mr. Wesley to turn more than his side face from Rome. Here, while he very *stoutly* asserts that he did not endeavor to bring back his fallen members by any of the *fopperies* of Rome, yet, at once, he smooths over these *fopperies*, by saying, very kindly, "*although in some measure countenanced by antiquity.*" And he then adds, that he did not prescribe "hair shirts and bodily austerities," *even as the ancient church*, because he "*durst not.*" Mr. Wesley thus clearly acknowledges, that had he "*dared,*" he would have prescribed "*the hair shirts, and the bodily austerities!!*" But as far as he "*durst*" he did go. He *divided* the believers from the rest of the society, and separated the penitents from them, and *appointed a peculiar service for them.* If Mr. Wesley had dared, he would have had the whole of the "*fopperies.*" And the whole of the "*fopperies*" must come in time, if the Methodist church shall *dare* to carry out the class meeting system to its proper and perfect results.

Here yet another question may be put to us. Whether Mr. Wesley gives any SCRIPTURE for his class meeting confessional? O yes. He brings just *one text* from the Bible. And that text *exactly the same one*, and the *only one* brought by the Roman Catholic to sustain his priestly confessional!!—"Confess your faults one to another, and pray one for another, that ye may be healed."—[James 5: 16.] The perversion of this text, when applied by Mr. Wesley to the class meeting confessional, is as

gross as when tortured by the Romanist to sustain his priestly confessional. The true meaning of the passage is happily expressed by Doddridge—“When you are conscious of having been really to blame; do not perversely vindicate a conduct which your own hearts condemn, but be frank in acknowledging it. Confess [your] faults one to another,” &c. &c. Here is the simple requirement, to confess our faults one to another—under the dictate of conscience, in *private*, to *the individual*, and *when*, and *where*, in our view suitable. *An obvious christian duty!* Now, what gross perversion of this Scripture, to bring it to sanction the Roman Catholic sacrament of *penance*, in which every member of that church is required, under fearful sanctions, to come to a priest, so many times a year, and confess to him every thought, word and act of sin against God! And we ask every man, if the perversion of the word of God by Mr. Wesley and Methodism, is not equally detestable, when they, like the Catholic, bring this solitary text to vindicate the class-meeting system—in which, every member of that church is under obligation, upon pain of exclusion, to appear before the class leader every week, and to submit to his careful enquiry how he has observed the outward rules, and how he grows in the knowledge and love of God—in which, every member may be separated from his wife or child in a band, where all are to be men or all women, all married or all unmarried—where, every week, they are *pledged*, by order of the church, to confess *every known sin committed since the last meeting*,—to confess what particular temptations they have met with,—to confess how they were delivered,—to confess what they have thought, said, or done, of which they doubt whether it be sin or no? What an outrage upon any honest interpretation of the Bible, to apply the text in James to the class-meeting confessional! But the class-meeting system is the Romish confessional in bud and blossom, and it was proper, therefore, for Mr. Wesley to pervert the same passage of Scripture brought by the priest, and just as the priest tortures it, to *sanction the same system of iniquity*.

Having thus, as we think, demonstrated the resemblance between the Roman and Methodist confessionals, in *principle*, we will now briefly notice *two other points of resemblance*, as results of the confessional, in a great degree, in both churches.

1. *The conscience is hardened by it.* Confession of sin to God *without contrition*, hardens the conscience. Confession of sin, then, any where else than to God, must harden the conscience in a greater degree. Confession, therefore, in the Roman and Methodist systems must tend to a callous conscience. *And it is so.* Nine out of ten of the readers of this article will say, if they are not Methodists, "Yes. It is true. We have often remarked a *peculiar insensibility*, as a characteristic of the Methodist common mass, [whatever very many exceptions there certainly are from education and refined associations in life,] a *peculiar insensibility to moral honor and integrity of character.*" We have not dropped this sentence in hasty writing. We say deliberately—it is so—it is so—wide and deep—and we are not mistaken in saying our readers will respond, "Alas! *It is even so.*" This is, in a great degree, the work of the class-meeting system of confessions.

2. The class-meeting system, like the Roman confessional, leads to *submission to priestly control.* We see, as the result of the latter, how, for a thousand years, the foot of the priest has been upon the neck of the submissive Catholic. This is the *consummation* of that stupendous system, concentrated in the confessional. *It grants relief to the burdened soul at the confessional.* Let man believe THAT, and *he is a slave to that confessional.* And we see, in the Methodist church, with just the difference, between the results of one hundred years of Methodism, and a thousand years of Romanism, the same thing. Let men and women go into the Methodist church. Let them believe it is the *will of God that they must meet a class leader every week or be turned out of the church.* Let them believe he is authorized to enquire how every soul in his class prospers, and that they are bound by compulsion of church wrath to tell how they have observed the outward rules of the church, and how they have grown in the knowledge and love of God. Let them believe it is their duty to submit to be divided into bands of three or four,—that in one of these bands all must be men, or all women; and all married, or all unmarried—that they must meet in these bands every week and be bound to tell to one another, 1. Every known sin they have committed since they last met. 2. What particular temptations they have met with. 3. How they were delivered. 4. What they

have thought, said, or done, of which they doubted whether it was sin or not? Let them believe it is also the will of God that they meet the preacher in charge once a quarter, if practicable, the men and women apart, and make other general confession to him. Let them believe that the preacher will *give tickets to none* [to enter the church] *until they are recommended by a leader with whom they have met at least six months on trial.* Let them believe that this leader is the mere tool of that preacher, who is one of a GREAT EPISCOPACY, *authorized by God to exert over them imperial dominion,* and, in reference to whose authority, *they have not a word to say.* Let men and women be in the Methodist church, and believe this—and their minds are paralyzed and dumb. They are a deformed mass, with little better life than that breathed into it from the nostrils of the itinerancy. They are a church stagnant as a pond, reflecting little else than that huge overshadowing cloud of despotism which frowns over it, and which must spread and shut out, at last, the light of heaven.

The submission of Methodists to their ministry, is, even now, lamentable and astounding. They submit to their immense itinerancy being quartered upon them like an army of soldiers, without any will of their own, whether they shall come, or stay, or go. They submit to be controlled in their reading, so that there is a virtual censorship of the press over them. They are drilled to prefer hearing some old hickupping driveler, who has “*got religion,*” to listening to Dr. Chalmers, if he is a Presbyterian. They submit to be controlled in the cut of their dress. They are drilled to extraordinary sameness in expression of face, and tone of voice. They are drilled to believe they verily do God service to be Methodists, whatever else they be—to uphold Methodism through thick and thin—right or wrong—precisely upon the principle on which political parties are sustained. For they are drilled to gather around the preacher in the pulpit, as around the demagogue on the stump, and hurrah over the merest bag of wind, as full answer to facts and arguments against Methodism.—They are drilled to believe that it is right to hate with personal, private malignity, every man who speaks against Methodism: and to propagate against him any and every hearsay gabble that may create odium, as lawful defence of Methodism.

METHODISM IS TO BE SUSTAINED,—and the end sanctifies the means. *This is the identical spirit of Rome.* But, like causes must produce like effects. The Methodist ministry, in its class-meeting system, is *Rome and its confessional*, and, LIKE PRIESTS LIKE PEOPLE.

III. We have promised to show the *difference* between the Roman and Methodist confessional. *One point* of difference will be sufficient for the present. The Romish confessional secures what is TRUE, in a great degree,—while the Methodist confessional results in what is FALSE, in a large measure. This can be made very plain. For, the Roman Catholic is not afraid to trust his priest almost to the fullest extent. The Methodist is afraid to trust his brotherhood to the same degree. The members of the band, it is true, are pledged to *secrecy*. [Wesley's works, vol. 5, p. 185.] But, notwithstanding, Methodism cannot give to every one, of innumerable bands, the secrecy of the Roman confessional. It is, therefore, preposterous to think that any member of a class, even when he goes into the more secret band, *will tell all his sins*. He then necessarily gives a *false* pledge when he enters the band—and his *experience* when *there*, is necessarily *not true* as to what he *omits*, if *true* as to what he actually reveals. The class-meeting system then, [although not so designed by Mr. Wesley,] is, in fact, as perfect a school to learn people to tell what is *not true* as any thing ever devised by the Jesuits.

This will farther appear as we now give the sum of the whole matter.

(1.) *The class-meeting system tends to make a Pharisee of the christian.* For, when the truly religious Methodist reveals his experience every week, in which his progressive sanctification is disclosed to the class, his brethren, of course, must think well of him. And he must, notwithstanding his humility, think well of himself. Such a man will have little, peradventure, of sin in his own opinion to confess in the open class, if any in the more secret band. What next? Why, he becomes more and more confirmed in good opinion of himself, as he reaches a higher sanctification every week—while the brethren will be the more impressed by his humble look and honied relations of his triumphs over the flesh and Satan. What results from all this? Why, the man is made a Pharisee. For, no

man can tell every week in public class meeting his supposed growth in grace, his joys and raptures, and see eyes swimming in exultation, and gazing upon him in fanatical or real religious sympathy—no man can pass through such secret, insidious, constant flattery, without spiritual pride. The poor man could not help being a Pharisee, even if his whole religious training did not tend that way. As it is, there is no help for him. Every body sees it, even as he walks along the street. There is an air about him not to be mistaken, as far as you recognize him. He has enlarged his borders, and made broad his spiritual phylacteries, even if he has laid aside the standing collar and rounded front. You see it as he smiles upon you, and talks with you by the way. As he reveals what he thinks of you, and what he thinks of himself, his heart speaks out—“*God I thank thee I am not as other men.*” No. The class meeting never did, and never can improve christian character. It always has, and always will injure the piety of the good man. The laws of human nature, however improved by grace, decide the question. And facts, every where, in all the life of Methodism, sustain the opinion expressed, as on a rock.

(2.) The results of the class meeting are, if possible, still worse upon the *seeker, and mere professor of religion*. Both these grades are induced by the whole influence of Methodism to make a false religious experience. To say nothing here of its mischievous teachings upon the subject of the evidences of regeneration, Methodism encourages its members to look for high excitement—enthusiastic joy—fanatical delusions. And now, when the truly good man tells his real experience, colored as it may be by his creed and his fancy, these seekers and mere professors, will desire to give as good an experience too as they can—and from the very fact that they have no religion, they will, in the workings of the deceitful heart, be led to tell what is false, in *self-deception*—even if they do not *make a mock character for the occasion*. O! what facts would be disclosed if we had the history of the class meeting from the beginning! Alas! what will be the revelations of the Last Day!

(3.) The class-meeting confessional, if enforced as Mr. Wesley planned it, and as it is in the Discipline, would make

the Methodist church the most hideous *school for scandal* in the world. Look at the thing! Just let us suppose they have eight hundred thousand members. [They claim a great many more.] That gives two hundred thousand bands of four members each. So, we may say, for round count, fifty thousand bands of *married men*—fifty thousand bands of *married women*—fifty thousand bands of *unmarried men*, and as many of *unmarried women*! Two hundred thousand confessionals in active operation every Sabbath day, in which every married man in the Methodist church would be telling to other married men, all his sins and temptations, and all he had said, thought or done, that was of doubtful morality; and every married woman earnest at the same thing; and every young man and every girl! Why, Satan himself never, even in Romanism, invented a system more certain to produce a lax morality. Let people talk about sin, *habitually*, especially secret thoughts and emotions, *as a prescribed round of duty*, whether at the Roman confessional, or in the Methodist class or band meeting, or in a McDowel New York Moral Reform Association, or any where else, *and you break down the natural barriers God has erected in the instinctive shame of human nature, to say nothing of quenching the Spirit.* "*Sin lieth at the door,*" and under such invitation, must and will *come in*. Just think of some of the questions which must be asked at the Romish confessional—questions so vile that they are in Latin—questions so vile, that a man in Pottsville, Pennsylvania, who made translated extracts from them, as contained in Dens' Theology, was arrested [in November 1843] on the charge of having sold and distributed a grossly immoral book. Just think that these questions might be asked by married men and married women, and young men and young women, of one another in the band meetings. Just think of sister Sally Slander-wink, leaning from the band-meeting bench, where confessions are to be made, and whispering to sister Susan Slack-twisted, as follows:

Sister Sally.—An aliquando frequentas personas alterius sexus vel consortia?

Sister Susan.—Ita.

Sister Sally.—An aliquando ibidem miscentur sermones sive verba impudica!

Sister Susan.—Sic est; de concubitu et partibus pudentis.

Sister Sally.—Quas partes tu egisti?

Sister Susan.—Ego risi cum aliis et quandoque verbum addidi.

Sister Sally.—Quoties id accidit? Coram quot hominibus? Coram qualibus personis? An sulsecuta quædam desideria, commotiones carnales aut libertates actionum, oscula, &c.?

These are the introductory questions only, which may be put to the penitent by the priest—or, as we have said, by the members of the band, the one to the other. [We have made this selection of questions from the *New Englander on Romanism*, July 1844.] And now, sister Sally Slander-wink is relieved of her burden of sin, and has taken into her bosom sister Susan's, and that of all the rest of the band. She goes home. She looks solemn and mysterious. And as her head bows over the shuttle, or bobs at the flax wheel, or jirks as she pulls the needle—no wonder her eye-brows are drawn up, and her mouth is drawn down, and the gray eye winks from time to time,—for, *she has the sins of a whole band meeting of women on her soul, except her own.* And sister Susan Slack-twisted has the same. And brother Tommy Love-to-tell-it, and brother Christopher Cant-keep-it have, in like manner, each of them the whole guilt of a band of men on their consciences—except their own. And so have all, in the two hundred thousand bands. Alas! what shall they do with this accumulation of other people's guilt, week after week—for it has been a strange exchange of burdens. The dream of Addison, in the *Spectator*, was nothing to it. Addison dreamed that Jupiter once allowed each of the human race to exchange troubles with his neighbor. One gave gray hairs in exchange for a carbuncle—another threw down his chains and took up the gout—a third laid down the colic and snatched up an undutiful son, and one gave a bad face for a lost reputation. But these were all bodily infirmities, or troubles. Those people made no barter of personal sins. But the Methodist confessional is a very different affair. *It is the swap of sins.* And the most remarkable point of the difference is, that each penitent gets *three* burdens of sin in return for the *one* he parts with. Thus, a member may have to confess some of “*the works of the flesh*,” and the account may run this way:—He exchanges, perhaps, a doubt-

ful thought as to *adultery*, and gets from his three band brethren certain emotions, which may be "*fornication, uncleanness, and lasciviousness.*" Another parts with *idolatry*, and gets back *witchcraft, hatred, and variance*—a third gives *emulation*, and finds he has got *wrath, strife, and seditions*—a fourth acknowledges *heresy*, and is filled with the whisperings of *envyings, and murder, and drunkenness*. And each may have dropped a word about *revelling*, and all take with them *such like* from the other. Alas! what shall all these eight hundred thousand do, *each of them loaded with three people's sins?* They cannot keep other folk's sins as they would their own. What shall they do? They are not in the situation of the Roman priest. He, good fat fellow, he can keep the secrets of his confessional. He has no wife, nor child, nor neighbors, nor farm, nor merchandize,—he has nothing to do all day long, but to drink cold water and say his prayers. He can, therefore, afford to keep secrets. Besides, he believes the devil will catch him if he tells; or, if Satan spares him, he knows the Pope will not. The priest, therefore, will give up any thing in the world, even his virginity, rather than tell the secrets of the confessional. But what shall these eight hundred thousand Methodists do with other people's sins? Why, they will burst unless they tell them—and tell them they will.

We repeat, what a *school for scandal* the Methodist church would be, if the class-meeting system could be made perfect in its motion under the action of the Great Iron Wheel!

Here we may remark, that the class meeting was most complete in its operation under the control of Mr. Wesley himself. Yet, enthusiastic and fanatical as he was, he seems to have felt, without knowing the cause, the mischievous working of his system. He remarks:—"The world say *the Methodists* are no *better than other people*. This is not true. But it is nearer the truth than we are willing to believe. For personal religion, either towards God or man, is *amazingly superficial* among us. How little faith! How little communion with God! How little brotherly love! What continual judging of one another! *What gossiping, evilspeaking, talebearing!*—**WHAT WANT OF MORAL HONESTY!** To instance only one or two particulars,—who does as he would be done by, in buying and selling, particularly in selling horses? Write him a

knave that does not. *And the Methodist knave is the worst of all knaves.* Family religion is shamefully wanting, and almost in every branch.”—[Wesley’s works, vol. 5, p. 213.]

What a commentary is this upon Mr. Wesley’s class-meeting system of weekly drill and confession of sins! What a picture of Methodism! And the picture drawn by Mr. Wesley himself. Shall any dare blame us if we say Mr. Wesley has drawn a true picture of Methodism? And we ask another question. Can Methodism, in its results, ever exhibit any better picture than this drawn by Mr. Wesley?

It is, then, the solemn duty of every lover of civil and religious liberty, to examine the Great Iron Wheel; and the duty of every upright man and woman in the community to understand this class-meeting system, and say, “*Let it be done away.*” It is the Roman Catholic confessional. It leads men to confess and be relieved of their sins without coming to Christ. It hardens the conscience to moral obligations. It prostrates body and soul under the feet of an irresponsible ministry. It injures the piety of the good man. It encourages hypocrisy. It must, if fully developed, demoralize society. It is a disgrace to the day in which we live, and it is a burlesque and dishonor upon the word of God. *Let it be done away.*

We have given *facts* and *arguments*, and if any complain that we have also spoken in some ridicule and contempt of this foul thing, we reply, that we are not careful to make any apology. We hold with Pascal in what he says to the Jesuits—and, we conclude with his words, which we address to Methodist preachers:—“Indeed, reverend sirs, there is a vast difference between laughing at religion, and laughing at those who profane it by their extravagant opinions. It were impiety to be wanting in respect for the verities which the spirit of God has revealed; but it were no less impiety, of another sort, to be wanting in contempt for the falsities which the spirit of man opposes to them. Do not then expect, sirs, to make people believe it is unworthy of a christian to treat error with derision. Nothing is easier than to convince all who were not aware of it before, that this practice is perfectly just—that it is common with the fathers of the church, and that it is sanctioned by the Scripture, by the example of the best of saints, and even by that of God himself.”

Resolutions of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church on Dancing.

MR. DUFFIELD, from the committee to whom was referred overture no. 20, from the 3d Presbytery of New York, on "Dancing," reported the following resolution, which was adopted:

Resolved, That the fashionable amusement of promiscuous dancing, is so entirely unscriptural, and so eminently and exclusively that of the 'world, which lieth in wickedness,' and so wholly inconsistent with the spirit of Christ, and with that propriety of christian deportment, and that purity of heart which his followers are bound to maintain, as to render it not only improper and injurious for professing christians either to partake in it, or to qualify their children for it by teaching them the art; but also to call for the faithful and judicious exercise of discipline on the part of church sessions, when any of the members of their churches have been guilty."

From the "Pictorial Life of George Whitefield."

Anecdote of Whitefield.

The Power of Truth.—A gentleman, on returning from one of Mr. Whitefield's sermons, was met, on his way home, by an eminent minister, whom he usually heard, and who expressed great surprise that he should go to hear such a man.—The gentleman replied, "Sir, when I hear you, I am planting trees all the time; but, during the whole of Mr. Whitefield's sermon, I never found time to plant one." A similar instance is related of a ship-builder, who usually could "build a ship from stem to stern during the sermon, but, under Mr. Whitefield, could not lay a single plank."

THE
Calvinistic Magazine.

[NEW SERIES.]

“Earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints.”

Vol. II.

May, 1847.

No. 5.

Mode of Baptism:

—
BY REV. WM. MINNIS:
—

“The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us, (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience towards God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ.”—1 PETER, 3: 21.

For the sake of the connection we will make a few remarks on the verses which precede the text, beginning at the 18th:—
“For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit.” Here the writer brings to view the only ground on which the gospel is and ever has been preached to the self-ruined race of Adam: Without the sufferings, death and resurrection of Christ, the blessings of the gospel never could have been proclaimed to a dying world.

“By which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison; which sometime were disobedient, when once the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is eight souls, were saved by water.”—19, 20.

We are not to understand from this, that the gospel was ever preached in the prison of the universe, either by Christ or his ministers; for we know from the Book of God that the voice of mercy never was, and never will be heard in hell. But by the authority of Christ, and on the ground of his sufferings, death and resurrection, the gospel was preached to the ante-

diluvian world in the days of Noah, and because of their disobedient rejection of it, their spirits, or souls, are now in prison—that is, in hell. The writer adverts to the remarkable fact, that notwithstanding the gospel was preached to the wicked world in the days of Noah, while the ark was being prepared, only eight souls were saved, and these were saved by means of the water which destroyed the ungodly. In the text the writer asserts, that the eight persons being saved in the ark by water, was a type of the baptism that saves us. But in stating this fact, he adopts an unusual mode of expression—he begins at the other end of the sentence and mentions the anti-type first. In consequence of this, doubtless, our translators have given us a very obscure translation of the passage. But in the original there is not the least obscurity. The following is the original, with a literal translation:—“Kai (and) baptisma (baptism) antitupon (the antitype) ho (to which) nun (now) sozei (saves) emas (us.)” Then follows a parenthesis, the design of which is, to prevent any mistake respecting the baptism of which he was speaking. He says, “not the putting away of the filth of the flesh.” That is, he does not speak of a baptism that consists in the putting away of the filth of the flesh, “but the answer of a good conscience toward God.”—The word in the original here translated answer, is eperotema, which is a noun from the verb eperotao, which means to interrogate, to demand, to require, &c. The noun here should have been translated, the demand, and the word, answers, or meets, should have been supplied; then, by filling up the elipsis, the sentence would read thus: “But the baptism which answers the demand of a good conscience toward God.” The gospel demands of the sinner a good conscience toward God. In himself he is unable to answer this demand, but the baptism that saves us, of which the apostle is speaking, answers, or meets this demand.

We will now take up the various baptisms spoken of in the Book of God, in order to ascertain which of them is the anti-type to the salvation of the eight persons by water in the ark.

The text furnishes us with the following facts in relation to the baptism spoken of:

First, it is a baptism that saves us. Secondly, it is a baptism that secures for us a good conscience toward God. Thirdly, it is

not a baptism that purifies the flesh. Having these facts to guide us, we cannot well fail of ascertaining the point in question. Some, doubtless, may be startled at the idea of various baptisms being spoken of in the Bible, for the great mass of writers have so blended and confounded them all together, that but few have been led to think that the Bible speaks of more than one, or at most two baptisms.

In our text there is a very clear distinction made between different baptisms; and Paul speaks of baptisms in the plural number, Hebrews 6: 2; and the same writer speaks of divers baptisms, Hebrews 9: 10. Nor does the expression, "One Lord, one faith, one baptism," contradict the fact that there are divers baptisms, as we will show when we come to speak of that one baptism.

The first baptisms of which we have any account in the Scriptures, are the divers baptisms spoken of by Paul in Hebrews, 9: 10. Speaking of the tabernacle service, he says, "Which stood only in meats, and drinks, and divers (baptis-mois) baptisms and carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the time of reformation." These divers baptisms, whatever they may have been, were imposed upon the church while under the ceremonial law, and we would be at no loss to know what they were, if the apostle had told us nothing more respecting them than what is said in the verse quoted above.—No one familiar with the Old Testament could believe that reference was had to divers immersions; for there is not a solitary instance in the whole law of Moses where an individual was required either to immerse himself, or to be immersed by another.

The washings of the person and his clothes, after purification, were not immersions. The words used in relation to these washings, in the original Hebrew, in the Septuagint, and in our own translation, do not mean to immerse, but simply to wash.

We cannot conceive of more than two things required of the Jews, to which the apostle could apply the term baptisms—the ceremonial purifications, and the washing that followed the purification. And that he did not refer to the washing after purification, is evident from the fact that this washing was not of various kinds. It was of but one kind—simply washing

with water. But the things to which the term baptisms is applied, were of various kinds. They were divers baptisms. The word here translated divers, is diaphorais, which means of various kinds. This terra would be inapplicable to a simple washing with water, no matter how many different things might be washed. The Pharisees baptized cups and pots, brazen vessels and tables, but no man of sense would call this divers baptisms; it was the same baptism applied to different things. By the divers baptisms, then, the apostle must have meant the various purifications enjoined in the ceremonial law. And, notwithstanding all these purifications were performed by sprinkling, they were divers purifications; the impurities from which they were to be cleansed were various, and that with which they were purified was different in different cases. In some cases the unclean person was sprinkled with water prepared with the ashes of a burnt heifer; in others, with water and the blood of a bird, and some other ingredients; in others, with blood alone, &c., so that with great propriety the apostle calls these various purifications divers baptisms.

But we are not under the necessity of determining what these baptisms were by a course of reasoning, for the apostle proceeds to enumerate some three or four of them. He says, "For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh."—Verse 13. In this verse he informs us what two of the divers baptisms were,—the sprinkling of the blood of bulls and of goats, and the sprinkling of the water prepared with the ashes of an heifer. Again he says—"For when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people, according to the law, he took the blood of calves, and of goats, with water, and scarlet wool, and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book and all the people."—Verse 19. Here is another of these baptisms. Again; "Moreover, he sprinkled likewise with blood both the tabernacle, and all the vessels of the ministry."—21. Here, then, are four of these divers baptisms enumerated, agreeing precisely with the conclusion that we came to above. With all these facts before us, nothing but wilful blindness could lead any one to mistake what these baptisms were.

But none of these baptisms saved those who received them;

none of them answered the demand of a good conscience, for the apostle asserts that the whole tabernacle service, in which these baptisms were included, could not make him that did the service perfect as pertaining to the conscience.—Heb. 9: 9.—He also says that these baptisms consisted merely in the purifying of the flesh.—Heb. 9: 13. Therefore none of these can be the baptism intended in the text.

In the next place, we will examine John's baptism. John was a Jewish priest, administered his baptism and closed his ministry and his life under the Old Testament dispensation, which did not terminate until the death of Christ. Hence his baptism must have been an Old Testament institution. John's baptism was from heaven and not of men—that is, he had divine authority for baptizing as he did. And he must have been authorized by a direct revelation from heaven to administer a new baptism which had not been administered before, or, as a Jewish Priest, he administered one of the divers baptisms imposed upon the Jews until the time of reformation.—That John's was not a new baptism, which had not been administered before, is evident from the following considerations:

First. If John instituted a new ordinance, he was bound to give satisfactory evidence of his divine authority, and God must have empowered him to give such evidence; for, without this, the Jews would not only have been under no obligations to have received his baptism, but they would have been very criminal if they had received it. For, if they had received a law as of divine authority from any one, without satisfactory evidence of his commission from heaven to impose such a law, they would have disregarded the authority of God and followed an impostor. And the evidence which they in all such cases were bound to require, and the evidence which God has always given, is miracles. If, then, John instituted a new baptism, he must have attested his authority for so doing by working miracles. But we not only have no account of any miracle wrought by John, but we are told plainly that he did no miracle.—John 10: 41. Therefore John did not institute a new baptism. In the second place, if the Jews had understood John's baptism to be a new ordinance, not authorized by Moses, they would have rejected both him and his baptism; and in

place of Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan looking to him and receiving his baptism, he would no doubt have shared the fate of Stephen. This is evident from the treatment that Christ and his disciples received at their hands, notwithstanding their divine authority was fully attested by miracles. Those inflexible Jews gloried in the declaration that they were Moses' disciples, and nothing would they receive unless they believed it had the authority of Moses, either written or traditional. Therefore the Jews did not believe that John's baptism was a new institution, or they would not have received it. John, then, must have derived his authority for baptizing as he did, from the Old Testament Scriptures, and his baptism must have been one of the divers baptisms imposed on the Jews until the time of reformation.—And when we consider the object of John's mission, we need be at no loss in determining what baptism it was. He was sent to prepare the way of the Lord,—not only to announce the near approach of the Messiah, but also to prepare the Jewish church for his appearance. At that time the Jews had greatly degenerated, and the church was in a state of great declension. They had made void the law by their traditions. John was sent to produce a reformation of manners, to restore the worship of God as prescribed in the Sacred Volume, and to bring the church back to the law of Moses. This view of John's work in preparing the way of the Lord, is verified by the declaration of Christ respecting it. He, in speaking of John under the name of Elias, says, "Elias truly shall first come and *restore* all things."—Matt. 17: 11. To restore is to bring back from declension to its former state. John's work, in bringing the Jews back to the worship of God as prescribed in the law of Moses, was first to bring them to repentance for their departure from the law; and secondly, to prevail upon them to agree now to keep the law; and when they did this he baptized them. Why did he baptize them? When Moses first gave this law to the Israelites, and they agreed to obey it, he sprinkled them in testimony of this agreement.—Heb. 9: 19, 20. And we have already shown that this was one of the divers baptisms spoken of by Paul.

When John prevailed upon the Jews to agree to keep this same law, he baptized them in testimony of this agreement.

Hence he baptized for the same reason that Moses baptised in the first case.

This then was John's baptism, and as it was included in the divers baptisms spoken of by Paul, we have already proved that it is not the baptism intended in the text.

In the third place, we will examine the baptism which took place on the morning of the day of Pentecost, foretold by John the Baptist when speaking of Jesus Christ. He said, "I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance; but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear: *he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire.*"—Matt. 3: 11. From this we learn two important facts respecting this baptism. First, Christ himself was to be the baptizer. Secondly, he would baptize *with* the Holy Ghost and with fire. The design of this baptism was to qualify the apostles for their great work—to confer upon them and other christians of that day miraculous gifts—to enable them to give satisfactory evidence of the truth of the gospel of Christ to all the world.—Acts 1: 8. and 2: 3, 4, 16, 17, 18. This baptism neither renewed the heart nor cleansed the soul from sin, because none received it but true believers, who had been renewed and cleansed before receiving it. The apostles and others, who were baptized with the Holy Ghost, on the day of Pentecost, had been regenerated, and were true believers long before that time. And Peter promised the gift of the Holy Ghost to those who would repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ.—Acts 2: 38. Receiving the baptism with the Holy Ghost, was evidence that the persons receiving it had previously believed on the Lord Jesus Christ.—Acts 11: 15—17. After certain disciples with whom Paul met at Ephesus, had received christian baptism, they were baptized with the Holy Ghost and spake with tongues and prophesied.—Acts 19: 5, 6. Therefore, as all who received this baptism were christians, had a good conscience toward God, and were in a state of salvation before receiving it, this cannot be the baptism spoken of in the text.

In the fourth place, we will examine the baptism instituted by Christ under the New Testament dispensation.—Matt. 28: 19. This baptism is to be administered by the ministers of the gospel, in the name of the Trinity, to all who have a right to

membership in the visible church; for this is the rite by which membership in the church is recognized. The symbol to be used is (*katharo udati*) clear, unsoiled, unalloyed water.—Heb. 10: 22. Without entering into an investigation of the various controverted questions respecting this baptism, we will proceed to prove that it is not the baptism spoken of in the text. In the dark ages of the church, when ignorance and superstition prevailed over Bible truth and common sense, many believed that this baptism contained intrinsic efficacy sufficient to cleanse and save the soul. And many who have never emerged out of the darkness and impiety of Popery, and others who wish to find a road to heaven without holiness, pretend to believe somewhat the same foolery in this enlightened age. But the hypothesis is so obviously unscriptural, so senseless and contemptible; that it is with some reluctance we enter upon a process of argumentation to prove its falsehood. We will, however, present a few arguments.

The Book of God authorizes this baptism to be administered to only two classes of the human family—believers and their children. And that it neither secures for the first class a good conscience toward God, nor saves them, will appear from the following facts. First, the adult, before he receives this baptism, must be a believer; and the faith required is not a dead intellectual faith; that is, it is not merely the assent of the understanding to the great truths of the gospel, but it is the faith of the heart. Philip said to the eunuch, “if thou believest with all thy heart thou mayest” be baptized.

Secondly, the living faith of the heart, which qualifies the adult for the reception of this baptism, is the faith which worketh by love:—Gal. 5: 6. Therefore this faith can not be exercised without love, and as every one that loveth is born of God; (1 John 4: 7,) it follows that whosoever has this faith has been born of God.

Thirdly, to suppose that one who loves God, and has accepted of Christ as his Saviour to save him from his sins,—to suppose that such an one has not repented of sin, would imply a direct contradiction; therefore repentance is an essential prerequisite or constituent of this faith. Then, before the adult receives this baptism, he must be born of God—he must have repented for sin, and he must be united to Christ by a living

faith. But no one can be the subject of all this without, at the same time, having a good conscience toward God, and being in a state of salvation. Hence, the adult must be in a state of salvation, and have a good conscience before he receives this baptism.

With regard to the other class entitled to this ordinance, we remark, that those who deny the divine right of infant baptism, of course will not believe that their baptism saves them. And those who understand the Bible doctrine on this subject, are as far from believing that baptism saves the infant, as they are from believing that baptism saves the adult; hence it would be useless to spend time in disproving what neither party believes.

To believe that the application of water to the person regenerates the heart, or removes sin from the soul, or in any sense of the word saves the soul, is base idolatry—it is making an idol-god and a saviour of water—it is substituting the minister of the gospel for the Holy Ghost, and water for the blood of Jesus Christ. And if those who believe it may be pious, and free from the sin of idolatry, so may the worshipper of the river Ganges.

Again. Who is so ignorant as not to know, that many in the days of the apostles, and multitudes in all the subsequent ages of the church, remained, like Simon the sorcerer, in the gall of bitterness and the bonds of iniquity, after receiving this baptism? Therefore this cannot be the baptism spoken of in the text.

The only remaining baptism to be examined, is the baptism of the Holy Ghost. This baptism has been strangely and very absurdly confounded with the Pentecostal baptism, but they are as distinct as any two baptisms spoken of in the Book of God. In the Pentecostal baptism, Jesus Christ was the baptizer; he baptized with the Holy Ghost; the design of this baptism was to confer miraculous gifts, and this baptism was confined to the days of the apostles.

But in the baptism of the Holy Ghost, the Holy Ghost is the baptizer—he baptizes with the blood of Jesus Christ. The design of his baptism is to regenerate the soul, and cleanse it from sin, and this baptism will continue to the end of time. Hence the two baptisms are entirely different throughout.

Paul speaks of this baptism: (in 1 Cor. 12: 13,) “For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free, and have been all

made to drink into one Spirit." From this passage we learn the following facts respecting this baptism:

1. The Holy Ghost is the baptizer; for the one Spirit here undoubtedly means the third person of the Trinity.

2. All true believers have received this baptism. The language of the apostle will admit of no other construction. He says, all we, that is, all true believers, all who are members of Christ's body, (and no unbeliever is a member of Christ's body,) we all, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free, have been baptized by the one Spirit.

3. All who receive this one baptism are by it brought into the one body. The one body here is Christ's mystical body, the invisible church, composed of Christ, the head, and all true believers in every age, the members. No one can become a member of this body without being regenerated and cleansed from sin. Therefore, this baptism, by the one Spirit, which brings us into the one body, must regenerate us, and cleanse us from sin. Hence, we are said to be saved by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost.—Tit. 3: 5.

4. All who receive this baptism are thereby made to drink into one Spirit. That is, they are thereby made to possess and enjoy all the graces of the Spirit. Henry, in his commentary on this passage, says, "It is baptism by the Spirit, it is internal renovation and drinking into one Spirit, partaking of his sanctifying influence from time to time, that makes us true members of Christ's body, and maintains our union with him." Here, then, is a baptism that saves us, a baptism that meets the demand of a good conscience towards God. Therefore this is the baptism spoken of in the text.

Should it be said that the one body is the visible church, we reply, first, that the whole connection forbids such a supposition,—the visible church is no where called the body of Christ.

2. It would be impious to say that the multitudes who enter the visible church without piety, were brought there by the Holy Spirit.

3. All the members of the visible church have not been made to drink into one Spirit. And if it should be said that the baptism here spoken of is water baptism, we answer,

1. That the one Spirit is not the baptizer in water baptism, in any sense whatever.
2. Water baptism does not bring us into the body of Christ.
3. All true believers have not received water baptism.
4. Water baptism does not make those who receive it drink into one Spirit.

Again. The baptism of the Holy Ghost, with its effects upon the soul, is spoken of in the 6th chapter of Romans:—"Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death?" &c.

It has been taken for granted by many, that the baptism here spoken of is water baptism. But the design of the apostle in introducing baptism in this connection, and the effects attributed to the baptism intended, must convince all who do not attribute the regeneration of the soul to water, that water baptism cannot possibly be intended.

Why did the apostle introduce baptism in this connection? In the preceding chapter he had said, that where sin abounded grace did much more abound. An objector might say, if the abounding of sin causes grace to abound, then the believer ought to continue in sin that grace may the more abound. In the 6th chapter he takes up this objection, and proceeds to prove that the believer will not continue in sin. His first argument is found in the 2d verse;—"How shall we that are dead to sin live any longer therein?" His position is, that every true believer is dead to sin, and cannot, and will not live any longer in it. But the objector might not admit the truth of this position; he might say, if it be true that every believer is dead to sin, then of course he will not live any longer therein;—but is it a fact that all true believers are dead to sin? His proof of this fact is found in the third verse:—"Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death?" Here two things are asserted respecting the baptism referred to. First, that it brings us into Jesus Christ. Secondly, that it brings us into Christ's death. By his, that is, Christ's death, he means a death to sin, as is evident from the 10th verse. Speaking of Christ, he says, "For in that he died, he died unto sin once, but in that he liveth, he liveth unto God." But water baptism neither brings us into Jesus Christ, nor into a state of death to sin; hence the recep-

tion of water baptism would be no proof whatever of the truth of the position which the apostle was aiming to establish—that the believer is dead to sin. If, then, we say that he refers to water baptism, we make the sacred writer assert as a well-known fact, what we all admit to be positive falsehood—that water baptism brings the person who receives it into Jesus Christ, and to a state of death to sin; and we make his argument perfect sophistry, for we all know that the reception of water baptism does not prove that he who receives it is dead to sin, and will live no longer therein. But the reception of the baptism of the Holy Ghost, is undeniable proof that the person receiving it is dead to sin. For the baptism of the Holy Ghost is the very thing, and the only thing that does bring any one into Christ, and into a state of death to sin. Hence it is called the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Ghost.—Tit. 3: 5. It causes those who receive it to put on Christ.—Gal. 3: 27. How clear and conclusive is his argument to prove that all believers are dead to sin, when we understand him to refer to baptism by the Holy Ghost:—“Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized by the Holy Ghost into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death?” For since all believers have been baptized by the one Spirit into one body, and have all been made to drink into one Spirit,—1 Cor. 12: 13; and have all been enabled by this baptism to put on Christ,—Gal. 3: 27; and have had the old man crucified and the body of sin destroyed in the soul by this baptism, that henceforth they should not serve sin.—Rom. 6: 6; therefore so many of us as have received this baptism are dead to sin, and will not live any longer therein. Now who will dare, for the sake of sustaining a favorite theory, to put a baptism into the mouth of the apostle that will make him guilty of falsehood and sophistry, and defeat the whole design of his argument? He that will must answer it to God.

In the 4th verse he draws his conclusions from the preceding arguments:—“Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death, that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so also we should walk in newness of life.” Here he asserts that the baptism of which he speaks, brings us with Christ into death, that is into a state of death to sin, in order that we should walk in newness of life,

He uses the word buried, in place of the word brought, because he wished to contrast the believer's death to sin by the baptism of the Holy Ghost, with Christ's death to sin and the new life of the believer after this baptism, with the life which Christ lived to God after his resurrection.—See verse 10th. But water baptism brings no one into a state of death to sin with Christ, nor does it cause any one to walk in newness of life, therefore he cannot intend water baptism. But the baptism of the Holy Ghost does bring us into a state of death to sin, and does cause us to walk in newness of life, therefore he must be speaking of the baptism of the Holy Ghost.

In the 5th verse he argues, that if we have been planted together with Christ in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection. But water baptism does not plant us together with Christ in the likeness of his death, nor does it bring us into the likeness of his resurrection, therefore he cannot intend water baptism. But the baptism of the Holy Ghost does both, therefore he is speaking of this baptism. In the 6th verse he asserts, that by the baptism of which he had been speaking, our old man is crucified, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin. But water baptism does not crucify our old man, it does not destroy the body of sin in the soul, nor does it secure us from living in the service of sin. Therefore he cannot intend water baptism. But the baptism of the Holy Ghost is the identical thing that crucifies our old man, and destroys the body of sin in the soul, and secures us from living in the service of sin; therefore he must intend the baptism of the Holy Ghost. Now, the intelligent reader cannot avoid seeing, that when we understand the apostle to refer to baptism by the Holy Ghost, his arguments are most forcible and conclusive, and the fact which he set out to prove, is established beyond all controversy—that the believer is dead to sin, and will not live any longer therein. In fact, a more cogent and masterly piece of reasoning is not found upon record. But when we suppose him to be speaking of water baptism, the whole is a tissue of falsehood, absurdity, and sophistry. Now, in the face of the above undeniable facts, can an honest man still persevere in maintaining that the apostle is speaking of water baptism?

We will now quote the whole passage, and insert water bap-

tism in every place where baptism is either expressed or understood; and if the apostle is speaking of water baptism, it will make him teach nothing contrary to what is elsewhere taught in the Book of God.

Verse 3.—Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized by water baptism into Jesus Christ, were baptized by water baptism into his death?

4.—Therefore we are buried with him by water baptism into death, that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also, by means of water baptism, should walk in newness of life.

5.—For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death by water baptism, we shall in consequence of the same, be in the likeness of his resurrection.

6.—Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, by water baptism, that the body of sin might be destroyed by water baptism, that henceforth, in consequence of water baptism, we should not serve sin.

7.—For he that is dead, by means of water baptism is freed from sin.

8.—Now if we be dead with Christ by means of water baptism, we believe that we shall also live with him.

This reading, you see, makes the apostle teach the most palpable falsehood in every verse.

We will now insert the baptism of the Holy Ghost in the very same places where we inserted water baptism, and see how that will do.

Verse 3.—Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized by the Holy Ghost into Jesus Christ, were baptized by the Holy Ghost into his death.

4.—Therefore we are buried with him by the baptism of the Holy Ghost into death, that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also, by means of the baptism of the Holy Ghost, should walk in newness of life.

5.—For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, by the baptism of the Holy Ghost, we shall, in consequence of the same, be in the likeness of his resurrection.

6.—Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him by the baptism of the Holy Ghost, that the body of sin might be

destroyed by the baptism of the Holy Ghost, that henceforth, in consequence of the baptism of the Holy Ghost, we should not serve sin.

7.—For he that is dead, by means of the baptism of the Holy Ghost is freed from sin.

8.—Now if we be dead with Christ, by means of the baptism of the Holy Ghost we believe that we shall live with him.

This reading makes the apostle teach what is strictly true in every sense, and admitted to be true by all except the grossest heretics. It makes him teach what is clearly taught elsewhere in the Word of God.

Now if this does not prove to a positive demonstration, that the inspired writer was speaking of the baptism of the Holy Ghost, and not of water baptism, then nothing can be demonstrated.

Here then is a baptism which accords precisely with the baptism spoken of in our text. It meets the demand of a good conscience toward God, and it saves us. For it brings us into Christ, and into a state of death to sin. It crucifies our old man, destroys the body of sin in the soul, and causes us to walk in newness of life. The reader may see this same baptism spoken of in Gal. 3: 26—29, and in Col. 2: 10—12, with the same saving effects attributed to it, as in the passages already considered.

We have already remarked that the Holy Ghost baptizes with the blood of Jesus Christ. Nothing in the universe, except this precious atoning blood, applied by the Holy Ghost, can renew, cleanse, and save our lost and guilty souls. Water applied to the body has no efficacy to cleanse and save the soul. The blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer, sprinkling the unclean, only sanctified to the purifying of the flesh.—Heb. 9: 13. But, blessed be God, “the blood of Jesus Christ his son cleanseth us from all sin.”—1 John 1: 7. “Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost.”—Titus 3: 5. The mode by which the blood of Christ is applied to the soul, is sprinkling. This fact is clearly taught by the divers typical sprinklings under the Old Testament. The sprinkling of the blood of the paschal lamb, the sprinkling of

the blood and water upon the leper, the sprinkling of the water prepared with the ashes of the burnt heifer, and the sprinkling of the blood of the victims offered in sacrifice, were all typical of the sprinkling of the blood of Christ upon the soul to cleanse it from sin. The same truth is taught in plain language in the New Testament. Here the blood of Christ is called "the blood of sprinkling." Paul, speaking of the superior advantages of those who live under the New Testament dispensation, says: "For ye are not come unto the mount that might be touched. But ye are come unto mount Sion. And to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant, and to the *blood of sprinkling*, that speaketh better things than that of Abel."—Heb. 12: 18—24. Why is the blood of Christ called the blood of sprinkling? Not because the blood of the sacrifices was sprinkled. As well might we say that the death of Christ is called an atonement, because the sacrifices under the Old Testament were called atonements. This would be a most outrageous transposition of the type and antitype. The death of Christ is called an atonement because it is an atonement, and the sacrifices are so called because they typified this fact. In like manner the blood of Christ is called the blood of sprinkling, because it is sprinkled upon the soul, and the divers sprinklings, under the Old Testament, typified this fact. Peter asserts that the Spirit sanctifies the elect unto obedience, by the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ. "Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit unto obedience, and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ."—1 Pet. 1: 2. Paul points out the difference between the effect produced by the sprinkling of the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer, and that produced by the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ. "For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh, how much more shall (the sprinkling understood) of the blood of Christ . . . purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God."—Heb. 9: 13, 14.

Again. The sanctification of the heart is called the sprinkling of the heart from an evil conscience. "Let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with

pure water.—Heb. 10: 22. The sprinkling here must be the sprinkling of the blood of Christ, for nothing else could produce this effect. Here the apostle speaks of the baptism of the Holy Ghost, and water baptism in connection. The one the sprinkling of the blood of Christ upon the heart to cleanse it from an evil conscience, and the other the ceremonial emblematical washing of the body with pure water. Now, we are compelled to admit that the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ, and the baptism spoken of in Corinthians 12: 13, and in Romans 6, and the baptism spoken of in our text, are all one and the same thing. The baptism in the text meets the demand of a good conscience toward God, and saves us. The baptism in Corinthians brings us into the one body, and makes us drink into one Spirit. The baptism in Romans brings us into Christ, and into a state of death to sin, and causes us to walk in newness of life. The sprinkling of the blood of Christ sanctifies unto obedience,—1 Peter 1: 2; purges our conscience from dead works to serve the living God, sprinkles our hearts from an evil conscience.

These repeated declarations, in which the blood of Christ is said to be sprinkled upon the soul, are not mere accidental remarks, designed to convey no definite ideas. For in the first place, there are no accidental unmeaning expressions in the Inspired Volume.

In the second place, this fact is taught with so much particularity, both in the Old and New Testament, as to prove that it is a cardinal truth.

And in the third place, while we are so repeatedly taught, both typically and verbally, that the blood of Christ is sprinkled, there is not a solitary instance in the whole Book of God in which the soul is said to be dipped or immersed into the blood of Christ, nor is the blood of Christ ever said to be poured upon the soul. The Holy Ghost is said to be poured out, but the blood of Christ never. There is, therefore, no possibility of evading the fact, that God has taught, and fully designed to teach, that the blood of Jesus Christ is sprinkled upon the soul in the baptism of the Holy Ghost.

(To be continued next month.)

Reminiscences of our Church.

Sir Walter Scott, than whom there never was a more generous hearted man, was indeed the minstrel of his native land; and long will it be ere the echo of his sweet cadences cease to sound among the hills of Caledonia. But Sir Walter, with all his amiability, his enchantment of poetry, his lofty-romantic bearing, his tender, beautiful purity of imagination—Sir Walter was not a spiritually-minded man; and this *want*, leaving nothing to balance his high-toned Toryism, and consequent prejudices, was the means of his throwing the light of his genius, too often, on the wrong side of the picture, and making that appear mean and vulgar, which was really and truly glorious.

Who that has read the exquisite tale of “Old Mortality,” and is also well-acquainted, and has a soul to sympathize with the Scottish history of those times, but must see at a glance the injustice which he has done to the noble-minded Covenanter? How many who have visited Scotland during the last twenty years, and have wandered over hills and dales, seeking out and gazing with the eye of enthusiasm upon every spot which *he*, with his wizard pen, has made classical—how many of that number have felt admiration for such characters as Claverhouse, while the high-souled, Bible-taught peasant or minister, has been looked upon, if not with contempt, yet with something akin to derision? Has it not been so? Verily it has—aye, until within the last half dozen years; but, in that period, “a change has come over the spirit” of the land, and now the traveller from a far country seeks other shrines at which to kneel, and lay down the offering of his admiration.

The struggles of the Church of Scotland, which in 1843 resulted in a noble Exodus, has driven reading men and women to other sources than fiction, and torches have been lighted at the great beacon-fire of historic truth which can never again be extinguished, and they are blazing, and bringing into full view the times and the men who were then the true heroes.

In a late No. you gave us an exceedingly interesting account of Mrs. Welch, the daughter of John Knox. The name of Welch is a favorite one in Scotland, especially in

Ayrshire, where many a tale is told of this lady and her devoted husband, who was settled as a minister in the town of Ayr in the year 1590. At that time this place was famous for the wickedness of its inhabitants; but soon the prayers of this holy man were answered, and the spirit of God changed the whole appearance of things. The kirk is still shewn in which he spent whole nights wrestling with God! Often while others slept, he rose to pray, and he kept his "plaid" by the side of his couch, to be ready to throw around him and protect him from the damp night air, as he sallied forth alone to meet his Saviour. It was his general custom to spend eight hours out of the twenty-four in prayer. He died full of joy, crying "Lord, thy servant is a clay vessel and can hold no more."

In the year 1662 this name was again honored in Presbyterian Scotland. Mr. John Welch, a grandson of this celebrated man, and consequently a great-grandson of the famous Reformer, Knox, was in that year "ejected" from his ministry. A dauntless and heroic man was this John Welch, worthy of the noble stock from which he was descended. "A godly, meek and humble man," says Kirkton, "but the boldest adventurer that ever I knew in Christ's church, old or late." His being ejected only gave him a new impulse in his Master's work. £500 was the price set on his head, and the bloodhounds of the Bishops were out in search of him; but still he preached, aye, and often too in his own parish of Iron-gray; and though he was thus a fugitive, yet such was the love and reverence of his people, that all the children were still baptized by him. Claverhouse, on information of his lurking-place, would sometimes ride forty miles in a winter night, but he always missed him. And in this way lived John Welch, preaching and holding communions among the mountains of Scotland for nearly twenty years, and died unmolested in London, the 9th of January, 1681. In McCrie's Church History there is the following anecdote related, which shews the boldness, the intepidity, and the confidence in God of this noble minister.

"On one occasion, being pursued with unrelenting rigor, he was quite at a loss where to flee, but depending on Scottish hospitality, he called at the house of a gentleman of known hostility to field-preachers in general, and to himself in particular, though he had never seen Mr. Welch before. He was

kindly received. In the course of conversation Welch was mentioned, and the difficulty of getting hold of him. 'I am sent,' said Welch, '*to apprehend rebels*; I know where he is to preach to-morrow, and I will give you the rebel by the hand.' The gentleman, overjoyed at this news, agreed to accompany his informant next morning. When they arrived the congregation made way for the minister and his host. He desired the gentleman to sit down on the chair, beside which, to his utter astonishment, his guest of the previous night stood and preached. During the sermon the gentleman seemed much affected, and at the close, when Mr. Welch, according to promise, gave him his hand, he said:—'You said you were sent to apprehend rebels, and I, a rebellious sinner, have been apprehended this day.' "

Such are some of the scenes, and men, the reminiscences of which throw interest around every cliff and cairn, green knoll or bleak mountain-top of *Auld* Scotland.

The beloved and gifted clergyman who had the honor to be Moderator, and to read that noble and still unanswered "Protest," which forever severed the chain that bound the Scottish church to an Erastian establishment, was the late David Welch, who is said to be a descendant of this same illustrious family.

If I have not intruded too far, and if such recollections of our good Calvinistic church should be acceptable, I shall with pleasure contribute my mite from time to time. M.

March 1st, 1847.

Raising up our own Ministers.

MANY objects are tangible, but remain forever untouched. Many ends, in morals and religion, easily attainable, have remained unaccomplished for ages. The summit of mountains in the distance is far more palpable than the base; yet thousands "tarry in all the plains," and never once enjoy the poetic rapture, that exquisite elevation of soul, inspired by wild scenery and boundless prospects. At the worst, this can only be called negligence; but it is highly criminal to fail in making

that *ascending* advance in piety and usefulness, so congenial to our nature and destiny. There is no lack of opportunities to do good—no paucity of objects towards which benevolent feelings and actions may be directed. Benevolence is right in itself considered; and due both to God and man; but great economy may be used in distributing our charities. A miscellaneous dispersion of means will not generally accomplish as great an amount of good as a regular fund. In every undertaking, system and concert of action are powerful auxiliaries.

In the December No., vol. I, Calvinistic Magazine, Presbyterians are respectfully called on to consider the importance of providing and educating a future ministry. Reference is again had to the same subject.

During the dark ages knights, nobles, and the bloodiest tyrants, were the chief founders of all public religious institutions. After leading lives of murder and rapine, old age coming on, and consequent inactivity, conscience would frequently resume its sway, and, to quell its ravings, they made great show of benevolence. Poor subterfuge! The objects upon which we bestow our contributions are more deserving, and our feelings should be infinitely purer than theirs.

The promulgation of the gospel, the preservation and extension of the church, are objects of the profoundest interest, challenging the highest capacities of rational and intelligent beings. And we are imperiously summoned to the great work by all the noble motives that influence human conduct. The gospel *must* be preached at home in its purity—light and truth *must* be brought to bear upon the minds of all, or the righteous wrath of Almighty God will be revealed against us. The controlling influences of the Spirit will be withdrawn, barrenness will ensue, churches decay, morals deteriorate, the country will be deluged with every shade and variety of vice and crime. Already the cry of confusion, anarchy, and infidelity grates upon the ears of honest men. Among the churches old plans of union are violently subverted, new tests of fellowship proposed, disorganization and revolution are losing their native terrors, and, unless caution is used, our hopes ecclesiastical must shortly be engulfed in the great maelstrom around whose tumultuary verge we seem to circulate with such fearful rapidity. Specifications are not necessary here—

a slight degree of intelligence can appreciate these remarks. Nor is it appropriate here to designate with particularity the laws and usages in government and politics, that wage a war of extermination against all that is fair and of good report. Various means are being used, with more or less efficiency, to counteract these baneful influences; but the best, the most active, the only permanent remedy, is a *pious, educated ministry*, without whose aid no general moral reform ever has, or ever can be effected. Tract and Temperance Societies, and, in short, benevolent associations of all kinds, have done much good, and might have done more—the *ministry* transmits a vivifying energy through the whole series of human agency.

Then arouse, Presbyterians, for you are particularly addressed. Arouse! Go on with the work you have so nobly *begun!* Our object is in *full view*, is *attainable*, and why not press forward to a consummation of our hopes and of our prayers? We need the ministers *now*. Hence the necessity of immediately redoubling our efforts to qualify them. Let us supply the whole of our own section of country, and ever afterwards hold ourselves in readiness to supply the places of those whom Providence may remove, and also to assist other parts of the world.

The time for theorizing has passed—the joyous manifestations of substantial reality rise before us. The problem of furnishing our own ministers has long since been solved; the scheme is possible and we are capable. The pioneers have cleared the ground, and though every inch has been disputed, the fiercest combinations have been gallantly met and confounded. Many of these same pioneers, for some, alas! are gone, stand far in front, and anxiously beckon to the churches “to come up to the help of the Lord, to the help of the Lord against the mighty.”

TERRAE FILIUS.

Missionary.

MADURA.—A letter has been received from this mission, urging the claims of the vast field in which they have been called to labor. “Including Poothacortta in this district,” they say, “there are upwards of 1,500,000 inhabitants; a number greater by 77,449 than is contained in Massachusetts, Rhode

Island, New Hampshire and Vermont." "Nor does this include the many large towns and the abundant population just without our southern and northern borders, which will, in all probability, be reached only by laborers from this mission." "There seems to be a tacit understanding that the Madura district is committed to the care of the American Board; so that it appears to be quite certain that if it does not supply these thousands and hundreds of thousands with the bread of life, they must suffer the fearful consequences of not being supplied." After presenting these general considerations, and saying that this whole region is accessible and whitening for an abundant harvest, the letter contains a particular description of thirty-four places, which ought to be occupied with the least possible delay." To this appeal, however, the Committee are unable to make such a response as the case demands. True, the increase of missionary feeling in some of our Theological seminaries is very cheering; but the wants of other missions are far from being adequately supplied. Unless, therefore, the candidates for the foreign service shall be greatly multiplied, the plea of our Madura brethren must be in vain. Where shall the responsibility rest?

—

SANDWICH ISLANDS.—A number of letters have been received from different stations; and though the intelligence is somewhat varied in its character, it is on the whole quite as favorable as was expected. Some of the missionaries speak of discouragements and difficulties; and their account of the state of religion in their churches is similar to the reports which are sometimes made by pastors in this country. Others, on the contrary, are permitted to speak of the reviving influences of the Spirit. Mr. Bishop of Ewa admitted to the church more than two hundred members within the first eight months of 1846; and Mr. Coan received into his large church, during the two years ending May 1, 1846, about five hundred and fifty persons. The mortality among church members, particularly on Hawaii, has been very great. Disease and famine have been busy among all classes.—*Dayspring.*

Collections for A. B. C. F. Missions.

BY. WM. POTTER.

Athens—Presbyterian Church and Congregation,	\$14 75
Madisonville, “ “ “	20 15
“ Rev. T. Martin,	10 00
Cleaveland—Presb'n Ch. and Cong.,	13 10
New Hope, “ “ “	4 86
Maryville, “ “ “	23 83
“ Rev. J. C. Craig,	9 00
McGee's Ferry—A. Humes, Esq.,	3 00
Mt. Horeb—Presb'n Ch. and Cong.,	5 10
New Market, “ “ “	26 50
St. Paul's, “ “ “	17 20
Philadelphia, “ “ “	20 91
New Bethel, “ “ “	5 40
Dandridge, “ “ “	14 07
Greeneville—Subscription,	27 40
Greeneville and Timber Ridge Camp-Meeting,	15 00
Rogersville Pres'n Ch. and Cong.,	30 25
Cold Spring, “ “ “	21 17
Paperville—Mr. Willoughby \$4, Mrs. Hammer 50cts.,	4 50
Blountville and Paperville—Beaver Creek C. Meeting,	85 78
“ S. Rhea, Esq.,	50 00
“ R. P. Rhea, Esq.,	10 00
Kingsport—Pres'n Ch. and Cong.,	101 00
“ Miss Ann Gamble,	10 00
Sapling Grove, Va.,—Rev. James King,	25 00
“ “ “ Mr. James Smith, Jr.,	25 00
Abingdon, Va.—Pres'n. Ch. and Cong.,	50 60
“ “ Rev.. S. Matthews and Wife,	20 00
Glade Spring, Va.,—Pres'n Ch. and Cong.,	20 00

A captain of a Western steamboat being asked if he thought the boats on the Ohio would ever stop on the Sabbath, replied that they would, when no minister of the gospel or church member would travel in them on that day.

THE
Calvinistic Magazine.

[NEW SERIES.]

“Earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints.”

Vol. II.

June, 1847.

No. 6.

Mode of Baptism:

—
BY REV. WM. MINNIS.
—

(Continued from page 153.)

We come now to speak of the one baptism. “One Lord, one faith, one baptism.”—Ephesians 4: 5. How is this to be reconciled with the fact, that there is a number of baptisms spoken of in the Word of God?

Suppose a little lad accompanies his father to town, and in every house they enter he sees General Washington suspended upon the wall. On their way home the little fellow says, “Father, there must be a great many General Washingtons, for I have seen a good many to-day, and I have seen three or four in books, and I have heard you tell about a General Washington that was in the war; can you tell me how many there are?” How would the father answer this question? He would say, “My son there has been but one General Washington, the great father of his country, and what you have seen to-day, and what you saw in books, are only pictures, designed to represent the one General Washington.”

In like manner, the baptism of the Holy Ghost is the one great baptism, the archtype, or prototype of all the others. All the other baptisms spoken of in the Book of God, are but pictures, types, or symbols of the one glorious baptism that saves us. In themselves they have no efficacy to cleanse or save the soul. They were appointed and designed to teach how the soul is cleansed from sin; to teach, and to impress upon the mind, the great and deeply interesting truth of the gospel, that the soul is renewed, cleansed and saved through

the sprinkling of the blood of the great atoning sacrifice by the Holy Ghost.

We have a striking illustration of the above facts in the case of sacrifices. The Son of God offered up the one great sacrifice for sin, and the divers sacrifices under the Old Testament were but types or pictures of this one sacrifice, having in themselves no efficacy to atone for sin, but were instituted and designed to teach the great gospel truth, that on the ground of the one sacrifice, sin can be pardoned. If we deny that the divers sprinklings were typical of the sprinkling of Christ's blood, we must deny that the divers sacrifices were typical of the sacrifice of Christ; for if the victim was a type of Christ, and the shedding of its blood typified the shedding of Christ's blood, it follows unavoidably, that what was done with the blood after it was shed, must have been typical of what is done with the blood of Christ. The blood of the victim was sprinkled for the purpose of ceremonial purification. This did teach, and undoubtedly was designed to teach, that the sprinkling of the blood of the antitype would purify the soul from sin. The same fact was taught by the sprinkling of the water of separation, to purify from uncleanness contracted by the touch of a dead body. This is called "a purification for sin."—Numbers, 19: 9. Not a literal purification for sin; for, in the first place, the water of separation had no efficacy to take away sin.—Romans, 10: 1. Secondly, the accidental touch of a dead body, or the bone of a man, or a grave, was not a sin at all. And thirdly, the water of separation was sprinkled upon things which could not be the subjects of sin. The meaning, therefore, must be, that it was a typical purification for sin. The uncleanness typified sin in the soul, the water prepared with the ashes of the blood-red heifer, typified the blood of Christ, and the sprinkling typified the sprinkling of the blood of Christ, to cleanse the soul from sin. Hence the transaction most forcibly prefigured the baptism of the Holy Ghost. Again, the cleansing of the leper, by sprinkling, was designed to teach the same important fact. And an additional confirmation of what we have said respecting these divers sprinklings, is found in the fact, that these sprinklings are called divers baptisms, by the inspired writer. This we have before proved.

Now, if these sprinklings were not typical of the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ, of what were they typical? If they were not designed to teach how the soul is cleansed from sin, what were they designed to teach? And if they did not represent the baptism of the Holy Ghost, what did they represent? Water baptism is another picture of the baptism of the Holy Ghost, designed to teach the same important truth taught by the divers sprinklings or baptisms under the Old Testament dispensation. We are taught in the Written Word, that the soul is cleansed from sin by the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ. Water baptism is designed to teach, symbolically, or emblematically, the same truth. Just as in the case of the Lord's supper, we are taught in the Written Word, that the soul is nourished and kept alive by eating the flesh and drinking the blood of Christ by faith, and the Lord's Supper was designed to teach, emblematically, the same truth. The water in baptism, is the emblem of the blood of Jesus Christ; that is, it represents his blood just as the bread represents his body in the Supper. The application of the water represents the application of Christ's blood to the soul, just as eating the bread in the Lord's Supper represents the soul feeding upon Christ by faith. The one sacrament teaches, emblematically, how the soul is cleansed from sin, and made alive unto God. The other teaches how the life of the soul is sustained after it has been made alive.

That water baptism is designed to teach, symbolically, the washing away of sin, or how the soul is cleansed from sin, is a truth not only clearly taught in the New Testament, but it is fully admitted by the most eminent Baptist writers. Mr. Carson, a learned Baptist writer, says, "Sins are symbolically washed away in baptism."—Page 254. Again he says, "Does not Dr. Wardlaw hold, that baptism is an *emblem* of washing away sin? We wash away sins in baptism, just as we eat the flesh of Jesus in the Lord's Supper; in *figure*, just so baptism washes away sin."—Page 282. Again: "Washing away of sin is the thing which baptism always signifies."—Page 266. Here it is admitted that sin is symbolically, emblematically, in figure, washed away in water baptism. And we have proved from the Written Word, that sin is literally washed away in the baptism of the Holy Ghost. Therefore, water baptism is a

symbol, emblem, figure, or picture of the baptism of the Holy Ghost. Penjilly, another Baptist writer, says: "That this sacred ordinance was intended to be symbolical, and to teach by an expressive and visible sign, what the Gospel taught by the word preached, is a truth too evident in the New Testament to be doubted."—Page 80. Again he says, "The spiritual design of baptism is to *represent* a washing away of sin."—Page 34. We have proved from the Written Word, that sin is literally washed away by the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ. Therefore, water baptism is an expressive and visible sign, designed to teach symbolically, or to represent, that sin is washed away by the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ.

We come now to speak more particularly of the mode of water baptism. Some have maintained that the mode is nothing—that any mode of applying water to the subject, or the subject to the water, in the name of the Trinity, by an authorized administrator, is christian baptism. In place of this, we maintain that the mode is every thing; it is nothing but a symbolical mode of teaching an important truth. If the application of water, in baptism, did literally cleanse from sin, then the mode of applying it would be nothing, so the cleansing be effected. But, if the application of the water be symbolical, figurative or representative, as all christians admit it is, then the mode of application is absolutely essential. For example, a lad enters his mother's room with his hands besmeared with mud. His mother orders him to go and wash his hands. Here the mode is nothing, for the lad may choose his own mode of applying the water, if he washes the mud from his hands.—But suppose the mother has been teaching the lad how a Jew, who had become unclean from the touch of a dead body, was cleansed with the water of separation, according to the law of Moses. And she gives him a cup of water to represent the water of separation, and a little block of wood to represent the unclean Jew, and tells him to go into the other room and show the other children how the Jew was cleansed. Here the mode of applying the water to the block of wood becomes every thing,—the transaction is symbolical, and one mode will not do as well as another. Hence, the lad is not at liberty to choose his own mode, for if he should pour the water upon the block of wood, he would teach a positive falsehood;—and if

he should dip the block of wood into the water he would teach a positive falsehood, for the unclean Jew was cleansed by sprinkling, and neither pouring nor dipping represents sprinkling, any more than the picture of a horse represents General Washington. On the very same principle, if the minister, in baptizing, should pour the water upon the subject, or dip the subject into it, he would teach a positive falsehood. And the transaction would no more be christian baptism, than cutting one's ears off in the name of the Trinity would be baptism. For the one transaction no more represents or teaches the thing intended than the other.

The position, that in teaching or communicating ideas symbolically, the action performed with the symbol is nothing—that it will do just as well to do one thing with it as another, is the first-born of absurdity and nonsense. As well might it be said that in teaching or communicating ideas verbally, the words used are nothing, that one set of words will do just as well as another; for symbolical action supplies the place of words. Suppose A is prosecuted for the murder of B, and three witnesses are brought into court to prove the charge, two of whom are deaf mutes. The first witness testifies, verbally, that A shot B through the heart with a pistol. The second witness testifies, by symbolical action, that A killed B with a club. The third testifies, symbolically, that A stabbed B with a dirk and killed him. Would any court on earth decide that the testimony of the three witnesses agreed? that the symbolical action of the deaf mutes was nothing? that they agreed in testimony with each other, and with the first witness, just as well as if they had represented that A shot B with a pistol? The court would decide that the witnesses totally disagreed, and credit would be given to none of them.

Now we all know that the Spirit of inspiration testifies verbally, in the Written Word, that the soul is cleansed from sin by the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ; and if one divine ordinance should testify symbolically that the blood of Christ is poured upon the soul in order to cleanse it, and another ordinance should testify symbolically that the soul is immersed into the blood of Christ in order to cleanse it, we would be constrained to admit that these witnesses did not agree in their testimony, and we would credit none of them. But we

find no such discrepancy amongst God's witnesses. The perfect concurrence of their testimony in relation to the point now under consideration, is distinctly noted by the inspired John;—"And there are three that bear witness in earth, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood: and these three agree in one."—1 John, 5: 8. The Spirit is the Holy Ghost, who inspired holy men to write the scriptures. His testimony is in the Written Word. The water and the blood here called witnesses, are the water and the blood used in the divers baptisms under the Old Testament, and the water used in baptism under the New Testament; their testimony is symbolical, but they agree perfectly with the Spirit in testifying that the soul is cleansed from sin by the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ.

But the advocates of immersion hold, that while baptism is designed to represent the cleansing of the soul from sin, it is also designed to represent the death, burial and resurrection of Christ, and the death, burial and resurrection of the believer.

By death, in this connection, we presume they do not mean death abstractly considered, as represented in the primer, for death in this sense cannot be represented by symbolical action. The meaning must be, that in baptism Christ and the believer are represented as dying. In order to represent symbolically the death, burial and resurrection of Christ, either the person to be baptized, or something else, must be the symbol of Christ; and then there must be actions performed by, or with the symbol, representing Christ as dying. But the same person, or thing, which in the ceremony is the symbol of Christ, cannot at the same time be the symbol of the believer; nor can the symbolical actions which represent that Christ did die, was buried and rose from the dead, at the same time represent that the believer will die, be buried and rise from the dead. Symbols, and symbolical action, supply the place of words. The declaration that Christ died, was buried and rose from the dead, cannot at the same time be a declaration that the believer will die, be buried and rise from the dead. Therefore it is absurd to suppose that baptism can represent the death, burial and resurrection of both Christ and the believer. And if immersion be a symbolical representation of the death of Christ and the believer, who, or what, is the symbol or emblem of them both? Will it be said that the person immersed is the

symbol or type of Christ and of himself both? And what symbolical action is there in the ceremony of immersion, to represent either Christ or the believer as dying? We are told that the immersion of the person represents burial, and the emergence, or lifting the person out of the water, represents resurrection. What, then, is there in the ceremony to represent death or dying? Why nothing—just absolutely nothing.—Hence, immersion is not, and cannot possibly be a symbolical representation of either the death of Christ, or the death of the believer.

But Mr. Carson, a learned Baptist writer, says:—"To immerse a living man, affords an emblem of death, as well as burial. The baptized person dies under the water, and for a moment lies buried with Christ."—*Page 255.* Now is not this demonstration? For if drowning a man does not afford an emblem of death, what would? But Mr. Carson's immersed man dies at the wrong time, and in the wrong place, to be a correct representation of the death of Christ. Christ died upon the cross, not in the sepulchre. And he died before, not after he was buried. Nor is it customary to bury believers alive, and let them die in the grave. Immersion, with Mr. Carson's gloss, would represent that Christ was buried alive, and was drowned in the grave, which is incorrect.

Again. The symbolical actions in the ceremony of immersion, do not represent the things said to be intended by them. Immersion is no figure or representation of the burial of Jesus Christ. His body was carried into a little room hewn out in the rock, and laid down upon the floor; then the door of this little room, called a sepulchre, was closed with a great stone. Is the immersion of a person into water, a figure or representation of this transaction? It must be obvious to every one, that there is not a single point in which the two transactions bear the most distant resemblance to each other. And it is just as far from being a representation of our usual mode of burial, as it is from representing the burial of Christ. We dig a grave, and the dead body, enclosed in a coffin, is let down by means of ropes into the grave, and then the earth is thrown in, until the grave is filled up. Does immersion represent this transaction? As well might it be said, that it is a representation of the creation of the world, or Noah's flood, or the chang-

ing of the moon. It is really an insult to common sense to be told that dipping a person into a river, or mill-pond, is a Divinely appointed figure or representation of any mode of burial that ever has been practiced upon earth.

We are told that lifting the immersed person out of the water, is a figure or representation of the resurrection of Christ and of the believer. Here again the symbolical action is a perfect failure. The resurrection of the dead does not consist in their bodies being lifted up out of the grave. If so, thousands would have no resurrection, because they never were buried. The body of Christ was not lifted up out of the sepulchre;—he came out himself. His resurrection consisted in the restoration of life to his dead body. The saints are not lifted up out of their graves. “And the graves were opened; and many bodies of the saints which slept, arose and came out of the graves.”—*Matt. 27: 52*. The resurrection of believers consists in the change of their natural bodies, whether dead or alive, whether buried or unburied, into living spiritual bodies. Lifting one out of the water represents no such change as this: Hence it is no figure whatever of the resurrection of the dead.

Again: We have seen from quotations already given, that the most eminent Baptist writers admit that one design of baptism is to represent symbolically, or figuratively, the washing away of sin. Therefore the water used in baptism must be the symbol of Christ's blood, for the blood of Christ alone cleanseth from sin, and the application of the water must be the symbol of the application of the blood of Christ to the soul. But if baptism represent death, burial and resurrection, the water must be the symbol of the earth in which the dead are buried, and the application of the water must be the symbol of the burial of a dead body in the earth. If, then, we suppose that both these different things are symbolically represented in baptism, the water must at the same time be the symbol of Christ's blood, and the symbol of the earth; and the application of the water must at the same time represent the application of Christ's blood to the soul, and the burial of a dead body in the earth, both of which suppositions are most grossly absurd.—As well might it be said that the bread in the Lord's Supper is at the same time the symbol of Christ's body, and the symbol of the bricks of which Babel was built, and that eating the

bread represents the soul feeding upon Christ by faith, and the destruction of Jerusalem. Therefore we have demonstrative proof that baptism does not represent death, burial and resurrection.

Again. It may be said, by way of objection to the view which we have given of the mode of baptism, that baptizo, to baptize, in classic Greek, means to dip. In order to show the fallacy and falsehood of this objection, it will be necessary to point out the difference between classic Greek and Hebrew Greek, or the Greek of the New Testament. Classic Greek is the language spoken and written in old Greece by the heathen Greeks, from three hundred to eight hundred years before the birth of Jesus Christ. Those heathen Greeks knew nothing whatever of the precepts, doctrines and ordinances of the gospel. Of course there were no words in their language at that time that did express any of these. And it requires no scholarship to enable any one to see, that when the language came to be applied to the precepts, doctrines and ordinances of the gospel, a multitude of words must unavoidably have been applied in a sense in which they never had been used by the heathen Greeks. And in addition to this, very great changes had taken place in the Greek language before the time in which the New Testament was written. The Greek of the New Testament, is a dialect formed from an amalgamation of the various dialects spoken by the different states of Greece, and this new dialect, again intermixed with the Hebrew, or Syro-Chaldaic, and modified by the modes of thinking and feeling, to which the Jews had been accustomed. So that the dialect of the New Testament is in many respects a different language from the pure classic Greek. The editor of the *Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, who is a Baptist, after speaking of the important changes in the Greek language, as noted above, says—"It should further be noticed, that there occur, in the New Testament, words that express both doctrines and practices which were utterly unknown to the Greeks, and also words bearing widely different interpretations from those which are ordinarily found in Greek writers."

Ernesti, Professor of Ancient Literature at Leipzig, says—"We deny without hesitation, that the diction of the New Testament is classic Greek. It is modelled after the Hebrew, not

only in single words, phrases and figures of speech, but in the general texture of the language. Moreover, in many passages there would arise an *absurd* and ridiculous meaning, if they should be interpreted according to a pure Greek idiom.”—

Page 56.

Dr. George Campbell says—“The classic use of words, both in the Greek and in the Latin, is not only unavailing, but may mislead. The sacred use of words, and the classic use, are often very different. With the greatest justice the Greek of the New Testament is denominated a peculiar idiom, being not only Hebrew and Chaldaic phrases put into Greek words; but even single Greek words used in a sense in which they never occur in writings of profane authors.”—*Dissertations; vol. 1, pp. 32, 33.*

This is sufficient to show the fallacy of the objection. For if it were true that baptizo means to dip, in classic Greek, this would determine nothing respecting its signification in Hebrew Greek. It also shows that the advocates of immersion are sorely pressed for arguments, when they leave, not only the Book of God, but the dialect in which it was written, and go to the heathen Greeks to inquire what God has taught. But it is not true that baptizo means to dip in classic Greek. Many good scholars, who agree with us in the mode of baptism, have admitted that this is one of its significations in classic Greek. But this mistake has arisen from the want of carefully observing the signification of words in our own language. It is not at all strange that a writer, who uses the words dip, sink, plunge, immerse, bury, overwhelm, drown, cover, surround, &c., as synonymous terms, should come to the conclusion that baptizo sometimes means to dip, in classic Greek; for some of these meanings it has. But the question to be settled is, does the word baptizo, as used in classic Greek, ever express the action as performed by a Baptist minister in the administration of baptism? This action consists in putting the person into the water, and taking him out again. And it is maintained that raising the person up out of the water is as essential to baptism, as the putting him into it. The only English word that does express this action, is dip. Immerse, means to put in—nothing more. Submerge, means to put under. To plunge, is to dash into forcibly. So that none of

these words does express the action in question. But the word dip does express the action, for it means to put into a liquid and to take out. Now, is there any word in classic Greek that corresponds to our English word dip? and is baptizo that word? The Greek word bapto, does exactly correspond to the word dip, as the following will prove.

The Baptist writer, Mr. Carson, has selected no less than one hundred examples, if we counted correctly, from Greek authors, in which bapto means to dip, and these are not forced cases—the action expressed is putting something into a liquid and taking it out again. And, as if his multiplicity of examples were not sufficient to prove that the word does literally mean to dip, he makes the following remarks respecting the writings of Hypocrates. He says—“In the words of the father of medicine, in which he has occasion to treat of every mode of the application of liquid, and which consist of no less than 543 closely printed folio pages, all the words of mode are applied, and bapto *invariably* is used when he designates immersion.”—Page 59. We will add an item or two to the evidence furnished by Mr. Carson,

The Hebrew word so repeatedly, in the Old Testament, translated to dip, is invariably in the Greek Septuagint translated bapto. And in every instance where the word dip occurs, in the New Testament, the word in the Greek is bapto. All this is surely sufficient to prove that the Greek word bapto corresponds exactly to the word dip.

But the word bapto is never in a solitary instance applied to the ordinance of baptism. Now, if baptizo also means to dip, how did it happen that Hypocrates, in his book of 543 closely printed folio pages, in which all the words of mode are applied, never used baptizo, but invariably bapto, when he designed immersion or dipping? And if both words mean to dip, how did it happen that bapto never was applied to the ordinance of baptism? And how did it happen that in the whole Greek Scriptures the action performed in dipping, is never expressed by baptizo? The way it happened was, that the word baptizo never did mean to dip. If the two words had meant the same thing, had expressed the same action, nothing but the interposition of heaven could have prevented them from having been interchanged.

Again. It is conceded by all, that *bapto*, to dip, also means to dye; and that from signifying to dip, it came to signify to dye, because this was the way in which things were usually dyed. But it is admitted on all hands that *baptizo* never did mean to dye. Now, if *baptizo* had been used to express the action of dipping, in order to dye, it must and would unavoidably have taken the secondary meaning, to dye, as well as *bapto*. And, if it did mean to dip, what under the heavens could have prevented it from being used to designate the action of dipping things in order to dye them? The fact that it never did mean to dye, proves that it never did mean to dip.

Again. Mr. Carson asserts, that in all languages, the word that means to dip, means also to dye; and he proves this to be true of a number of different languages; and we believe that the assertion will hold good respecting all languages. But *baptizo* never did mean to dye;—this Mr. Carson himself admits. Therefore it never did mean to dip. That *baptizo* has different significations in classic Greek, amongst which are to wash, to wet, to sink, to sprinkle, &c., is readily admitted. But that it ever was used to designate the action performed in putting something into a liquid and taking it out again, we deny.

We have now proved that the objection under consideration is both false and deceptive.

But is there any difficulty in learning the meaning of *baptizo*, as used by the Spirit of inspiration, from the Book of God itself, that we should be driven to the necessity of seeking light on the subject, from the heathen Greek writers? We think not. We believe that there is as little difficulty in determining, with clearness and certainty, the meaning of this word, as there is in determining the meaning of any other Greek word in the New Testament.

The following considerations place the signification of this word, as used in the scriptures, beyond controversy. First. The sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ upon the soul, by the Holy Ghost, washes or cleanses the soul from sin. That the Book of God thus teaches, we presume no enlightened christian will deny.

Second.—The cleansing of the soul from sin is called the baptism of the Holy Ghost. The words *baptizo*, to baptize,

and *baptisma*, baptism, are used no less than eight times in the New Testament, to designate this washing or cleansing of the soul from sin. See 1 Corinthians, 12: 13—Galations, 3: 27—Ephesians, 4: 5—Collos. 2: 12—1 Peter, 3: 21, and three times in Romans, 6: 3, 4. Now, the signification of the word in question, when applied to the baptism of the Holy Ghost, will admit of no controversy. An attempt to make it appear that it means something else in this connection, is too hazardous. It cannot be done without interfering with the work of the Holy Ghost, and attempting to undermine the whole system of the Gospel. To deny the baptism of the Holy Ghost, will not do—a christian will not do this. To assume that the baptism of the Holy Ghost is any thing else than the cleansing of the soul from sin by the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ, will not do. This would be denying a truth most clearly and repeatedly taught in God's Word, both in the Old and in the New Testaments, both in plain language and in divers types and figures. To assume that the Holy Ghost immerses, or dips the soul into the blood of Christ, in order to cleanse it, would be what never was assumed by the greatest fanatic under the phrenzy of immersion, and baptismal regeneration, during the darkest ages of the church, and surely never will be, while the Book of God remains as it is, and man continues a rational being. Therefore it must be conceded that the word, as used in this connection, means a washing or cleansing performed by sprinkling.

And as we have proved in a former part of this discourse, that the baptism of the Holy Ghost is the prototype, antitype, or archetype of all the baptisms recorded in the Book of God, it follows unavoidably, that when the word in question is applied to any of these typical baptisms, it must designate a typical or symbolical washing or cleansing performed by sprinkling; for a washing performed in any other way, would not, and could not be a type, figure, or representation of the baptism of the Holy Ghost. This fixes the signification of the term in its application to all the divers baptisms, under both the Old and the New Testaments, with a clearness and certainty that amounts to demonstration.

The word occurs in a few instances, in the New Testament, in which it may perhaps be thought by some, there is no refe-

rence to the baptism of the Holy Ghost. A few remarks on these passages may not be amiss:—"For the Pharisees, and all the Jews, except they wash their hands oft, eat not, holding the traditions of the elders. And when they come from the market except they baptize (baptisontai) they eat not, and many other things there, be which they have received to hold, as the baptizing (baptismois) of cups, and pots, brazen vessels and tables."—Mark, 7: 3, 4. The washing of the hands, here spoken of, was not figurative or symbolical; it was a literal washing, for the purpose of removing filth from the hands, lest in eating they might swallow some of it;—the swallowing of which, they were taught to believe, would defile the person. See Matt. 15, 17—20. Hence, the inspired writer says, they washed their hands, (pugme) that is, diligently, strongly or forcibly. But this washing is never called a baptism, for the inspired writers never apply the term baptize to a common literal washing. The baptizing of the person on his return from the market, and the baptizing of the vessels, and tables, or beds (klinon) was a figurative or typical washing—therefore it is called a baptism. This baptism was merely a perversion, or extension of one of the divers baptisms or sprinklings spoken of by Paul in Hebrews 9: 10, prescribed in the ceremonial law, for the purpose of teaching how the soul is cleansed from sin by the blood of Christ. In certain cases of typical uncleanness, the law required the water of separation to be sprinkled, not only upon the unclean person, but also upon all the vessels that were in his tent.—Numbers, 19: 18. By the tradition of the elders, this typical rite was extended beyond the prescribed limits of the law, So that this baptism was, in its original design, a type, or figure of the baptism of the Holy Ghost. Moreover, all the vessels that were used in the ministry of the tabernacle, were purified by sprinkling."—Hebrews 9: 21.

Now, as the Jewish Church had a mode of purifying vessels prescribed by the law of Moses, can we believe, without one syllable of evidence, that when they were led to practice this rite in cases where the law had not required it, they would abandon the legal mode, and adopt another totally different? If the Baptist church should be led to baptize the plates and cups used at the Lord's table, would they sprinkle them? And

if the Presbyterian church should be induced to baptize these things, would they dip them? And are we to suppose that the Jews were less prejudiced in favor of the mode of purifying prescribed by the law of Moses; and practiced by their church for ages, than we are in favor of our peculiar modes of baptism? The term baptism, occurs in Luke 12: 50—"But I have a baptism to be baptized with, and how am I straitened till it be accomplished." It is admitted that Christ here alluded to his most intense sufferings. If so, he must have referred to his agony in the garden, for here his most intense sufferings were endured. But why did he call this a baptism? All writers admit that baptism is here used in a metaphorical or figurative sense. The plain meaning of which is, that Christ called the event to which he referred, a baptism, because there was something in it, or connected with it, resembling baptism.—Resembling what baptism? Most writers have taken it for granted that the figurative expression was founded upon water baptism. But a little reflection will convince any one that this supposition is absurd. It is admitted by all sects and parties, that water baptism is itself but a type or figure: If, then, we suppose the figure to be drawn from water baptism, we have a type of a type; a figure of a figure, which would be as absurd as to talk about the shadow of a shade. We might with as much propriety suppose that the manna in the wilderness was a type of the bread used at the Lord's table. Or that when the historian says that Charles the Twelfth was the lion of the north, he means that Charles was like the picture of a lion. In all cases where baptism is used in a figurative sense by the inspired writers, the figure is drawn, not from a figure of baptism, but from the baptism of the Holy Ghost itself.—What, then, was there connected with Christ's agony in the garden, that resembled the baptism of the Holy Ghost? When we remember that the holy Redeemer, in his agony in the garden, was sprinkled with his own blood, and that the baptism of the Holy Ghost consists in the sprinkling of the blood of Christ upon the soul, we can be at no loss for the answer. Nor can we avoid seeing a beauty and force in the figurative expression, without tracing out other points in which the two events resemble each other.

Baptism is again used in a like figurative sense, in 1 Corin-

thians; 10: 2—"And were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." Here the miraculous passage of the Israelites through the channel of the sea, is called a baptism, because there was something in it, or connected with it, resembling, not water baptism, for this would be the figure of a figure, but the baptism of the Holy Ghost. That a mist or vapour, from the cloud, and from the water of the sea, would be sprinkled upon the Israelites as they marched in the night through the channel of the sea, is a truth which cannot be doubted. This of itself would be sufficient to justify the figurative expression. But it is evident from the language of the apostle, that he had reference more particularly to the effects, rather than to the mode of baptism. He says they were baptized *unto Moses*. The effects produced upon the minds of the Israelites, in relation to Moses, by the miracles wrought, by means of the cloud and the sea, resembled the effects produced upon the soul by the baptism of the Holy Ghost. The miraculous passage of the Israelites through the sea, under the guidance of Moses, secured for him the affection, confidence and obedience of the children of Israel. And the baptism of the Holy Ghost secures for God the affection, confidence or faith, and obedience of the true Israel of God, redeemed from the slavery of sin. This shows, with the clearness of a sun-beam, why this event was called a baptism unto Moses. Now, with all the above bible proof respecting the signification of the word baptizo, we have no need to travel out of the Inspired Volume in search of further proof. To do so, would be like lighting a candle to aid the sun in giving light at noon day.

Another objection to the view we have given of the mode of baptism, is, that John the Baptist took the inhabitants of Jerusalem all the way to the Jordan to be baptized, and that if he had baptized by sprinkling, he would have baptized them in Jerusalem.

This objection is founded on the assumption that John could not have administered baptism by immersion in Jerusalem, for want of water, and that this was the only reason for calling the people to the Jordan. For, the moment that it is admitted that he could have immersed the people in Jerusalem, and that he did not resort to the Jordan for the sake of water in which to immerse, the objection becomes a perfect nullity.

That John could not have immersed the people in Jerusalem for want of a suitable place, we readily admit, for the history of the place fully establishes this fact. And for the sake of argument we can safely admit that this was the reason why he took the inhabitants of the city all the way to the Jordan, though we believe no such thing.

What then? Why, the apostles on the day of Pentecost did baptize three thousand in Jerusalem, the very place where John could not immerse a single soul for want of water. Therefore these three thousand could not have been immersed. So that if the argument proves that John baptized by immersion, it proves at the same time, and with equal force, that the apostles did not administer baptism by immersion. And of course we feel very little opposition to an argument which proves that the apostles did not administer baptism by immersion.

Again; the passages in the New Testament, where it says that John baptized in Jordan and in the river of Jordan, are urged in proof of immersion.

These passages afford no proof that John dipped his disciples into the river, for he baptized in the wilderness and in Bethabara, but this surely does not prove that he dipped the people into the wilderness, and into the village. The argument is founded entirely on the signification of the Greek preposition (*en*) translated in. But this Greek preposition also means at, by, near to; and we have no proof that it ought not to have been translated at, by, or near to the river Jordan, in the passages under consideration. Hence the argument is worthless. But the following passages of Scripture prove, beyond a doubt, that the preposition must have one of the above significations in the passages upon which the argument is founded. "These things were done in Bethabara, beyond Jordan, where John was baptizing."—John 1: 28. Now, if John was baptizing in the river, then the town Bethabara was in the river, and it was also beyond the river, which is a contradiction. But if John was baptizing at, by, or near to the river, the passages are clearly reconciled, and this is the only way to avoid making the inspired writers contradict each other.

"And (Jesus) went away again beyond Jordan into the place where John at first baptized, and there he abode."—

John 10: 40. If John baptized in the river, this passage proves that Jesus had to go beyond the river to get into it; and beyond the river, and in the river, is one and the same place; and Jesus went and dwelt in the river, all of which is grossly absurd. But if John baptized at, by, or near to the river, the different passages perfectly agree, and there is no absurdity in the case. Therefore, the Greek preposition (*en*) in the passages under consideration, not only may, but absolutely must be translated at, by, or near to.

We will now close our remarks on the subject by asking the following questions to the advocates for immersion:

1. If Jesus Christ has not authorized baptism to be administered by sprinkling, when, and how was the following prophecy respecting Christ fulfilled? "So shall he sprinkle many nations."—Isaiah 52: 15. It will not do to deny the correctness of the translation, for it is perfectly correct. If you admit that the prophecy refers to water baptism, then you must admit that sprinkling is the mode of baptism. If you say that it refers to the baptism of the Holy Ghost, then you admit that the one great baptism which we have proved to be the prototype of all the rest, is administered by sprinkling.—If you deny that it refers either to water baptism or the baptism of the Holy Ghost, to what then does it refer? and when, and how has the prophecy been fulfilled?

2. If baptism is not to be administered by sprinkling, how will the following prophecy respecting the Jews be fulfilled? "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you."—Ezek. 36: 25. It will not do to say that the prophecy was fulfilled under the Old Testament dispensation, and that the sprinkling referred to some one of the purifications prescribed in the ceremonial law. For the connection shows clearly that the prophecy has not yet been fulfilled. And none of the sprinklings prescribed in the ceremonial law were to be performed with clean water. It will not do to say that it refers to the baptism of the Holy Ghost, for the Holy Ghost does not baptize with water. If, then, this prophecy does not refer to water baptism, to what does it refer? and how will it be fulfilled?

3. If the word immerse had been used in all the places both in the Old and New Testament, where we find the word sprinkle, for instance, if every thing upon which the blood of the

sacrifices was sprinkled, had been immersed in the blood,—if the leper had been cleansed by immersing him in the blood and water,—if all the persons who were cleansed with the water of separation had been immersed in it,—if Moses had immersed the book and all the people, when they agreed to keep the law,—if the Tabernacle and the altar, and all the vessels of the ministry had been immersed in place of being sprinkled,—if the blood of Christ had been called the blood of immersion,—if the soul had been said to be immersed in the blood of Christ, and this had been called baptism,—if, in the Old Testament, you had met with such passages as these: So shall he immerse many nations, Then will I immerse you in clean water,—and if, in the New Testament, you had met with such as these: But ye are come unto the blood of immersion, Having our hearts immersed from an evil conscience, &c.—and if the word sprinkle had not been found in any of all the above connections, (for this is the fact with regard to immersion,)—if the above suppositions were all true, would you not feel that you had from this source alone, stronger evidence in favor of immersion than all the arguments put together that you have ever heard advanced on that side of the question? Now, we cannot tell what verbal answer you may give, but we feel no doubt in regard to the answer that your conscience will give. And remember, that all we have supposed to be true of the word immerse, is literally true of the word sprinkle, we have the full force of all this evidence in favor of the mode of baptism which we advocate.

Now, if the views we have given on this much controverted subject are true, as we conscientiously believe they are, may God bless them to the enlightening of the minds of the people. And should any part of what we have written be false, may God prevent the minds of the people from receiving it. Amen.

The failings of good men are commonly more published in the world than their good deeds; and one fault of a deserving man shall meet with more reproaches than all his virtues praise; such is the force of ill-will and ill-nature.

Election.

“God predestinates, or fore-appoints all disobedient unbelievers to damnation, not without, but according to His fore-knowledge of all their works from the foundation of the world.”—*Methodist Doctrinal Tracts*, page 139,

“God knows with certainty that an individual will reject the Saviour, resist the Holy Ghost, die in his sins, and go to hell.”—*Meth. Episcopalian*, Jan. 5,

“If thou seekest knowledge as silver, and searchest for her as for hid treasures, then shalt thou understand the fear of the Lord, and find the knowledge of God.”—*Bible*,

Truth does not usually lie upon the surface, but needs to be sought for as for hid treasures. This being the fact, our first impressions are generally erroneous, and after further investigation are given up as worthless. We will illustrate our idea by one or two examples. It may safely be asserted that the first impression of every one is, that the sun moves around the earth; and it requires a laborious examination to convince the mind to the contrary. A little reflection will convince the reader that this is equally true with regard to almost every important truth that science has demonstrated. But does Theology form an exception to this fact? Have we any instinct which leads us unerringly to the truth here more than in other branches of knowledge? We say not, and will illustrate by an example. It may safely be affirmed, that at first view we all reject the doctrine of election, but in this case the wickedness of the human heart helps to blind the intellectual powers; for acknowledge this doctrine to be true, and it takes away all ground of self-righteousness, and leaves us as clay in the hands of the potter. The natural heart cannot brook this, and hence will not allow the understanding to examine the subject dispassionately, nor yield to proofs however convincing.

It is our purpose at present to examine this doctrine. And whilst we do it, allow us to entreat you, gentle reader, to cast far from you all prejudice, and embrace the truth, however repugnant it may be to your preconceived notions. If you be a Methodist in your views, we know this will be exceedingly difficult. The writer of this article once thought it the most

horrible doctrine ever embraced by mankind, and therefore knows how to sympathize with you, but trusts you will bear with him while he gives you some of the arguments which convinced him of its truth.

We will not attempt at present, by quotations from the scriptures, to prove that this much condemned doctrine is taught in that sacred book, but will content ourselves with merely referring to the following explicit and unequivocal passages; Eph. i. 4, 5; Rom. viii. 29, 30; ix. 15, 16, 18, 21; John xvii. 2; 2 Thess. ii. 13; John vi. 37, 39; 2 Tim. i. 9. We hope the reader will turn to them and examine for himself, feeling that God will not hold him guiltless who intentionally rejects the truth.

If this doctrine be indeed true, as so many powerful minds have supposed; it will most certainly be discoverable in God's government of the world—for the same good Being is the author of the Bible and of Providence.

Who can not see an exemplification of it in the history of the Jews? Were they not the chosen people of God? Start not at this, our Arminian friend—we are well aware of your oft-repeated objection, that “this was the election of a nation, and not of individuals;” bear with us and this quibble shall be answered. Did not God manifest himself to them in such a manner as to cause thousands to turn to Him, and therefore to receive eternal life; whilst he left the rest of mankind to the dim light of nature, and consequently in the great majority of cases, to that final doom which awaits the idolater and the unrenewed heart? We invite you to reflect seriously upon the history of the human race, from its commencement to the present moment, and you will find this to be uniformly God's method of dealing with men—“For he saith to Moses, I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion. So then it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy.”—Rom. ix. 15, 16. We pray you look at the present condition of mankind, and you will find the same fact illustrated. There is a portion of the earth illuminated with the rays of divine truth, enjoying all the means of grace, whilst the remainder is in the grossest darkness. We would ask, in all candour, who has caused this difference? If God

be the author of providence, the answer is plain. We see here the same being who revealed himself in so many ways to the Jews, and left the heathen to the dark ways of superstition. It is in vain for the Methodist to say, this is his mode of dealing with nations, and has nothing to do with *individuals*; for if it be true, as none will deny, that *more* Jews were saved in consequence of God's dealings with them, than of the heathen around them, just so far he elected them *individually*, and left the others (the heathen) to pursue the devices of their own hearts and perish.

Does any Methodist pretend, that as many heathens are saved as christians? If so, why is he so anxious to send the Missionary among them? And why such pathetic appeals about their dying souls, and the necessity of sending them the bread of life or they perish? Very true, they do not believe as many heathens will be saved as christians, for this would be to contradict themselves and every principle of common sense. Take an example. Suppose in a certain district of the city of Canton, in China, there will be 100 children born during the present year 1847; and, that an equal number will be born during the same year in the city of Richmond, in Virginia. Now, suppose that five of the Chinese are saved in consequence of obeying "the law written in their hearts," whilst fifty of the Virginians are saved because of their possessing superior advantages. Here are forty-five more Virginians than Chinese, saved out of the same number of children, on account of something God has done for them which he has not done for the Chinese. These numbers may be incorrect; but it matters not, *the principle is the same* if any more are saved in a christian than a heathen country.

Well, does not this look like that same odious doctrine of decrees? Very true, but how are you to get out of it? We are not now talking of a passage in the Bible, which you may possibly gloss over and explain away, as the Universalist does the texts that teach the doctrine of eternal punishment, and for a similar reason—because it does not accord with *your* notions of justice—but about a fact in the actual providence of God. It looks strange, but will you therefore deny it? "Nay, but O man, who art thou that replyest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, why hast thou made

me thus? Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honor, and another unto dishonor?"

We grant very readily, that the doctrine is repugnant to the natural heart, and (as previously stated) that the first impression probably always is, that it is false. We grant further, that this impression is greatly strengthened on account of the difficulty of reconciling it with the justice of God. But shall we deny every thing which we can not reconcile with his justice. If so, the Universalist will ask nothing more at your hands—for you will find it very difficult to convince him that it is just to punish a man *eternally* for the transient offences of this life. Take the case of one who has just come to the years of accountability, and dies, say two minutes after, without the change necessary to salvation. The Universalist says, "God's *justice* will not allow him to punish one, throughout the never ending ages of eternity, who has only been a sinner two minutes." How does the Methodist meet him? Why, he says, "My good friend this doctrine is clearly taught in the Bible. The Bible is the word of God; ergo, the doctrine is true." Now, this is verily a good argument, but why forget it, when you come to argue about decrees.

In conclusion, we will ask the Methodist, why he is opposed to this doctrine, since his own belief leads inevitably to the very same thing. The great majority of them believe in God's fore-knowledge, though some have denied it, in order to get rid of the difficulty to which it leads. Well, if he knows *before* he creates a human being, whether he will reject all the offers of mercy and finally be lost, and if he possesses at the same time *the power to create or not to create*, and yet does elect or determine to create such an one, this is nothing more nor less than reprobation. If he creates one whom he knows will be saved, this, if not election, is something equally difficult to reconcile with his mercy. For the question may be asked just here, *why does he create any others* than those whom he knows will be saved. The Presbyterian comes boldly up to the difficulty, and embraces the teachings of the Bible and of Providence. The Methodist puts it away back out of sight, conceals it from himself, and the depraved hearts of the unconverted, in order that his church may number its million of

members; and then, forsooth, Calvinism is false because it is not so *popular* as Methodism. If a doctrine, or system of doctrines being popular is evidence of its truth, then Roman Catholicism, Mahomedanism and Paganism have this evidence, whilst the doctrines of our blessed Lord have it not. Away, then, with all your abuse of Calvinism! If election and reprobation be a mote in our eye, take the beam out of your own—get rid of the difficulty yourselves—answer fairly the arguments from scripture and providence, and then we will embrace your views most cordially; but until then we remain a Calvinist.

G. M. S.

Statistical Facts.

It is often asked, why Calvinists should trouble themselves to refute the sentiments and expose the doings of Arminians. This is a strange question on any subject upon which the Bible has expressed the mind of the Spirit; for it is always to be granted, that if God has said a thing, there are good reasons why it should be insisted on, and its antagonist error exposed at any cost or hazard that can possibly occur. We propose, however, to answer the question by stating a few authentic facts.

1st.—The Synod of Tennessee, and Conference of Holston, cover nearly the same territory. According to the *Methodist Almanac* for 1845, there are somewhat over eighty Methodist members to each minister in the bounds of the Conference. I write at the present moment from memory, the document not being now before my eye. This number includes all the seekers, probationers, non-professors in full fellowship, &c.; for which a large deduction must be made.

But the Synod embraces considerably over one hundred communicants to each minister, and every one of these communicants professes to be a new creature in Christ Jesus.

Now, supposing that Methodist members are, on an average, as efficient and valuable in the cause of Christ, as are the average of Presbyterians, there is about *twenty per cent.* more reason why we should promote Calvinistic, Presbyterian teaching, than its opposite. How much more, when we deduct the

multitudes of Methodists over whose repentance angels never rejoice!

2d.—The relative value of Christians is to be ascertained by their amount of efficiency respectively; and the relative value of doctrines, or systems of doctrines, by their influence in producing efficiency of christian character. Just so we estimate the worth of a tree by the quantity of good fruit it produces. It was of *teachers* and *doctrines* Christ said, “by their fruits ye shall know them.”

There are, in the United States, something over a million of Episcopal Methodists. Of New School Presbyterians and Congregationalists, there are less than one-third of a million. I mention these denominations merely for the sake of a fair basis of calculation and comparison. “By a neat calculation” there are *three and a half* Methodists to *one* of these two denominations of Calvinists, taken together. This fact, considered by itself, looks as if Methodism were the better *ism*: and so it would be, if it made its members equally efficient and useful with Calvinists. The boasting about Methodist efficiency and success, however indecent, might in that case be less intolerable, because less untrue than it is. But look now at a missionary map, that most accurate index of the amount of true godliness on earth. Those Methodists sustain *fourteen* missionary stations in foreign lands. This is so much for the cause of Christ, and in view of it, let us render honor to whom honor is due. But those two denominations of Calvinists, operating through the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, sustain *ninety-five* foreign Missionary stations. Then, by the plainest rule of simple proportions, as fourteen stations are to ninety-five stations, multiplied by three and a half, so is one average Presbyterian worth twenty-three average Methodists, and twenty-one twenty-thirds of another. To state the case to the ready comprehension of every school-boy, as $14 : 95 \times 3 \frac{1}{2} :: 1 : 23 \frac{21}{23}$.

According to the respective numbers of Methodists and Calvinists taken into the calculation, there ought to be three hundred and thirty-two Methodist stations, to show that Methodism is worth as much to a man or to the world as Calvinism; and these must be in every respect equal to the stations of the A. B. C. F. Missions. And yet the half is not told. For

3d.—The date and location of Methodist Missions authorize more than the suspicion, that more than two-thirds of them are established with other motives than simply the spread of the Gospel. They even compel men to inquire whether *ten* of those missions are not arranged more for the purpose of making Methodist capital out of other men's labor, than simply for evangelizing the heathen. Why is it, that only four of their stations can be seen which are not planted near the stations of some other society, and within its present or prospective range of influence? There are the Cherokees, Creek Indians, &c. We challenge the General Conference to show *one* station among these people, during their stay east of the Mississippi, that had nothing of these suspicious looking facts about it. Especially when we look at this matter in the light of Methodist policy at home, which is to expend their best talent where the people are best furnished with religious instruction from other sources, we ask again, why is it so? And till facts shall answer otherwise, we must say it means, that when some other society has braved the danger, borne the toil, and paid the expense, *then* the General Conference will come to its aid, and plant a station to help the work, in the way of gathering the half-enlightened heathen into church fellowship, and sending home the account to extend the catalogue of Methodism; while, alas! how many of those poor pagans go back to their idols, and cause the name of Christ to be blasphemed among the Gentiles. Whatever be the motive, this is the result; and the thing can only be justified by assuming as an axiom—No Methodism, no christianity. Nor is this far beyond the claims of the Bishops,—(see Meth. Disc. page 4,) “We believe that God's design in raising up the preachers called Methodists, in America, was *to reform the continent* and spread *scriptural holiness* over these lands. As a proof hereof, we have seen since that time a great and glorious work of God, from New York, through the Jerseys, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North and South Carolina, and Georgia; as also of late, to the extremities of the western and *eastern States.*” The italics are our own, for we must ask, if Methodism claims to be the *reformer* and *evangelizer* of the land of Edwards, and Elliot, and Davies, and the Tennants,

may she not mean, among the heathen, what she seems to mean—no Methodism, no christianity.

Now, admitting that the ten stations thus doubtfully situated, do as much good as harm, leaving no excess of evil to be subtracted from the good effect of the remaining four, the figures stand, as 4:95 \times 3 1-2 :: 1:83 1-8;—as four good Methodist stations are to ninety-five Calvinistic stations, multiplied by three and a half, so is *one* average Calvinist worth *eighty-three* Methodists and *one-eighth* of another.

4th.—Add to the above demonstration *twenty per cent.*, which appears to the advantage of the Presbyterian minister over the Methodist, in the number of members to each minister, and you have the relative worth of a Presbyterian minister—equal to about *one hundred* Methodist preachers. Because, every ordinary Presbyterian member is about worth one Methodist preacher with all his members.

REMARKS.—1st.—There is more than a hundred times more reason for promoting and attending the ministrations of Calvinistic Presbyterians, than that of Methodists.

2d.—Bring a man to be an ordinary Presbyterian, and you have done eighty-three times more for the good of man, and the glory of God, than if you had made the same man an ordinary Methodist.

3d.—If you are a Presbyterian neglecting your duty, you are eighty-three times a greater sinner than the Methodist who neglects the same.

4th.—The saying that Calvinism is unfavorable to christian diligence, is an impudent denial of general and obvious facts.

5th.—Take from Arminians the little Calvinism that attaches to their prayers, and what would they be worth?

6th.—When the facts of history shall have been fairly exhibited, it will be seen that there is more power to redeem the world in the little finger of Calvinism, than in all the loins of Methodism.

N. R. M.

Judicious liberality is invaluable as a means of grace. “The liberal soul shall be made fat; and he that watereth, shall be watered also himself.”

Extracts from the Minutes of Holston Presbytery at its late Session at Elizabethton.

THE Committee to take into consideration the subject of Missionary and Colporteur efforts in the bounds of Presbytery, report, that it is very desirable that Presbytery should take measures to enter upon the work immediately, and they recommend the adoption of the following Constitution:—

ARTICLE 1.—This Presbytery shall be known by the name of the Home Missionary Society.

2.—The object of this Society shall be to preach the gospel to the destitute, to organize new churches and sustain feeble ones within the bounds of Holston Presbytery, and to distribute religious books and tracts.

* * * * *

6.—Any person may become a member of this Society by contributing to its funds, and may continue to be a member by a yearly contribution.

7.—The contributions may be paid in cash, or in due bills, given by any good merchant in the vicinity of the Presbytery, or in any kind of produce delivered to a selling Agent.

Officers of the Society.—John R. King, President; Daniel Rogan, Secretary; F. A. McCorkle Treasurer.

Standing Committee.—F. A. Ross, F. A. McCorkle, R. P. Wells, Daniel Rogan, Samuel Rhea, J. F. Deaderick, S. D. Mitchell, John Lynn, James McDowell.

Collecting and Selling Agents.—Jacob Cameron, Elizabethton Church; John Lynn, Kingsport; S. Jewell, Greeneville; Samuel Rhea, Blountville; David Woods, New Bethel; Orville Rice, Rogersville; Elijah Hill, Mt. Carmel; Anthony Rankin, Timber Ridge; Marshall Gregg, Meadow Creek; Daniel Kennedy, Mt. Zion; Emanuel Mann, Mt. Lebanon.

Presbytery voted to request all its members to present the subject of Domestic Missions to the churches under its care, and to take up collections previous to the next meeting of Presbytery.

DANIEL ROGAN, *Stated Clerk.*

In advancing the *benevolent* design contemplated in this movement of Presbytery, it may be seen that *much* depends

upon the *fidelity* of the ministers in presenting the subject in its proper aspect to the churches—*much* upon the *promptness* and *activity* of the collecting and selling agents in procuring contributions and converting them into available means, for the support of the men who are to occupy the field of labor. It is believed that our churches will be as ready to respond to this call as those coming through other channels, to meet the wants of the *destitute* and *perishing* in our bounds.

If Presbyterianism is, *as we believe it is, eminent*, under God, to the work of *thorough, biblical instruction* in doctrine and in precept, salutary in *government* and bright in *example*, then we say, let its light emanate without obstruction or limitation.—Let the people see and understand it, not as it is *represented* to be, but as it is in fact. For this purpose we want the living Missionary, “well furnished to his work,” and the Colporteur to go beyond the bounds of our organized churches, to preach the gospel, visit the people, circulate *our* books and pamphlets, organize and resuscitate Sabbath-Schools—in short, to act the noble part of God’s servant, in preparing in the wilderness the way for the coming of Christ’s kingdom.

Let this work be superadded to the usual efficiency of our church, in the appropriate duties of pastors and people—let it be continued from year to year, until we have complied with the injunction of the risen Redeemer—preached the gospel to every one to whom we may have access in our bounds, and preached it as *we understand* it. Then, and not till then, may we hope for the happiest result which the gospel is calculated to produce. Then shall the *Presbyterian church* assume her proper position with the sister churches of the land, in cultivating and reaping for the Lord the harvest which is to fill up the garner of his grace. Then may we expect our churches to be replenished by revivals, and our Colleges and Seminaries filled with pious youth, who shall be prepared to receive the mantle of our fathers in the ministry, as they resign their labors and go to their reward.

D. R.

As life is short and uncertain, and its pleasures intermingled with pains and sorrows, it is absurd to make it the sole object of your thoughts and pursuits.

Practical Tendency of Calvinism.

HAVING now, in pursuance of our original design, discoursed at some length on the principal points embraced in our doctrinal system, we deem it necessary here to notice an objection often urged against that system, namely, that it is *demoralizing in its tendency*.

To this we answer: that we are willing and desirous that the system should be tested by its fruits; and we appeal to impartial judges to say, what has been its uniform practical influence. Only select those portions of Europe and America, where Calvinism has been the only, or the prevailing creed, and inquire what has been the character of the great body of the people. The unanimous verdict of historians and travelers is that they have always been distinguished from the surrounding population by a purer and more elevated morality. Take for a sample the city where Calvin taught, and where the influence of his doctrine must have been most deeply felt; and let the testimony of the celebrated D'Aubigne be heard. "Calvin," says he, "with the zeal of a prophet, and the devotion of a martyr, who submits himself unreservedly to the stern word of God, exacted from the church under his care an absolute obedience. He strove hand to hand with the libertine party, and by the grace of God he remained the stronger. Geneva, formerly so corrupted, was regenerated, and displayed a purity of manners, a Christian simplicity, which drew from Farel, after an absence of fifteen years, a shout of admiration, and these remarkable words: 'I would rather wish to be the last in Geneva than the first any where else.' And fifty years after Calvin's death" adds D'Aubigne "Jean Valentin Andreae, a fervent Lutheran, having passed some time within our walls, said on his return: 'What I have seen there I shall never forget, and I shall ardently desire to retain it all my life. The fairest ornament of that republic is its tribunal of manners, which makes inquiry every week into the disorders among the citizens. Games of cards and chance, oaths, blasphemies, impurity, quarrels, hatreds, deceits, infidelities, drunkenness and other vices are suppressed. Oh! but this purity is a beautiful ornament of Christianity! We (the Lutherans,) cannot

shed tears enough over that in which we are awanting. If the difference of doctrine did not withdraw me from Geneva, the harmony of its manners would have retained me there forever.'”—*D'Aubigne Luth. & Calv.* pp. 54, 55.

“Will it not be granted by every intelligent reader,” says Dr. Miller, “that during the first half century after the Reformation was established in England, when nineteen twentieths of the Protestant clergy in that kingdom were avowed Calvinists, the state both of piety and of morals was unspeakably better than during the latter half of the seventeenth century, when Arminianism had, among the majority, taken its place? What was the character of the two thousand ‘ejected ministers,’ in the reign of Charles II. who were almost to a man Calvinists? Were they not, characteristically as a body, the most pious, pure, diligent and exemplary servants of God that England ever saw. Is it not universally admitted, that the state of piety and of morals has ever been far more pure in Scotland than in England, and pre-eminently in those districts and congregations in Scotland, in which Calvinism has maintained a steady reign? And can any part of the world be named, in which, for nearly a hundred years after its settlement, purer morals reigned, than in New England, in which; as every one knows, during the greater part of that period a Calvinistic creed almost universally prevailed?”

“From the earliest morning of liberty,” says the organ of the Campbellite Baptists, at Pittsburg; “from the earliest morning of liberty, when the pilgrim fathers first set foot on Plymouth rock, and contested it with the wild beasts, and the wild men of the forest, down to the noon tide heat and burden of the Revolutionary day, and thence to these times, Presbyterians have sought out and wrought out the weal and the wealth, the peace and prosperity of this great and growing republic.”

The Rev. Dr. Charles Elliot, editor of the “Western (Methodist) Christian Advocate, testifies as follows: “The Presbyterians of every class were prominent, and even foremost in achieving the liberties of the United States. They have been all along the leading supporters of constitution and law, and good order. They have been the pioneers of learning and sound knowledge from the highest to the lowest grade, and are now its principal supporters. The cause of morals and

good order have always found them the first to aid, and among the last to retire from its support."

On this subject; also, the British Encyclopedia, a work not friendly to Calvinism, makes a remarkable concession. At the close of a long article on Predestination, the writers say,—"There is one remark which we feel ourselves bound in justice to make, although it appears to us somewhat singular. It is this,—that from the earliest ages down to our own days, if we consider the character of the ancient Stoics, the Jewish Essenes, the modern Calvinists and Jansenists, when compared with that of their antagonists, the Epicureans, the Sadducees; the Arminians and the Jesuits, we shall find that they have excelled; in no small degree, in the practice of the most rigid and respectable virtues; and have been the highest honor to their own ages, and the best models for imitation to every age succeeding."

Still there are those who insist that the Calvinistic doctrine *does harm*. But how is it that it does this harm? Only as misrepresented and distorted by its enemies. And this is not our fault, nor the fault of the doctrine. We endeavor to dispense the truth of God just as we find it in the sacred volume. Certain designing party men, in order to render it odious, mix with it soul-destroying error. We hand out what we believe to be the pure water of life from the divine fountain; they add to it the poison of death and then pass it round as our mixture. If, therefore, harm is done, we cannot be held accountable. The whole responsibility, and it is a fearful one, rests upon those misguided men, who, for party purposes, give currency to their own wicked perversions of our system. It is the poison they infuse into the cup which does all the mischief.—*The Great Supper, by Rev. Ashbel G. Fairchild, D. D.*

There will be a great difference in the lives of two men, one of whom always bears in mind that he has rights and other men have duties, and the other of whom never forgets that other men have rights and he has duties.

THE
Calvinistic Magazine.

[NEW SERIES.]

“Earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints,”

Vol. II.

July, 1847.

No. 7.

OBJECTIONS

To the Doctrine of the Final Perseverance of the Saints considered and answered; in a conversation between an Arminian and a Calvinist.

—
BY J. D. M.

—
No. I.

ARMINIAN.—Good morning neighbor,—I have called to see you with a desire of having a little talk about the sermon which your minister gave us on last Sabbath.

CALVINIST.—Glad to see you brother—walk in. It will give me pleasure to converse with you about the doctrine of that discourse;—for when I saw with what close attention you listened to it, a hope began to rise within me that you would be convinced by its powerful and scriptural reasoning.

A.—You will be disappointed in that hope, my brother. I cannot believe the doctrine of final perseverance. Since last Sabbath I have been examining the scriptures with reference to that doctrine, and I find many passages *directly against* it. I admit that the sermon was eloquent and powerful, and to me at the time, almost unanswerable; but on referring to my Bible I easily found several passages of scripture which I have marked down, that seem to me to be wholly irreconcilable with that doctrine.

C.—If the sermon has set you to a reinvestigation of the subject, I still have a hope of making you a good Calvinist; and if you will name the passages of scripture that constitute a sufficient warrant, as you think, for rejecting the doctrine, I will most cheerfully examine them with you.

A.—Here they are. I have brought my Bible along with the passages marked. Let us look first at Matthew 18: 23, to the end of the chapter. “Therefore is the kingdom of heaven likened unto a certain king which would take account of his servants,” &c. Notice the 27th, 32d and 34th verses, particularly: “*Then the Lord of that servant was moved with compassion, and loosed him, and forgave him the debt.*” “*O thou wicked servant, I forgave thee all that debt, because thou desirest me.*” “*And his Lord was wroth, and delivered him to the tormentors, till he should pay all that was due unto him.*” Now here is a king forgiving a servant, and afterwards punishing the same servant, as though he had never been forgiven. The king represents our Lord. He once forgave the servant. The servant, then, may represent a person *once in grace*—for he was pardoned. But he proved “unprofitable;”—this represents a person “*fallen from grace.*” And lastly, he is condemned and cast into prison—*he perishes*. Here then is the representation of one who was *fully pardoned*, who *fell from grace*, and did *finally perish*. Is not this a clear case against you?

C.—If your application of the passage be correct, the “case is clear” enough;—but let me understand you. Do you consider this servant’s penitence a fair representation of gospel repentance?

A.—I do. He repents, prays, and is forgiven.

C.—Allow me to say, my brother, that you have made a misapplication of the parable. The design of this parable is, to show that God will not forgive us *our* sins, unless we forgive *others*. Our Lord did not design to illustrate true repentance by the case of the servant, but to teach men one essential requisite to their obtaining pardon, namely, that they should have a forgiving mind themselves. There is nothing here about “falling from grace,” or “perseverance.” Look at the parable again. Is there any mention made of the *gospel way of forgiveness*? Or of the mediation of Jesus Christ, through whose blood alone we have forgiveness? And what plea does the servant make? Does he ask for pardon for Christ’s sake? No. He feels that he is able to *buy a pardon*—his plea is, have patience with me and *I will pay thee all*. This is not the language of an humble penitent, as you must perceive. The case does neither represent gospel repentance or gospel pardon, and

consequently can teach us nothing on the subject of "falling from grace." The passage can therefore have no weight against the doctrine of final perseverance.

A.—Well, well, I won't contend for that passage; its application may be doubtful. We will drop this for the present, as I have another parable more decidedly against your doctrine. Turn to the 25th chapter of Matthew. Listen to this: "*Then shall the kingdom of heaven be likened unto ten virgins, which took their lamps and went forth to meet the bridegroom. And five of them were wise and five of them were foolish. They that were foolish took their lamps, and took no oil with them. But the wise took oil in their vessels with their lamps. While the bridegroom tarried they all slumbered and slept. And at midnight there was a cry made, Behold, the bridegroom cometh; go ye out to meet him. Then all those virgins arose and trimmed their lamps. And the foolish said unto the wise, give us of your oil, for our lamps are gone out. But the wise answered, saying, Not so, lest there be not enough for us and you: but go ye rather to them that sell, and buy for yourselves. And while they went to buy, the bridegroom came; and they that were ready went in with him to the marriage; and the door was shut. Afterward came also the other virgins, saying, Lord, Lord, open to us. But he answered and said, Verily I say unto you, I know you not.*" Here are ten virgins representing christians, all of whom at one time possessed grace, or true religion. Afterwards five of them lost their religion, and are called *foolish* on that account, as those who kept their religion are called *wise*, on that account: Observe, 1st. They *all* went together on the *same* road, with the *same* object in view—"to meet the bridegroom. 2d. They *all* "went forth" with their lamps. 3d. They *all* went forth with their *lamps burning*; for if the lamps of the foolish virgins *had not been burning*, how could they have said, *our lamps have gone out*? Then is it not clear that up to the time at which they all slept, they *all* had lamps burning, or were alike christians? But when aroused from their slumbers by the midnight cry, "Behold, the bridegroom cometh," it is discovered that the lamps of five of them had gone out. They *once* had light but it was now gone; they *once had grace*, but have lost it, and consequently they were shut out from the marriage feast. They lost grace and lost heaven

too. Now, brother, how does your doctrine, "that all true christians persevere unto the end and are saved," tally with this parable? Is it not plain that at *one time* the five foolish virgins had as distinctive marks of true religion as the wise? Yet they *fell* and *were lost*.

C.—You ask how my "doctrine of perseverance" will tally with this parable? I answer, this parable, if it has *any* consistent application to the doctrine in question, rather supports my views than yours. For the wise certainly persevered unto the end. You have made out a pretty strong case, I admit, but permit me to say, that you have done it by most singularly overlooking the plain facts in the case. In this parable there is a representation of the kingdom of heaven—the visible church—including real saints and false professors, or wise and foolish virgins. Five of these virgins are called foolish, (i. e.) thoughtless, wicked. *This is their character—they were foolish. They never had any better character—they never were wise.* In the 2d verse it is said, "*and five were foolish.*" They did not become foolish or graceless after they went to sleep,—for it is expressly said, in verse 3d, that in the setting out they were "*foolish,*" and the evidence of their folly is this,—they took lamps, but took *no oil in them.* They had a mere "profession"—a flickering, glaring lamp of profession, which for awhile may have deceived both themselves and the "wise." They had neither vessels nor oil. The "wise" had oil in their vessels with their lamps, from which their lamps were fed. Here our Lord draws a line of distinction broad and deep, between the foolish and wise—the mere outward showy professor (and I fear there are many such in our day,) and the true christian with the oil of grace in his heart, which causes his light ever to shine, "*brighter and brighter.*" The foolish are represented as having only *one thing* in common with the wise, namely, a "lamp"—a *mere profession.* The wise are represented as having two things, the possession of which constituted them wise, which the foolish had not, the destitution of which constituted them foolish, namely, *vessels and oil,* for the wise took oil in their vessels. It thus appears that from the *outset* "*five were wise and five were foolish.*" Then the doctrine of falling from grace is not found here, and I am authorized to say that this parable affords you no just ground for rejecting the doc-

fine of the final perseverance of the saints. You will have to "drop" this as you did the other, and if you don't take care you will be a Calvinist yet.

A.—Not so fast, brother. I would be no nearer Calvinism were I to give up both these parables, than I am now; for I have other and stronger scriptural arguments against your doctrine. For instance, there is the parable of the vine and branches, in John 15; and in Heb. 6: 4—6, we have the doctrine of falling from grace clearly taught; and in Ezekiel, in several places, we are told of the righteous man turning from his righteousness and dying in his sin; and in 1 Cor. 9: 27, the apostle Paul plainly intimates that he himself might fall away and perish; and Peter did actually fall, lost his religion, and obtained it again; and there are other passages which I need not mention at present. If you have no objection we will continue our friendly discussion.

C.—Proceed brother, and bring out all your strong objections to what I consider a "precious doctrine of grace," and I will endeavor to answer, in the spirit of the gospel.

A.—In that same spirit I will refer you to the 15th chapter of John: "I am the vine, ye are the branches." Now please observe particularly the 2d and 6th verses: "Every branch in me that beareth not fruit, he taketh away, and every branch that beareth fruit he purgeth it, that it may bring forth more fruit." "If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch and is withered; and men gather them and cast them into the fire and they are burned." Here our Saviour represents to us the intimate union between himself and his people—and they are connected as the vine and its branches. He here says that a branch of the vine may be "taken away"—may be "cast forth as a branch" and be "burned." It is said in 2 Cor. 5: 17, "*If any man be in Christ he is a NEW CREATURE.*" But a branch in the vine represents a man in Christ, therefore a branch in the vine represents a "*new creature.*" And as our Saviour has taught us that a branch in him may be taken away, being unfruitful, and may be cast into the fire and be burned, it is an evident truth that a new creature, a *real child of God, may fall from grace and be lost.* The doctrine of the final perseverance of all believers cannot, therefore, be true.

C.—It seems to me that you have again mistaken the intent

of the Saviour's words. He is here speaking of the outward, visible church,—of those who *professed* to be in him, and not *solely* of those who were really and truly in him. You will admit that while a soul is in real, spiritual union with Christ, and in this sense “is in Christ,” and Christ in him, it must and will exhibit good fruit. Then is it not absurd to say, that a “branch in Christ,” a soul truly and spiritually joined to him, is *unfruitful*? The branch draws its life from the vine, and if the vine be fruitful, so must the branches be.

A.—What then does our Saviour mean, when he says, “every branch *in me* that beareth *not fruit*?”

C.—I will give you my view of the parable, and then your question will be answered. The parable of the vine is a representation of the visible church, with two kinds of branches, or members, both of which are “*in Christ*” *in this sense*—they are both in connection with his church. Some are branches only in name, in profession, and are taken into the church on their profession of faith in Christ; but like the foolish virgins, they have nothing but a profession, and of course prove fruitless branches, and will, if they so continue, be “taken away,” “cast forth,” and be “burned.” The other kind of branches are in Christ, not by profession only, but are *vitally united to him*. They have been “grafted into Christ contrary to nature.” These are always fruit-bearing branches, which the Lord “purgeth,” that they may be more fruitful. Their *life* is in the *vine*, and they cannot be cast forth and withered while there is life in the vine. *Christ says because I live ye shall live also*. Here, then, we have the doctrine of “final perseverance” again, and it appears that a “new creature,” or one spiritually in Christ, will, under the purging process, become “more fruitful,” and “shall never perish,” but *shall live while Christ, who is his life, liveth*. Your question is now answered, for it is obvious that Paul, in 2 Cor. 5: 17, was speaking of a vital union with Christ; and our Lord, in John 15: 2, was speaking only of a visible or outward union.

A.—I have only to say, in reply, that your views of this parable are entirely new to me, and that I will examine them more carefully at my leisure. Let us now look at the next passage. It is found in Heb. 6: 4—6:—“*For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the hea-*

venly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, if they shall fall away, to renew them again unto repentance; seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame." Are we not here taught the "falling away" of saints, and their consequent perdition? For all who cannot be brought to repentance must perish. The persons here spoken of as falling away, have experienced all the powerful influences of the christian religion, with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven; they had participated in the privileges of the gospel here, and in the hope of future blessedness in the world to come. They must have been true christians, and yet of these the apostle says, "*if these shall fall away.*"

C.—Suppose it were admitted that the apostle has reference here to real saints,—yet you perceive he speaks *only by supposition*,—"if these shall fall away." He does not teach that such ever *did* or ever *will* fall away. We might assert with truth, that *if* Paul, now in heaven, should sin and apostatize, he would be cast down to hell, and would you thence infer that he or any other saint in heaven was in danger of apostatizing? But many learned and godly men think it very questionable, whether the apostle in this place is speaking of true believers at all, for nothing is said of their faith in Christ, or of their regeneration, or of their justification through the righteousness of Christ. They were enlightened, (i. e.) instructed in the nature and design of the christian religion,—had a superficial knowledge of the doctrines of the gospel, without saving grace. They had "tasted of the heavenly gift,"—had enjoyed all the privileges of a preached gospel, and had eternal life offered to them, and had some faint relish for life eternal. Had been "made partakers of the Holy Ghost," not of his sanctifying, but of his ordinary and miraculous gifts. They "tasted the good word of God," had a superficial knowledge of it, but were ignorant of its power, like Herod, or the "stony ground hearers." Or it may mean that they had witnessed, and perhaps had performed miracles,—for these powers were not necessarily restricted to God's own people, but were exercised by Balaam, and Saul, and Judas, and others who prophesied in Christ's name, and whom he never did acknowledge as his

true disciples.* In the 7th and 8th verses their characters seem to be expressed under the image of the "earth which beareth thorns and briars," while that of real christians is expressed under the figure of the earth "which bringeth forth herbs meet for them by whom it is dressed." Thus, brother, this passage, which is so much relied on by your people, presents at best but a doubtful support to your doctrine of "falling from grace," and of course cannot weigh heavily as an objection against the doctrine of "final perseverance."

A.—Still, it seems to me that the apostle was speaking of real christians;—indeed, it is evident to my mind that he *was*, from the fact, that he says it is impossible to *renew them again to repentance*. He would not have spoken of the impossibility of renewing them *again* to repentance unless they *had once* been *repentant sinners*.

C.—Suppose this all to be so—though what I have said already renders it doubtful,—it is still but a supposition of the apostle; *if* these shall fall, &c. And the passage may be considered as addressed to christians, as a warning, a motive to increased watchfulness and prayer. When God preserves his people, he does it not by mere power, but by the teaching of his word and providence—by promises and threatenings, applied by the Holy Spirit to the heart and conscience—by just such truths as that now under consideration.

A.—All *Arminians* admit that this passage is a warning to christians against apostacy, but I cannot perceive how it can have much or any weight as a motive, in the minds of those who believe that all christians will be "*kept*" and *saved*! How can you feel the force of such a motive, when you profess to know and believe that you are safe? What need of *motives* when you believe, *God's power is pledged to keep you?*

C.—Need I tell you further, that Calvinists believe that God treats all christians as *free agents*; and in determining to preserve them, (for the Lord preserveth his Saints, Ps. 37: 28;) he has instituted certain means of grace adapted to them as free agents? The Lord keeps his saints not by *mere* power; but that power of God operates "through faith unto salvation." By his Spirit he presents to the mind, promise and

* See Presbyterian Tracts, Vol. I, Tract 7, p. 14.

threatening blessing and cursing:—the love of Christ, the beauty of holiness,—the joys of heaven and the perdition of the apostate. *This is God's method of preserving the saints.* Here is the “sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth.” *If* God's children depart from his plan, or decline its provisions, they will of course fall and perish.

A.—I believe I understand you, and candidly confess that this view appears to me to be reasonable. But have you not admitted that a christian *may* fall?

C.—In this sense only, that *if* Paul, now in heaven, should sin, he would fall and perish. Viewing christians as free agents, they certainly have power to sin and apostatize;—but viewing them as free agents, under the powerful influence of a new nature, and of that gracious plan for their preservation which our God has established, who has said in his word, “*I will put my fear in their heart, that they shall not depart from me,*” it is rendered *certain* that the true saint *never will* apostatize. And now, brother, let me ask you to repeat the 12th article of your creed, if you can remember it.

A.—O yes, I believe I can repeat it—it reads thus:—“After we have received the Holy Ghost we may depart from grace given and fall into sin, and by the grace of God rise again and amend our lives.”

C.—It is just what I thought. What a discrepancy is here between your creed and the Bible! *If* the apostle is here speaking of the falling away of christians, he says it is “*impossible to renew them again unto repentance;*” but your creed says they “*may rise again and amend their lives.*”

A.—Our creed and the Bible may be nearer together than you now perceive; for the apostle does not say that it is impossible with *God* to renew the fallen. With men it is impossible, but with *God all things are possible;* and our creed says “*by God's grace they may rise,*” &c.

C.—Ah, brother, you have not relieved your article by that explanation, for the whole work of renewing a sinner, from first to last, is, and ever has been, impossible to men or angels. It is God who renews at first, and if a sinner is to be reclaimed from open apostacy, God alone can reclaim him. But it is “*impossible to renew*” those who have “*fallen away;*”—not that all things are not possible to God, but it is declared that

there is no propitiation made in the measures of grace and mercy revealed in the gospel for the renewal of such apostates as are here described, and therefore, under gospel influences, it is *impossible to renew them again to repentance*. While this blast of condemnation is sent forth from the *mouth of God* against the apostate, your church raises a counter-blast, and tells him "he may rise again and amend his life!"

A.—Come, my good brother, be gentle;—let us have "soft words and hard arguments." I wish to continue this friendly discussion, but as I have duties that demand my presence elsewhere, if it is agreeable to you we will postpone it for the present and will meet again to-morrow.

The Omniscience of God.

BY REV. STEPHEN TAYLOR.

THE design of this article is to exhibit, in a simple and intelligible manner, the scriptural doctrine of one of the divine attributes—the knowledge of God. Introductory to it, however, I would remark, that much confusion, if not error, originates in many minds from unsettled, indistinct notions of the immutability of the Godhead. Let it be carefully considered (what no one will deny) that just what God now is, he has from eternity been, and will to eternity be. He is necessarily, immutably and eternally the same in all his attributes—not in some, but in all of them. It would be just as absurd and unscriptural to say that he made himself almighty, or holy, or just, or good, as to say that he made his own existence. These are the eternal attributes of his eternal existence. There never was a period when he either was destitute of them, or when they belonged to him in any inferior degree, than at this moment. He has exercised and manifested them in his works of creation and providence, but they were neither originated, nor in any respect changed by these works.

The same is true of the divine knowledge. Yet, as our knowledge is all acquired,—as our own minds were once blank, as to wisdom and purposes, until we acquired our ideas and formed our schemes, we are prone to conceive of the di-

vine existence and operations as bearing a strong analogy to our own. We thus, in violation of the exalted conclusions of natural theology, and the sublime doctrines of revelation, degrade the eternal Jehovah to the level of the imaginary deities of heathen mythology. The doctrine of divine immutability, however, teaches us, that whatever we ascertain him now to be, whether in knowledge, wisdom, or purpose, from his works or his word, he eternally is "without variableness or shadow of turning." Our minds will often recur to the immutability of Jehovah in the course of these remarks.

That "the Lord is a God of knowledge," seems to be an impression coincident with the belief of divine existence.—The Bible was not given to us, nor is there a single passage in it, whose main design is to declare to us that there is a God, but in the words of our excellent catechism, "the Scriptures principally teach what man is to believe concerning God, and what duty God requires of man."

Knowledge, considered irrespective of the use which is made of it, has no more moral character, than strength or power. When combined with a disposition to select the best means to attain the best ends, it is true wisdom and worthy of admiration and praise. When united with a disposition to select the means best adapted to accomplish the worst ends, it is detestable folly and malevolence.

Knowledge is power, because it gives energy and effect to the efforts over which it presides, whether they are directed to benevolent or malevolent ends.

It is an essential attribute of a moral being. No act which is performed without knowledge, without design, can have any moral character. There must be knowledge of various ends, in order to choose between them.

To a holy being, knowledge must be a source of happiness. It is therefore esteemed and coveted by all holy intelligent beings, and by the probationary inhabitants of our world.

To the unholy and reprobate, it must prove an instrument of torture, since it can bring before the heart and conscience, only that which is hated. Increasing knowledge of the character and works of God, only increases the conviction of the evil and folly of sin.

Knowledge, or the capacity of knowing and enjoying, was

one of the features of resemblance to God, in which man was originally created. "And having put on the new man which is renewed in knowledge, after the image of him which created him."—Col. 3: 10.

Knowledge, then, is one of the glorious and adorable attributes of God. As knowledge, and not ignorance, is the mother of true devotion, it is incumbent on us to avail ourselves of the means which he has afforded us for attaining clear and enlarged views of this divine perfection.

With respect to creatures, who are finite in their capacities, and progressive in their attainments of knowledge, we distinguish between the power of knowing and the amount of information which is stored up. But it will appear in the course of this discussion, that with respect to God, the amount of his knowledge, of course implying a capacity adequate to this amount, is the only subject presented to our consideration in the Sacred Scriptures.

The scriptural doctrine with respect to the knowledge of God is, that it is infinite.

Job says, "He is perfect in knowledge."—Job 37: 16.

The Psalmist—"His understanding is infinite."—Ps. 147: 5.

These two passages cover the whole ground which we have to examine in relation to this subject.

1. "He is perfect in knowledge." This seems to accord with our original and universal notions of the perfection of the character of the great First Cause of all things. We can conceive of no cause which can limit or dim the perfection and clearness of his knowledge. Created beings are limited as to the perfect clearness of their understanding and knowledge by the imperfection of their faculties. They are finite as to the power of their perception and apprehension, as well as to the amount which they can grasp in their comprehension. There doubtless are subjects which are necessarily and eternally incomprehensible to finite minds. Their capacity may forever be increasing, and yet they must forever be finite.

But God is perfect in knowledge. He "is light, and in him is no darkness at all."—1 John, 1: 5. A passage which is as applicable to his understanding as to his holiness,

The perfection of the divine knowledge will appear, if we consider that it is intuitive. In the divine mind there is no

process of induction, inference or reasoning, or of gradually coming to a conclusion. This would imply ignorance, uncertainty and imperfection of knowledge on these subjects, until the conclusion is reached. It would indicate limitation and progress in the perfection of the divine knowledge. But there can be no degrees of knowledge, when the knowledge is eternally perfect. All those terms which we apply to the operations of the human mind, such as doubt, perplexity, darkness or confusion of mind, investigation, &c., are wholly inapplicable to the divine mind, except in a highly figurative sense, and in accommodation to our habits of thought. See Gen. 18: 20, 21, and Jer. 17: 10, &c.

2. The other point which is presented to our consideration is, that his understanding is infinite, or embraces all things. I might safely leave it to the reader, to open the Bible and find the various passages which directly or by implication declare the extent of divine knowledge. With the aid of a good Concordance, or a reference Bible, or Ghaston's Collections, it will be found a pleasant and profitable exercise.

But there are a few points so intimately connected with the whole system of theological truth, that they seem to claim a particular consideration.

First.—The omniscience, or perfect knowledge of Jehovah, embraces his perfect knowledge of all things now existent.—“Neither is there any creature that is not manifest in his sight, for all things are naked and open to the eyes of him with whom we have to do.”—Heb. 4: 13. So also Math. 10: 29, and Ps. 139: 1—12.

2. His infinite understanding embraces a perfect knowledge of all things past. What events have transpired, and stand recorded upon the annals of eternal ages past, we know not, but he knows. Nothing fades from his memory. He has no infirmities of age, that former events should grow dim as they recede from the present time. Concerning this, there can be no diversity of opinion. It is the wicked that “hath said in his heart, God hath forgotten.”—Ps. 10: 11.

3. His infinite understanding embraces an equally clear and perfect and certain knowledge of all things future. If his knowledge of the future is not as perfect as that of the past, his understanding is not infinite—it has its limits—is capable

of increase, and will actually be increased. He, like his creatures, has had his infancy in knowledge, and is growing wiser every day.

Such absurdities force us to the conclusion that no curtain conceals the events of futurity from the all-seeing eye of Jehovah—that there is no more dimness or uncertainty in the divine mind respecting the future, than respecting the present or the past.

This is clearly taught in the Scriptures. It is the very point to which James referred in Acts 15: 18, in connection with the 15—17 verses. “Known unto God are all his works from the beginning of creation.”

All the prophecies which are spread upon the sacred page are so many proofs and illustrations of God’s universal and perfect knowledge of futurity. Prophecy is the history of the future, and as certain and accurate as any history of the past, even that which is recorded under the superintendence of the Spirit of inspiration. He himself appeals to this as proof that he and he only is the living and true God. “I am God, and there is none else. Declaring the end from the beginning, and from the ancient times the things that are not yet done.”—Is. 46: 9, 10.

By examining the 42d and 46th chapters of Isaiah, it will be found that while he asserts his perfect understanding of the future, he claims it also as his own peculiar prerogative.—“These prophecies often designate but a few circumstances, but they imply a perfect knowledge of all the accompaniments and appendages of these circumstances, involving ten thousand incidents which are inseparably linked with those which are expressly declared. Shake our confidence in the perfect foreknowledge of God, and you destroy the foundation upon which our faith in the prophecies is based.

(To be concluded next month.)

How admirable is the simplicity of the Evangelists! They never speak injuriously of the enemies of Jesus Christ, of his executioners, nor of his judges. They report the facts, without adding a single reflection.—*Racine.*

Reminiscences of our venerable Church.

ARGYLE AND GUTHRIE.

THE "Martyr-land!" How often are these words uttered by the pilgrim as he wanders by the "burn-side" from which the "hunted" ones slaked their thirst—as he gazes on the ocean-laved rock, oft-times their prison—as he stands in the midst of Edina's ancient glories. The land of Wallace and of Bruce—the land of the brave Douglass—"the land of Burns," has a thousand associations, pure and living as her mountain streams. Them we love, and cold must be the heart of the Scotsman, if it beats not with gratitude when he thinks of his home. But there are other and more hallowed associations, which bind this land, not only to the heart of him who learned his catechism in the broad accent of his native country, but to all who cherish the mind-strengthening truths of that "great compendium of christian doctrine," though their home may be with the antipodes.

The stranger stands in the "Heart of Midlothian" on the High Street, leading from the Castle on the west, to Holyrood on the east. Tall dark houses are on either hand, and in the middle of the way, in massive grandeur, stands the venerable St. Giles—in more Scottish Presbyterian phrase, the "High Kirk," which was founded more than a thousand years ago. Not a quarter of a century since, another building crouched as it were beside it. A low, dark, ugly pile of architecture, built in the reign of Queen Mary for a jail, or Tolbooth. This has been wisely sacrificed to modern taste, and a splendid castellated edifice has been reared in one of the most picturesque situations of the town, as a home for the culprit and felon.—Old St. Giles, after undergoing much remodelling, now looms out majestically, and in its cathedral magnificence covers with its ample roof three places of worship. As the stranger gazes on the elegant gothic structure, its lofty square tower rising from the centre—its spire representing an imperial crown—and as he listens to its sonorous bell, he cannot but bring to mind how often the latter has knelled on the hearts of the many condemned ones who used to gaze from the grated windows of the Tolbooth on this very building.

It was the end of May, 1661, that two noble godly men were confined in the Tolbooth. The clock of St. Giles had not much longer to greet their ears—their hours were numbered, yet no melancholy hung her weeds around them. They were happy, for they knew that God was with them.

The Marquis of Argyle was a christian nobleman in the true sense of the word—a Presbyterian, free as the truth had made him free. His country, and the best political interests of his country, were near to his heart, but his God, and the best interests of his church were nearer. With that charity which thinketh no evil, he believed that the political sins of Charles I. were those of ignorance, and as a peer of the realm, he protested against his execution;—and when anarchy reigned in England, and distracted Scotland scarcely knew what to do—when the “man Cromwell,” with his *mighty earnest* mind had fallen asleep, he listened to the hypocritical promises of Charles II.—saw him lift his hand in solemn oath, that he, as king, would keep the covenant, and then he placed the crown on his head, hoping that his church and his country would at last have peace. False hope,—the very purity of his own heart made the pious Argyle now the more readily duped. How bitterly was Argyle hated by this dissolute monarch.—How he scorned to think of the time, when in his poverty, a wretched fugitive, he had promised “good behaviour,” and covenanted freedom to their church in the presence of the “rigidly virtuous” covenanters, with Argyle at their head. Yes, he hated these men, and *that man* especially; and no sooner was he in power than the ruin of Argyle was determined on.

The accomplishment of this was not difficult. While in London on a visit, he was thrown into the Tower, and from thence transported to Edingburgh, to await his trial for high treason. Fourteen charges are preferred against him, and all disproved. At length he is betrayed by one on whose honor he had relied, and to whom he had often written confidentially during the Commonwealth, when his country's weal hung heavily on his heart. Letters from him to Gen. Moak are produced. The General, who had been the active agent of Cromwell, is made Duke of Albemarle,—and Argyle, who only yielded to the force of circumstances, for his country's *apparently* best interests, *is condemned to be beheaded!*

And now let us glance at his last hours. "I could die like a Roman," said he, "but choose rather to die as a christian." On hearing his sentence pronounced, he remarked calmly, "I had the honor to set the crown on the king's head, and now he hastens me to a better crown than his own." After his trial, he met his wife in the Tolbooth, whither now he was conveyed, and throwing his arms around her, he said, "Till Monday they have given me to be with you, my dear, therefore let us make the most of it." The forlorn woman lifted up her voice in wailing—"The Lord will require it," said she. "Forbear," said the marquis, "truly I pity them, they know not what they do; they may shut me in where they please, they cannot shut out God from me."

The evening before he was executed he could not conceal his happiness from those around. "I thought," said he, "to have concealed the Lord's goodness, but it will not do. I am now ordering my worldly affairs, and God is sealing my charter to a better inheritance, and just now saying, '*son be of good cheer, thy sins are forgiven thee.*'"

Ere he left the prison he requested an interview with Mr. Guthrie, his fellow-prisoner. This was permitted, and after a long embrace Mr. Guthrie broke the silence. "My lord," said he, "God hath been with you, he is with you, and will be with you. Were I not under sentence of death myself, I could cheerfully die for you." They parted soon to meet again.

When on the scaffold he was perfectly composed, and his pulse beat calmly and strongly;—so said his physician who stood by, and who knew him to be constitutionally timorous; but he was now strong in the Lord, and able to speak at length and to the purpose in his Master's cause. After saying that he forgave all his enemies and condemned none, he continued: "God hath laid engagements on Scotland. We are tied by covenants to religion and reformation; those who are yet unborn are yet engaged, and it passeth the power of all the magistrates under heaven to absolve from the oath of God. These times are like to be either very sinning or very suffering times, and let christians make their choice. There is a sad dilemma in the business—sin or suffer; and surely he that will choose the better part will choose to suffer." After much more of such discourse, he concluded thus:—"I have no more to say

but to beg the Lord that when I go away he would bless every one that stayeth behind." Blessed christianity! Thou and thou only canst throw the mantle of charity around thy bitterest enemies! Cheerfully did he kneel down, and the same hand which was held up to heaven when he covenanted to be the Lord's, was now raised as a token of readiness to enter into the dark valley. The loaded knife fell, and struck off his head, which was carried forth and affixed to the west end of the Tolbooth.

Thus died the Marquis of Argyle, on the 27th of May, 186 years ago. Many foul slanders have been heaped upon him, because of the obloquy of the cause in which he suffered, but truth is mighty, and there are few now who do not agree with his honest countryman and cotemporary, that "The good Marquis of Argyle had piety for a christian, sense for a counsellor, courage for a martyr, and a soul for a king."

But we turn to another, who, perhaps, from his grated window saw the bloody head carried and affixed to stare with its glazed eye-balls on the pitying as well as on the hard-hearted. The bell of St. Giles has announced the dawn of his last day—the last day of James Guthrie, the humble minister of Stirling, who is also one of the martyrs of the Restoration.

The first charge brought against him was, "his declinature of the king and council's competency to judge respecting matters purely ecclesiastical." In other words, the declining to acknowledge the wicked Charles II. as head of the church. The king managed to procure a sentence of deposition from a packed assembly; but as the church would not recognize that assembly as free and lawful, the sentence fell into abeyance, and Guthrie preached still to his dear people in Stirling. His enemies, however, are not to be baffled. The king's commissioner, Middleton, and Archbishop Sharp, of memory notorious, had motives of private revenge, and with the king, they determined that he should suffer, in order to strike terror and pave the way for contemplated innovations. An indictment was soon found, charging him with various offences, in all amounting in the eyes of his foes to high treason. Mr. G. defended himself, and his speech is said to have been a most eloquent and triumphant vindication. "My Lord," said this upright christian to his corrupt judge, "my conscience I can-

not submit, but this old crazy body and mortal flesh I do submit to do with whatsoever ye will, whether by death, banishment, or imprisonment, or any thing else;—only I beseech you to ponder well what profit there is in my blood. It is not the extinguishing me or many others that will extinguish the covenant and work of reformation. My blood, bondage, or banishment will contribute more for the propagation of those things, than my life or liberty could do, should I live many years.”

His doom was sealed, and he heard the sentence with composure which condemned him “to be hanged at the Cross of Edinburgh as a traitor, and thereafter his head to be struck off and affixed on the Netherbow,” also his estate to be confiscated, and his children deprived of their rights as citizens.—“My lords,” said he, “let never this sentence affect you more than it does me, and let not my blood be required of the king’s family.”

At supper with his friends, the night before his execution, he was cheerful even to pleasantry. On the fatal ladder “he spoke an hour,” says Burnet, who saw him suffer, “with the composedness of one who was delivering a sermon, rather than his last words. ‘I take God to record upon my soul,’ he said, ‘I would not exchange this scaffold for the palace or mitre of the greatest prelate in Britain.’” And just before the drop fell, he lifted the napkin from his face and cried, “The covenants, the covenants, shall yet be Scotland’s reviving!” These were his last words ere he was launched into eternity. And soon the head was severed from the body, and the lifeless trunk was carried by friendly hands into the aisle of St. Giles, where ladies of the highest respectability waited to prepare it for decent burial. O! there was much weeping there, and some in their anguish of spirit would dip their kerchiefs in the blood of the martyr. While engaged in their melancholy task, a young man of genteel appearance entered the church, and poured on the body a vial of rich perfume, “God bless you, sir,” said one of the ladies, “for this labor of love shown to the slain body of the servant of Christ.” The young man spake not, but slowly retired.

Those bodies—those heads, have long since mouldered into dust, but who can gaze on those scenes, associated as they are

with the history of his church, but must feel his soul rise in thankfulness that God gave his servants courage to suffer.

Not very far from the locality of these tragedies, the pilgrim may now see a splendid new place of worship. That building has been erected since 1843. Sabbath after sabbath he sees crowds of worshippers, that almost choke the entrance to this temple;—but when he enters he finds that densely seated mass silent and solemn. Who is that noble-looking man in the pulpit, with open, frank, yet serious countenance, an index sure of his heart? That beloved minister is a direct descendant of the martyr—the Rev. Thomas Guthrie. M.

Long Prayers.

ENOUGH has been written on this subject to arrest the most obstinate offender, were it not that there are many persons who need “line upon line and precept upon precept,” to cure them of a bad habit. To the attentive and docile disciple, one would suppose the positive injunction of the Saviour on this point would be amply sufficient. Nothing, indeed, can be more explicit; and yet how frequently is it totally disregarded? I have heard some well-educated men, who did not mean to be ostentatious, and were not destitute of common sense in other respects, who would spin out a prayer to the length of ten, fifteen, twenty, nay, sometimes I verily believe to thirty minutes, in the course of which they would unconsciously be guilty of a great deal of repetition, and seem to search for irrelevant topics and deprecated possibilities, wherewith to weary out and expel the spirit of devotion in a mixed assembly. My brother, remember! “God is in heaven, and thou upon the earth, therefore let thy words be few.”—Eccl. 5: 2.

I have taken some little pains to see how the practice of Bible characters corresponds with the precept that we be not like the heathen, who “think that they shall be heard for their much speaking,” and I have just been reading over by a time-piece, in a deliberate manner, the two longest prayers I find in Scripture—that of the Saviour, recorded in the 17th chapter of John’s gospel, and the prayer of Solomon at the dedication of the first temple at Jerusalem. The former I make to be not

quite three minutes long, and the latter nearly five minutes.—The latter prayer, however, was pronounced at a very extraordinary and august juncture in the history of the church, and is scarcely a fair guide for a worshipping assembly, congregated on an ordinary occasion. But testing the long prayers of some of our ministers by these standards, how wide a departure do they evince, not merely from the positive teachings, but also from the most luminous examples of Scripture.

If any thing further were needed, to prove the impropriety of long prayers in public worship, we might very safely refer to their practical effects. Their operation on a mixed assembly may be pronounced absolutely disastrous. The pious will strive to follow the prayer as far as they can, but their frail human nature will at last tire, and the wandering thought intrude—leaving, when the prayer is ended, a distressing consciousness of want of preparation for the discourse which is to follow. The worldlying is simply vexed and disgusted, and he secretly resolves that he will not be again entrapped in a like dilemma. I recollect distinctly noticing, for several successive Sabbaths, a little squad of worldly-minded men, remaining outside a certain church door, during the first exercises of the morning service, and coming in just before the sermon;—and I had good reason to believe that they were staying out to avoid hearing the minister's long prayer. I have remarked further, (the minister not having yet corrected this habit,) that some of these persons have almost altogether abandoned that church, whilst the others very seldom frequent it. Indeed, a pastor can take no surer method to secure himself a select and regularly thin congregation, than to indulge himself in tedious prayers and long sermons. There being so obvious a connection between cause and effect in this matter, it is astonishing that ministers who generally are, and ought to be, desirous of preaching to large congregations, should adopt the very surest means of disappointing themselves.

Should it be urged here, that we are not bound to accommodate our worship to meet the taste and indifference of worldly-minded and impenitent men, I would answer, as—uredly not—when such complaisance involves any violation of any the least important precept of the Gospel. But when gain-saying sinners are tempted to absent themselves from the

house of God, by your deliberate disregard of the plain teachings of Him whom you profess to follow and to preach, are you guiltless, O man! when you thus violate His positive injunctions at such fearful risk as the jeopardizing the salvation of those who ought to sit at your feet and be won by your teachings to the obedience of the life of faith? If Paul conformed in things non-essential to the prejudices of others, to such extent that he could say, "I am made all things to all men, that I might by all means save some," surely we need not fear any undue compliance in a case where Christ expressly teaches—illustrated as that teaching is, by the dictates of common sense and propriety, and the clearest indications of expediency.

But the exercises of prayer and praise are "the more important parts of public worship;"—so saith our Directory for the worship of Almighty God. This, however, does not prove that they are to be protracted so as to defeat their very end and object. It is the emotion, not the words of a prayer, which constitutes it an acceptable offering to the Most High; and the utterances of the full heart are always as brief as they are impassioned and eloquent. A few words spoken in humility, in the presence of, and addressed to, the Searcher of hearts, far better besit dust and ashes, than the wordy supplication which seems to imply that the Omniscient needs to be informed of our wants. The brief prayer—fervent in its aspirations—humble and awe-struck in its utterance—direct in its supplications, and its very briefness made briefer by strong emotion—oh! is not such a prayer a more worthy tribute to the great God—does not such a prayer leave a more salutary impression on an assembly who are privileged to join in it, and constitute a better preparative for the discourse which is to follow, than the long-drawn supplication, two-thirds of which are argumentative and explanatory, and which seems to be meant rather to impress the human auditor, than to reach the ear of the Most High?

The above remarks are intended to apply only to the worship of the Sanctuary. No such restrictions need be imposed upon the devotions of the closet. *There*, doubtless, the ear of the Sleepless One is not wearied with the sincere, albeit protracted, supplications of the contrite and the humble—far removed as is *that* altar from all the appliances of pharisaism,

and consecrated as it is by the holiest communings of the spirit of man with that gracious Spirit who is at once the Inspirer and the Object of all acceptable prayer. D.

Selected.

THE ELECTION OF INFANTS.

ANOTHER article of our belief, which seems to have provoked the displeasure of our opponents in a high degree, is THE ELECTION OF INFANTS DYING IN INFANCY. A passage in the tenth chapter of our Confession of Faith, on this subject, has furnished them with a fruitful theme of declamation, which they have not failed diligently to improve. The chapter referred to is designed to explain the subject of "effectual calling," and as infants cannot be called by the external ministrations of the word, the question naturally arises, In what manner, consistent with God's method of mercy, can infants be saved? This is answered in Section 3d, as follows: "Elect infants, dying in infancy, are regenerated and saved by Christ, through the Spirit, who worketh when and where and how he pleaseth." From this passage, our opponents argue thus, "If some who die in infancy are elect, others dying in infancy are reprobate." So, according to these good brethren, when John, in his 2d Epistle, addressing "the elect lady," speaks of her "elect sister," it follows that she must have had a *reprobate* sister also! I need scarcely inform you that the word *elect*, when used in Scripture with reference to salvation, does not signify chosen out of a *class* or *age*, but out of the general mass of mankind. Thus the "elect sister" mentioned, was not chosen with reference to a particular family, but out of the fallen race of Adam. In this scriptural sense the term is uniformly employed in our Confession. When infants are styled *elect*, its obvious meaning is that they are elected *out* of the mass of human beings, and this is in perfect accordance with the opinion of Presbyterians, that all who die in infancy are elect unto salvation.

And where will our opponents place infants in a future world, if they are not "God's elect?" Christ assures us that

at the last day he will "send forth his angels and gather his *elect* from the four winds."—Math. 24: 31. Will he also gather the *non-elect* into his kingdom? Deny the election of infants, and you must necessarily exclude them from the happiness of heaven. On the other hand, if our opponents, in order to escape so dreadful a conclusion, assert the election of infants to salvation, then they establish the doctrine of sovereign, unconditional election in all its length and breadth, and their own favorite scheme is overthrown and demolished. For if infants are chosen to eternal life, it cannot be for foreseen faith, or works, or any other goodness in the creature; but God must have chosen them "according to the counsel of his own will," and influenced only by his own spontaneous mercy. And then the question forces itself upon our good brethren, Why is one selected and taken to heaven in infancy, before it has been stained with actual transgression, and another, born on the same day suffered to grow up in impenitence, become polluted with crime and sink to hell under a load of guilt? This is *discriminating* mercy displayed in its utmost extent, but it is what our opponents style "partiality and arbitrary injustice." And the extreme difficulties to which they are reduced by this doctrine, forcibly reminds us of the dilemma into which the Jewish priests and elders were thrown, when our Saviour asked them the question, whether the baptism of John was "from heaven or of men."—Luke 20: 3—7. "And they reasoned with themselves, saying, If we shall say, from heaven; he will say, Why then believed ye him not? But if we say, of men; all the people will stone us: for they be persuaded that John was a prophet. And they answered, that they could not tell whence it was." The opponents of Calvinism perceive that if they admit infants dying in infancy to be "elect unto salvation;" they must admit that one-fourth part at least of the human race are saved by sovereign, gratuitous election, and then the very foundation of their whole system is destroyed. On the other hand, if they deny the election of infants, they arouse against it the strongest feelings of humanity; since they close the gates of glory against all who depart in infancy. They therefore pretty generally try to evade this question. They answer, "We cannot tell."

The Rev. Dr. Smyth, of Charleston, S. C., in his recent

work on the salvation of infants, has shown that the advocates of what is called Calvinism, were the first who threw any clear light on the future state of infants, and placed their salvation on tenable grounds. The doctrines of grace which they taught, dissolved the supposed connection between baptism and salvation. The system of Calvin, more than that of any other Reformer, made special provision for the salvation of those dying in infancy, whether baptized or unbaptized. In his Institutes, Book IV, Ch. 16, Sec. 31, he represents an opponent of this doctrine as arguing, "That all who do not believe on Christ remain in spiritual death, and that the wrath of God abideth on them: (John 3: 35,) and that infants therefore who are incapable of believing, must remain in their own condemnation." To this, says Calvin, "I answer that Christ is not speaking of the general guilt in which all the descendants of Adam are involved, but only threatening the despisers of the gospel, who proudly and obstinately reject the grace that is offered them: and this has nothing to do with infants. I likewise oppose a contrary argument; all those whom Christ blesses are exempted from the curse of Adam and the wrath of God. And as it is known that infants were blessed by him, it follows that they are exempted from death." See also B. IV, Ch. 16, Sec. 17, and Ch. 15, Sec. 20.

Compare these liberal sentiments of Calvin with the contractedness of others who have embraced an opposite system. The great founder of Methodism, so far from admitting the salvation of all who die in infancy, presents the danger of their damnation as a principal argument for their baptism. In his treatise on *Infant Baptism*, published by the General Conference, in their volume of *Doctrinal Tracts*, he says: "If infants are guilty of original sin, then they are proper subjects of baptism; seeing in the ordinary way *they cannot be saved unless this be washed away by baptism*. It has already been proved that this original stain cleaves to every child of man; and that hereby they are children of wrath, and *liable to eternal damnation*."—Page 251. In another part of the same treatise, in summing up his arguments, Mr. Wesley repeats that "outward baptism is generally, in an ordinary way necessary to salvation," that "infants may be saved as well as adults;" and he urges that "we ought not to neglect any means of saving

them.”—Page 259. Here then is “the horrible doctrine of infant damnation” clearly avowed. Infants, according to Wesley, cannot *ordinarily* be saved, unless their original stain be washed away by baptism! Of course, if this be true, those who die without baptism must *ordinarily* suffer “eternal damnation.” What narrow views of the free grace of God through Jesus Christ!—*Divine Sovereignty*, by A. G. Fairchild, D. D.

We have received from the Rev. Wm. Potter the following circular, which we publish that the ministers and churches of our Synod may know in due time that he is not to visit our churches this summer. We most earnestly hope that, though the agent of the A. B. C. F. Missions, will not be with us, every minister will lay the missionary cause before his people, and that there will be no falling off in our contributions.—EDS.

Circular.

COLUMBIA, June 1, 1847.

DEAR BROTHER:—I shall not be able to visit the churches in the Synod of Tennessee this summer, and must, therefore, request you to present the object of Foreign Missions to your people at the proper season. I am persuaded you will cheerfully do it, and the people will in the same good way respond to the call. There has never been more encouragement, or greater need to labor in this blessed work than at present.—“The fields are white for the harvest.” The heathen in many places are imploring us to send them the Gospel. A large number of young men are preparing for the foreign service. One thing is lacking. *The means of sustaining the laborers.* The receipts of our Board are falling short! Thirty thousand dollars less than this time last year! Our hope, under God, is in the church to whom he has committed this glorious cause. Will you not do all you can for us, or rather for the Master?

The collections may be sent to me here, or to Mr. C. Wallace, Knoxville, or to the Treasurer of the Board, Henry Hill, Esq., Boston, Mass. I should be glad to know the amount.

Respectfully yours,

WM. POTTER, *Agent,*
For Foreign Missions.

BLOUNTVILLE, April 16th, 1847.

To the Editors of the Calvinistic Magazine:

GENTLEMEN:—Acting as Agent for the American Bible Society in East Tennessee and its mountainous vicinity, I am anxious that every family within this field shall be furnished with a copy of the Holy Scriptures as soon as possible. This will require at least *forty thousand*. How is this supply to be obtained, and how distributed among these “everlasting hills?” Not by inventing new projects, or making new experiments, but by carrying out the long-tried and successful purposes and plans of the parent Society. With these you are familiar.

First.—By uniting the friends of the Bible everywhere in the great work.

Many years may pass away before the various branches of Christ’s church shall form such a “holy alliance” on either “doctrinal” or “ecclesiastical basis” as will secure unity of effort in all things; but, the “unity of the Spirit in the bonds of peace,” and united effort in the Bible cause may exist amid diversified denominational peculiarities.

The Romish priesthood oppose the circulation of the Bible, because the Bible is opposed to them. But Protestants are better taught. With us the word of God is the “only and all-sufficient rule of faith and practice,” and consistency requires that our zeal for this word should be commensurate with our confidence in its blessed truths, and in the accordance of our principles, severally, with those truths. Just in so far as any one man may consider his cherished views of religion sustained by the Bible, in opposition to those of others, so far should his endeavors go, beyond those of others, to circulate the Holy Scriptures. On this ground we may all unite our influence and contributions in support of the American Bible Society.

The same considerations will bear on that portion of the community who have not attached themselves to any branch of the church. All intelligent persons, whose opinions have not been swayed by prejudice or passion, must be satisfied that the circulation of the Holy Scriptures among the people at large, is of vast importance. Its influence is noiseless, but balmy as the dews, and sacred as the charms of a mother’s love. Its conservative power is realized in governing the

family and the school—in the Court-House and in the Legislative hall. It creates a strong current of opposition to intemperance of every kind, and thus lessens the amount of crime. It stimulates to productive industry, and thus becomes a source of revenue to the country as well as of domestic comfort. The Bible is the only book that can be relied on with confidence to prepare all classes of men for exercising with safety to the country the high functions of self-government. We must be an intelligent and virtuous people, or soon be governed by a despotism. The surest preventive is the BIBLE. The Bible cause, therefore, is the cause of the church—the cause of our common country.

I shall beg permission to say something more in its favor in your next No. Meantime allow me to acknowledge the receipt of the following sums for the Bible Society, since my last acknowledgement in the Methodist Episcopalian:

1847, Feb. 16,	Tuscumbia Ala.,	\$20.00	Lagrange Ala.,	\$18.50
“ “ 17,	Judge Wood, of Florence,	1.00	Decatur Ala.,	20.00
“ “ 19,	Somerville Ala.,	6.50	New Market Ala.,	13.00
“ “ 20,	Hazel Green Ala.,	11.60	Mooresville Ala.,	5.00
“ March 8,	Athens Ala.,	16.44	Tellico Plains Ten.	15.00
“ April 13,	Rogersville Ten.,	18.00	Wm. Alexander,	1.00
“ “ 14,	Kingsport Ten.,	24.05	Blountville Ten.,	5.65

The above amounts, except that from Tellico Plains and Kingsport, were donations to the Auxiliaries severally where collections were made.

My trip to Alabama was made during the high waters there, in consequence of which I could not visit some places near the river. Monies were collected in Huntsville and other places, which were not paid over to me. The same has been the case in most of the towns in E. Tennessee. It is my duty to collect funds,—but this is not my only work. New Societies have to be formed, and old ones stirred up. It is my duty also, to “superintend the distribution of Bibles.” This is a difficult work. The cause is looking up in most parts of the field, and, by the aid of the friends of the good cause, much will be accomplished during the present year.

Yours, very respectfully,

THOS. STRINGFIELD,

Agent A. B. S.

Admission of Proselytes into the M. E. Church.

IN the April No. of our Magazine, we published "Methodism as it is," by "A Reformer." In that article the author says that in the Methodist Episcopal and Methodist Protestant churches, proselytes from other churches are required to undergo the same trial as the sinner, before they can be confirmed as members of their church. Upon this point the Junior Editor states, in a note, that he believes "A Reformer" is mistaken as to the admission of members from other churches into the Methodist Protestant church," but that "what the writer says, is all that he knows about the practice of the *Methodist Episcopal church* as to the reception of members from other denominations."

In commenting upon this article, the Editor of the Methodist Episcopalian *tries* to be quite severe upon "A Reformer" and the "Junior Editor" for the remarks just noticed. This Editor *denies* that the Methodist Episcopal church receives proselytes from other churches into their church *on trial*, the same as sinners. *The next* No. of this paper disproves the Editor's assertion. In that, Mr. Ekin says that he received some *Presbyterians* into the Methodist Episcopal church *on trial*. They were *Presbyterians*, and he took them into his church *on trial*, the same as if they were sinners. We give the following extracts of a letter from "A Reformer."—Eds.

"Lest you should be overmuch frightened by the anathema of Bro. Patton, hurled at your "Junior" head, in the 51st No. of the Episcopalian, because you had not *known* what I said in relation to the reception of proselytes into his church to be untrue, I have concluded to address you this, lest, further, you may not have seen a sight which I have since seen. It is contained in the next No. (the 52d) of the Episcopalian, and completely exonerates the Reformer from falsehood, and you from invincible "ignorance." In the letter of George Ekin (generally called Akin) of that No., we find the following boast of his success on the *Abingdon* circuit for the year 1846, to wit: "I also during that year (1846) formed and organized ten or twelve Sabbath Schools, and received into the church

On trial, 285 members: some of them, too, were Presbyterians."

The Reformer did not attempt to speak of Methodism as it *was* in the book, but as it *is* in this general community. He spake that which he *knew* and testified that which he had *seen*. And may I not ask which has the better right to complain of your "ignorance," Bro. Patton or the Reformer?—Bro. P. because you did not know that to be *false* which was *true*, or the Reformer, because you did not know that to be *true* which was *true*—especially as the evidence of its truth had been transpiring in the Abingdon circuit in 1846?

I design, at a convenient time, writing another article on the same subject as the first, but I should like for you, in justice to me and yourself, to set this point right in an early No. of the Magazine.

I am by no means satisfied that the *practice* of the Protestant Methodists is any more in accordance with their discipline than that of the E. M. is in accordance with their "C. M. vol. 2, p. 98." I asked the Protestant class-leader at ———, the other day, how he confirmed seekers in his church. He replied, "By asking them if they were satisfied with the church and wished to stay in it." Do you ask them if they have religion! "*Not generally,*" he replied. That is too hard a question, I replied. He said their church beyond the mountain (meaning the Blue Ridge) did not confirm without religion. I suppose they only ask them the *hard question* here when they have previous evidence that they profess religion. If this question was asked the sinner it might scare him back.

I see, also, that a writer in the Christian Observer, who is attempting some strictures on Mr. Ross, denied in his preliminary article that the E. M. confirmed seekers without a previous profession of religion; and quotes the Discipline for it. But Mr. Patton has not dared to deny it, though he would wish the people to believe it false. The Methodists in this section all admit the charge to be true, and if they would not, I am prepared to prove it to be true. This is the great point in this controversy, and if you will take the trouble to quote Mr. Ekin in confirmation of my charge in relation to proselytes, be so good as to designate this as the great question, and challenge from Mr. Patton an admission or denial of it. For,

their transmountain practice and their oracle-like Discipline to the contrary notwithstanding, I can *certify* the truth of what I say. They 'fear the people' too much to risk such a denial."

From the Methodist Protestant.

The New York Difficulties.

It seems that our brethren of the Methodist Episcopal church are sorely pressed at this time, not only with the "border difficulties," but with much local strife. The case of Mr. Maffit has caused no little contention. We sincerely hope that both parties may do as little injury to the cause of religion as may be; but we deplore such exhibitions of trouble and dissent, as entirely opposed to the spread of gospel truth and brotherly love.

The New-York Express in an article in relation to the trial of Rev. J. C. Green, of the Centenary Church, Brooklyn, under a charge of "mal-administration," in receiving Rev. J. N. Maffit into the Methodist Episcopal Church while charges were hanging over him"—says:

"Unlike congregationalism, where the government is emphatically a government of the laity, Methodism is a government of the clergy—and from the decision of a Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, it is assumed there is no appeal."

Here is seen at once that oppressive and odious feature of the government of the M. E. Church against which we have long since protested. It cannot be that so large and influential a body as the Meth. Episcopal Church has become in this country, shall submit that its interests, so varied in their character, are to be forever confided exclusively to the decisions of the clergy. It is in the times of difficulty that men are brought to feel the oppressiveness of such governments; and it is only necessary, in this age, that they should feel them, that the oppression shall meet with prompt and effectual resistance.

From the statements of the Express we farther learn that:

"The Conference were engaged principally, to-day, in listening to the testimony on both sides, which being concluded, Dr. Peck rose and, on the part of the prosecution, spoke for nearly two hours, and was listened to with breathless attention.

The question to be decided, he said, was the most important that had ever come up in the history of Methodism, so far as his knowledge extended. It was the question: Shall a minister control his own pulpit? Or shall the stewards and trustees of his church control it, and say who shall or who shall not preach in it? He contended that if the Conf. exonerated Mr. Green, it would be an admission that a Methodist must bow to his people—to his official men—and not they to him. It would be as good to say to a Methodist preacher: Consult the wishes of your church officers, and not your Bishop. It would be to establish the principle that when a Bishop appointed a preacher to any given church, they might, if they did not happen to like him, say to the Bishop, we won't have him; and say to the preacher sent, go back, sir, we do not like you; we do not wish you; take your seat on the pulpit steps."

Here again are the people arrayed against the clergy. The interests and powers of the two, are made antipodes. The *people must be ground to the earth*, if the preachers see fit so to oppress them, and upon the slightest show of resistance for the sake of right and justice, Dr. Peck very indignantly asks—if it has come to this, that a Methodist preacher must sometimes "bow to his people—to his official men—and not they to him?" Verily this is an important query. It is one that the people, depend upon it, will begin to look full in the face.

We said, a few weeks ago, that decomposition was commenced in the body politic of the Methodist Episcopal church. The proofs of this assertion are every day augmented. From the New York Post we learn—

"That the Centenary Methodist Episcopal Church, in Brooklyn, of which the Rev. John C. Greene was pastor the past year, and who has been suspended by the New York Conference for one year, on account of mal-administration in reference to Rev. John N. Maffit, called a joint meeting of the board of trustees, stewards, and the male members of the church this morning and organized themselves into an independent Methodist Church. They have called their recent pastor, Rev. John C. Greene, and he has accepted the call."

FURTHER SIGNS OF DECOMPOSITION.—The N. Y. Annual Conference of the M. Episcopal church closed its labors in the city of New York on Thursday morning. It appears from the reports of the ministry, that there was a decrease of more than two thousand members during the last year within the bounds of the Conference.—*Methodist Protestant.*

THE
Calvinistic Magazine.

[NEW SERIES.]

‘Earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints.’

Vol. II.

August, 1847.

No. 8.

The Omniscience of God.

—
BY THE REV. STEPHEN TAYLOR.

—
(Concluded from page 206.)

UPON these points there has rarely been a difference of opinion entertained or expressed. But Dr. Adam Clark has advanced views, (see his commentary, remarks at the end of Acts 2,) which, on account of the various learning and extensive reputation of their author, deserve a passing notice and respectful examination. A few sentences in his own language, will exhibit fairly the substance of his argument.

“As God’s omnipotence implies his power to do all things, so God’s omniscience implies his power to know all things.”
“It does not follow that because God can do all things, therefore he must do all things. God is omniscient and can know all things;—but does it follow from this that he must know all things? Is he not as free in the volitions of his wisdom as in the volitions of his power?”

This language must, at first, sound strange in the ears of most readers of the word of God, and with reason, for

1. The notion that God can foreknow all things, but does not choose to foreknow them all, and does not foreknow all things, is wholly, root and branch, unscriptural. When we are told that he is almighty, we understand by this word that he is able to do all things—all things possible or not involving an absurdity. No one in his senses ever understood this to affirm that he has actually done all things. Nor is it any where in the Bible affirmed that he will do all things which he is able to do.

But when we are told that he knoweth all things, we do not understand this as declaring his ability to know, but the extent of his actual knowledge. And here we affirm, without fear of being convicted of error, that there is not a single passage in the Bible which teaches any thing about God's ability or power to know any thing which he does not now know, and has not from eternity known. Had Dr. Clark attempted to fortify his position by an appeal to the Scriptures, he would have found himself destitute of a single text which could be of avail to his purpose. It is remarkable that he quotes no Scripture; and his whole argument is founded upon a meaning of the word omniscience, which is sustained by no etymology nor lexicography under the whole heavens. "To the law and to the testimony." "Search the Scriptures."

2. This doctrine is absurd; for in order to make a wise choice, between what he will foreknow and what he will not, he must first foreknow all future events. His own acts must be determined by the issue of those contingent events which he does not choose to foreknow. But this involves a double absurdity.

1. He must be continually forming new plans, and performing unpremeditated works to meet the results of contingencies which he did not foreknow, and

2. As events are linked together in the wise arrangement of God, and single events often give rise to a long train of successive events which are his works, (Gen. 45: 5—7,) it must follow that so far from its being the fact that "known unto God are all his works from the beginning of creation," very few indeed of his works can be known to him. Most of his works and doings must remain to be determined by the issue of contingencies which he did not choose to foreknow. Suppose that he did not choose to foreknow whether Adam would transgress. What could he have known of the succeeding events of our world? Suppose that he had chosen not to foreknow that Cain would slay his brother Abel? What could he have known of the state of the arts and morals of the antediluvian world, which was evidently the consequence of Cain's going off into a separate place of abode, and raising up an ungodly and worldly community? And if we were able to trace out the connection of events, the same difficulty would be found

with respect to every event, whether great or small, in our world. Suppose that he did not choose to foreknow that a poor man would lend an old torn book to the father of Richard Baxter, or that the book would be instrumental of young Richard's conversion, what would he have foreknown of all those consequences which have resulted and will result, in time and eternity, through the chain embracing these links—Richard Baxter, Doddridge, Wilberforce, Leigh Richmond?

3. The doctrine of Dr. Clark does not in the least relieve Theology of the difficulties it was intended to remove. His object was to evade the consequences of the universal and perfect foreknowledge of God, in relation to his eternal purpose and predestination, and man's free agency. Granting that there are some things which God does not choose to foreknow—what things are they? Not, surely, whether the starry hosts to which he had given his ordinances would continue to move in obedience to them? Not, surely, whether the earth would continue to exist and be inhabited, after he had promised that the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head—cursed it for man's sake—set his bow in the cloud—promised seed-time and harvest—foretold the rise and fall of empires—forewarned the church of the great apostacy, and promised its enlargement and triumph in the world? The grand arrangements and succession of events in the physical world must have been foreknown.

What things are they, then, which God does not choose to foreknow? Doubtless, the supposition must be, that they are the moral actions of his creatures, under the notion, that if he knows certainly what they will do, in the circumstances in which in his providence he shall place them, there must be some constraint imposed upon them, to force them into the fulfilment of his unerring prescience.

But beyond all question he has, in numerous instances, foreknown and foretold the actions, both good and bad, of those who, notwithstanding were free, and dealt with according to their character as determined by these actions. It would be a waste of time to prove this to those who have the Bible in their hands, and are accustomed to read it. As an instance in which the actions of an individual were foretold more than 200 years before, let me refer to 1 Kings, 13: 1—6, compared

with 2 Kings, 23,—and Peter's fall, hours before it occurred,—of a definite number, as in the case of Joseph's brethren, Gen. 27: 5—11, compared with chap. 42—46,—of Cyrus and Nebuchadnezzur, and others.

Of more general prophecies, let the prophecies which foretold the coming of our Saviour, and the treatment which he should receive, be attentively considered, and the conclusion will come home to the heart, that the thoughts, feelings, and actions of all moral beings are as distinctly and certainly foreknown to God, as their present or past character and doings. If he can foreknow and arrange one act of one mortal being, without infringing upon his free agency and proper accountability, he can foreknow and arrange all the acts of all moral beings without in the least relieving them from the burden of their responsibility. Dr. Clark's theory of Divine foreknowledge is not only gratuitous, but futile.

Having, as we believe, proved satisfactorily,

1. That the knowledge of God is perfect;
2. That it is infinite, embracing a perfect knowledge or understanding of all things, present, past, and future, there is one other point properly embraced under the second general head, to which I would now briefly invite the attention of the reader, which is, that *the searching of the heart* is the *peculiar prerogative* of God.

1. This is proved by the general ascriptions of this power to God which we find in the Scriptures, and which, from the manner in which they are introduced, prove it to be as much his peculiar glory, as his wisdom, power or goodness. 1 Sam. 16: 7—"For the Lord seeth not as man seeth; for man looketh on the outward appearance, but the Lord looketh on the heart." Jer. 20: 12—"O Lord of hosts, thou seest the reins and the heart."

2. It is expressly declared—1 Kings, 8: 39—"Thou only knowest the hearts of all men."

3. It is a power nowhere ascribed to any other being. It is sufficient to make this assertion until some proof to the contrary shall be brought forward.

This doctrine, with respect to the knowledge of God, has a direct practical importance.

1. In reference to the divinity of our Saviour. I need not

remind the reader of the particular passages in which it is declared that he knew what was in the hearts of men. I need not point out the numerous instances in which, knowing exactly the thoughts of those who surrounded him, he addressed his discourse to them before they had expressed them, and answered their questions before they had asked them.

What ought to have been the unhesitating inference with respect to his character in the mind of a Jew, and especially of the Scribes, Lawyers, and Rabbis, stored as it was with the knowledge of the Old Testament? They could not have been ignorant that he was herein exercising and taking to himself the glory of one of the peculiar and inalienable attributes of Jehovah? And how can the Arian, the Socinian, and the Humanitarian evade the force of the argument derived from this fact, that the Word which was made flesh and dwelt among us, was God? Well has it been remarked, that if Jesus Christ be not God, and a proper object of divine worship, no book which has ever been composed is so well adapted to promote idolatry as the New Testament. We see here, in him, a divine qualification to act as our Mediator, Intercessor and final Judge.

2. The doctrine that the searching of hearts is the peculiar prerogative of Jehovah, is practically important in its bearing upon the opinion, by no means uncommon, that Satan has the power of knowing and revealing the thoughts of men. No such power is ascribed to him in the Bible, nor is there an instance in which he exercised it. In the case of Job, he certainly was mistaken, as the issue of his trials proved. That he has the power of suggesting thoughts, and so, of putting things into their minds, and of diverting their attention and affecting their hearts, will not be disputed by any candid reader of the Bible. Matt. 13: 19; John, 13: 2; Acts, 5: 3; 2 Cor. 4: 4; Eph. 4: 18.

This great truth of the Bible, in connection with that of the knowledge of the future, being the peculiar attribute and prerogative of God, stigmatizes as impious and supremely blasphemous all pretensions of men to know, by any direct insight, the thoughts, and reveal the feelings of men, or foretell except by well-authenticated inspiration, their future destinies. And when fortune-tellers, jugglers, and mesmerizers, profess

to do this, we are bound by our professed subjection to the authority of the Bible, to stand aloof and bear our testimony against their heaven-insulting profanity. When will "Witchcraft," (Gal. 5: 20,) considered as a superstitious propensity of the heart, the working of the flesh, cease to be unblushingly acknowledged, even by professing christians? When will the visible church, by a simple yet unwavering faith in the word of God, which endureth forever, be steadfast and immovable?

In fine, let this whole subject impress our minds with exalted conceptions of the character and government of the God whom we worship.

"The Lord is a God of knowledge." "He is perfect in knowledge." "His understanding is infinite." The wide range of immensity in space, and eternity in duration, is embraced in the field of his chrystal vision. All things now in the hearts of men are naked and open to him. But there is nothing new, nothing unexpected to him. He knows that we are intelligent, moral, and justly accountable beings, and to deal with us as such, is his present and eternal purpose. His present, perfect understanding, enables him to do all things wisely. But he sees no reasons for doing any thing to-day, which were not from eternity equally distinct before his mind; and why should we object to his eternal purpose, when he never purposed to do any thing which is not wise, and holy, and just, and good? His eternal foreknowledge and purpose have nothing more to do with man's free agency and proper accountability, than his present knowledge and purpose. He is not now ordaining, nor has he fore-ordained, any scheme which interferes with his own justice and goodness, or our responsibility.

Let not the finite creature dare to rob him of any of his attributes. Let him not limit the Holy One of Israel. Submit to his authority. Obey his commands. Worship him with fear. Believe his word. Trust in his exceeding great and precious promises—apply without delay to the blood of Christ for cleansing, for the heart-searching God with whom you have to do, is of purer eyes than to behold iniquity.

Selected.
DR. CHALMERS.

The New York Observer contains the following interesting account of the life and death of the great divine for whose decease the whole christian world is now in mourning. We feel that we cannot better fill a portion of our pages than by giving our readers the entire article of the Observer.

The Death and Life of Dr. Chalmers.

We had just sent our last week's paper to press when the intelligence reached us by Telegraph, that the Rev. Dr. CHALMERS was dead. We announced the fact in nearly our whole edition, but were then without any particulars of that mournful event. The Edinburgh Witness of June 1, gives the following account of the circumstances attending the decease of one whose name and talents and usefulness were the common property of the Christian world.

“DEATH OF DR. CHALMERS.

“It is with feelings to which we can give no adequate expressions, that we have to intimate to our readers the death of this super-eminently great and good man. Dr. Chalmers died at his residence at Morningside on the morning of Monday the 31st.

“The Doctor retired to rest at an early hour on Sabbath evening, in perfect health, as it appeared to his family, and to a brother clergyman who was living under his roof. Next morning, Professor Macdougall, who expected to have received a packet of papers from the Doctor, sent, at about twenty minutes before eight, to inquire if the papers had been left out. The house-keeper knocked at the door of the Doctor's bedroom, but receiving no answer, and concluding that the Doctor was asleep, sent to the Professor a reply, intimating that the papers would be sent as soon as the Doctor should awake.— Half an hour later another party called, when the house-keeper knocked as before, but still received no answer. This, taken in connection with the fact that the Doctor had not rung his bell at six o'clock for his cup of coffee, as was his wont, awa-

kened the fears of the domestics, who agreed to enter the chamber, and ascertain if all were well with their revered master. On entering, they were horror-struck on discovering that the Doctor, partly erect, partly reclining on his pillow, had fallen into the sleep of death. Not venturing themselves to communicate the mournful intelligence to the family, they went instantly to the residence of Professor Macdougall, immediately adjoining, and communicated to him the melancholy tidings. Stunned by the intelligence, the Professor hastened to the Doctor's residence, and entering his sleeping apartment, and drawing aside the bed-curtains, saw, alas! the lifeless form of one whom he had so deeply revered, and with whom he had conversed but the day before. The Doctor, it appeared, had been sitting erect when overtaken by the stroke of death, and he still retained in part that position. The massy head gently reclined on the pillow. The arms were folded peacefully on the breast. There was a slight air of oppression and heaviness on the brow, but not a wrinkle, not a trace of sorrow or pain, disturbed its smoothness. The countenance wore an attitude of deep repose. Professor Macdougall grasped the hand. It was cold as marble. Life had been absent for several hours; and the air of majesty on the countenance, greater than he had ever perceived on the living face, seemed to say, 'I am gone up.'

"No conflict had preceded dissolution. As a proof of this, we may mention that the bedclothes were gathered about his person, and had plainly not been disturbed by any struggle at the moment of departure. On the forenoon of Monday, the Doctor was to give in the Report of the College Committee to the General Assembly of the Free Church; and, in anticipation of that event, his papers and writing materials lay beside him in bed, so arranged that he might begin his work as soon as he should awake. 'Blessed is that servant whom his Lord, when he cometh, shall find so doing.'

"It was only on Friday evening that Dr. Chalmers returned from London, where he had given evidence before the Site Committee. He preached on three several Sabbaths in England, with all the fire and vehemence of his former days, and to crowded audiences, including the Prime Minister, and other influential members of the Legislature. On his way home,

he visited his sisters at Glo'ster, and in doing so fulfilled the purposes and longings which he had cherished for years. On arriving at Edinburgh, his family and friends found him, as it appeared to them, in excellent health and spirits. On Sabbath afternoon he attended public worship, in company with Dr. Cunningham, in the Free Church of Morningside. His friends observed nothing about him of an unusual kind, save perhaps that he was gentler than before,—more benevolent than before, that, in short, his temper and talk seemed more that of one already translated, than of one still walking on the earth.

“The announcement of the melancholy event made a profound impression on the members of the Assembly. They had met expecting that day to see him amongst them, but were called, alas! to listen to the mournful announcement of the Moderator, that ‘he was not, for God had taken him.’ Many of the members were in tears, and there was not one present whose feelings could be adequately expressed, save in the words with which Elisha gave vent to his sorrow, when told that his master was to be taken from his head,—‘My father, my father; the chariots of Israel and the horsemen thereof.’

“Not the Free Church only, but the whole Christian world, will deplore this loss. It is the foremost champion of Christianity who has fallen,—it is the mind that acted with the greatest power on society that has passed so unexpectedly from amongst us. To estimate the character and powers of the illustrious dead, and the service he rendered to the world, would require greater equanimity than it is possible at present to command. The manner of his death bears a striking resemblance to that of some of his illustrious predecessors,—Dr. Andrew Thompson and Dr. McCrie. These men went to the grave in the full vigor of their powers; they were cut down, as it seemed to us, in the very midst of their usefulness; and yet we must acknowledge the wisdom of that arrangement which permitted them to prosecute their labors up to the very moment of their departure, and thus made that departure nearly as conspicuous and striking as was that of the ancient prophet, who ascended in a chariot of fire, and made it speak with just as emphatic a voice to the Churches amid which they labored, and the nation in which they lived.”

The General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland was

in session at Edinburgh, and, as mentioned above, Dr. Chalmers was expected to be present on Monday morning. The following is an extract from the minutes of that day:

Monday, May 31.—Death of Dr. Chalmers.—The Assembly met to-day at a quarter past eleven.

On the Moderator taking the chair, he read for worship the 53d paraphrase, the first and the three last verses, which were sung by the Assembly and the audience under a profound sense of their application to the solemn and afflicting event which was this morning announced. Dr. Clason afterwards read the 90th Psalm.

The Moderator, who was much affected, rose and said—I believe all the brethren are aware of the event which has taken place this morning. I need not enlarge upon it. Who does not feel overpowered with a sense of the bereavement? It cannot be expressed by words, nor shall I attempt it. This is not the time—this is not the occasion. The strongest minds are overwhelmed by this great calamity; and in present circumstances, we think that the most appropriate course will be to suspend the business of the Assembly this day, and to adjourn all the cases which were to have come up before it, till to-morrow, when it will meet at twelve o'clock, to proceed with the business that is yet in dependence. I doubt not you will all concur in the propriety of this proposal.

The Clerk then read the minute of the sederunt—In respect to the calamitous event which has been just announced by the Moderator, the General Assembly resolve to adjourn, to meet in this place to-morrow at twelve.

The Moderator then pronounced the benediction, and the Assembly adjourned.

During these brief proceedings, there was not a dry eye in the House. All were profoundly affected, and many were unable to control their feelings.

At this moment the following biographical sketch of Dr. Chalmers, which we abridge from the "Genius of Scotland," by Turnbull, will be read with profound interest by thousands who have admired the genius and moral worth of the great man whose death is now deplored.

Thomas Chalmers, D. D., was born about the year 1780, in the town of Anstruther in Fifeshire. Young Chalmers gave decided indications of genius and energy, and was sent to the college of St. Andrews, and soon became "a mathematician, a natural philosopher, and though there was no regular professor of that science at St. Andrews, a chemist." After being licensed as a preacher, he officiated for sometime, as assistant minister, at Cavers in Roxburghshire. He was subsequently

called to the care of the parish church in Kilmany, beautifully situated "amid the green hills and smiling valleys" of his native country. He was ordained on the 12th of May, 1803, and soon displayed the vigor and activity of his mind. In addition to his regular parochial engagements, he devoted much attention to botany and chemistry; lectured on the latter science and kindred subjects in the neighboring towns; became an officer in a volunteer corps; assisted the late Professor Viant in teaching the mathematical class in the college of St. Andrews; on the succeeding session opened a private class of his own on the same branch of science, to which all the students flocked, and wrote one or two books, and several pamphlets on the topics of the day. His first publication appeared at Cupar in Fife, on what was termed the Leslie Controversy. It was written in the form of a letter to Professor Playfair; and abounds in talent, wit and humor. It was published anonymously, and for a long time was not known to be his. He vindicates in it very powerfully, the divines of the Church of Scotland, from the imputation of a want of mathematical talent, a reproach which he thought Professor Playfair had thrown upon them. He also wrote a volume on the resources of the country, which attracted much attention, as a work of ability and eloquence.

From these statements it must be evident that Dr. Chalmers had but little time to devote to the spiritual interests of his parish. He performed his *stated* duties, it is true, but devoted his energies chiefly to literary and scientific pursuits. Indeed he was in religious belief a rationalist, and had not yet adopted those profound and spiritual convictions which subsequently formed the main-spring of his ministry. In 1805 he offered himself as a candidate for the vacant chair of Mathematics in the University of Edinburgh, with considerable chances of success, but afterwards withdrew his name at the earnest solicitation of his friends, who wished to retain him in the Church.

When Dr. Brewster's Edinburgh Encyclopedia was projected, Dr. Chalmers was engaged as one of the contributors, and wrote the article "Christianity," which was subsequently published in a separate form. It was about this time that his mind underwent a radical change on the subject of vital religion.—He discovered the utter inefficiency of an utilitarian morality, for the renovation and guidance of man, and eagerly embraced those peculiar views of evangelical faith, which recognize the sacrifice and intercession of Christ as a ground of hope to the fallen, the necessity of "being born of the Spirit," and the ineffable beauty and blessedness of "a life hid with Christ in God." It is said that this change took place while writing the article referred to; he then felt the necessity of acting upon his own principles, of yielding his heart absolutely and for-

ever, to the truths of that Revelation; the reality and authority of which he was called to prove.

In 1815 Dr. Chalmers was translated to the Tron church of Glasgow, and here displayed all the resources of his brilliant and vigorous mind. Fired with a generous ardor for the salvation of souls, he poured the truth of God upon rapt and crowded congregations. In addition to the indefatigable performance of his ministerial duties, he embarked with eagerness in plans for the amelioration of the condition of the poor. He urged the importance of free school education, and although he had to encounter much prejudice, he accomplished a large amount of good for the city of Glasgow. His views upon this subject are developed in a large work, published at the time, on the "Christian and Civic condition of Large Towns,"—a production somewhat elaborate and diffuse, but abounding in important suggestions and earnest appeals.

In 1816 he was invited to preach before the King's Commissioner in the High Church of Edinburgh. His discourse on that occasion comprised the essence of his astronomical sermons, and was probably "as magnificent a display of eloquence as was ever heard from the pulpit." The effect upon the audience was immediate and electric. It broke upon them like a shower of light from the opening heavens. By means of this discourse his fame was perhaps first widely established. From that day crowds followed him wherever he went, and, to quote his own words, he began to feel the burden "of a popularity of stare, and pressure and animal heat."

In 1819 Dr. Chalmers removed to the new church and parish of St. John's, in which the writer, while a student at Glasgow College, had the pleasure of hearing some of his thrilling discourses. He was then in the hey-day of life, full of mental and bodily vigor, and preached with a rapidity, force, and pathos perfectly overwhelming. He continued to devote himself to the interests of the poor, and indeed took part in every plan which contemplated the welfare of society.

In 1823 he was elected Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of St. Andrews, "where he imparted a very different character to this course from the mere worldly cast which it too generally assumes in our universities." Firmly convinced of the great truths of the Gospel, he infused into his prelections the spirit of a profound and earnest godliness.—While here, he also delivered a separate course of lectures on Political Economy, as connected with the chair of Moral Philosophy.

It may be supposed from his frequent changes that Dr. Chalmers was either a fickle or ambitious man. But those best acquainted with the circumstances, feel assured that this could not possibly have been the case. He neither increased his

income nor his popularity by means of these changes, and all, we doubt not, were made with a view to greater usefulness. In one instance, certainly, he proved his disinterestedness by refusing the most wealthy living in the Church of Scotland, the west parish of Greenock, which was presented to him by the patron.

He was more than once offered an Edinburgh church, but uniformly declined it; as he had long conceived that his widest sphere of usefulness was a theological chair. He was accordingly elected to this office in the University of Edinburgh, and soon attracted the attention of a large and enthusiastic class of students. His lectures were able and brilliant, but this, in our judgment, was not the principal cause of his success. It consisted, as we believe, in his own ardor and enthusiasm, and the consequent ardor and enthusiasm which he inspired in his pupils. "At one time the object of the young men seemed to be to evade attendance on the Divinity Lecture; now the difficulty became to get a good place to hear their eloquent instructor." By this means much good was accomplished for the Church of Scotland, by diffusing amongst its ministry a true evangelical spirit. Still we believe that Dr. Chalmers' true sphere of labor was the pulpit, and that here alone he could exert his widest influence. It is true he preached occasionally while occupying the chair of Divinity, and gave a series of lectures on Church Establishments, which at that time he earnestly defended. "He considered that each established church throughout the land may be termed a centre of *emanation*, from which Christianity, with proper zeal, would be made to move by an aggressive and converting operation, on the wide mass of the people; whilst a dissenting *chapel* he views as a centre of *attraction* only for those who are religiously disposed." Recently the Doctor has found his *centre of emanation* sadly curtailed. The union of church and state has proved, even to him, a prodigious hindrance and difficulty—a proof this, that theory and practice are very different things.

It was while Professor of Theology at Edinburgh, as we believe, that he visited London, and attracted so much attention by his sermons and lectures. While there, Mr. Canning, Lord Castlereagh, Lord Eldon, the Duke of Sussex, with several branches of the Royal Family, whom, as the journals remarked, "they were not accustomed to elbow at a place of worship," were found anxiously waiting to hear this modern Chrysostom. Caught by the irresistible charm of true genius and piety, they listened with wonder and delight to his honest and earnest appeals. They felt and acknowledged that his sermons, "as far transcended those of the mawkish productions to be frequently met with, as does the genius of Milton or of Newton surpass that of the common herd of poets and philosophers."

It was a sublime sight to behold crowds of all ranks and conditions listening devoutly to the vehement exhortations of this man of God.

"Can earth afford
Such genuine state, pre-eminence so free,
As when arrayed in Christ's authority,
He from the pulpit lifts his awful hand;
Conjures, implores, and labors all he can
In resubjecting to Divine command
The stubborn spirit of rebellious man?"

WORDSWORTH.

Dr. Chalmers, as all are aware, was the principal leader of the Free Church movement. He has uniformly asserted the supremacy of Christ in his own church, and the right of the people to the election of their pastors. This being denied and withheld by the legal authorities in Scotland, Dr. Chalmers, and the noble host of ministers and churches that agreed with him, departed in a body from "the Established Kirk." In 1843 he relinquished his station as Professor of Theology in the University; and since that time has occupied the same office, in connection with "the Free Church of Scotland."

It is not our purpose in this place to say much on the subject of the published works of Dr. Chalmers. These are quite voluminous. The English edition of his works consists of twenty-five duodecimo volumes. Of these the two first volumes on *Natural Theology*, the third and fourth on the *Evidences of Christianity*, the fifth on *Moral Philosophy*, the sixth, *Commercial Discourses*, the seventh, *Astronomical Discourses*, and the last four on *Paul's Epistle to the Romans*, are the most interesting and valuable.* In style and arrangement, in logic and definition, they possess some obvious defects, but ever indicate a genius of the highest order, a heart burning with love and zeal, a conscience void of offence toward God and toward all men; and a devotion, akin to that of angels and the spirits of just men made perfect.

A missionary in the East Indies passed by a place which had fallen into decay, although it had been the supposed dwelling place of a god. Not finding the god there, he inquired what had become of him, and was told by the people that the white ants had eaten him up!—*Juv. Miss. Herald.*

*All these, with the addition of four volumes of Sermons, forming the Theological works of Dr. Chalmers, have been republished, in handsome form, by Mr. Carter of New York.

“The Great Iron Wheel.”

No. III.

BY FRED. A. ROSS.

DEDICATED—To Judges and Lawyers—in whose Ermine and Justice, and Robe of Eloquence, THE PEOPLE will find, as ever, in our land, the mind, and heart, to guard their rights, and peace.

METHODISM AND ITS MONEY.

1 PETER, 2: 5.—“*And through covetuousness, shall they, with feigned words, make merchandize of you.*”

The readers of the Calvinistic Magazine are requested in this our third number, to examine Methodism as a GREAT MONEY POWER—and, in its development to see,—that Methodist preachers have practiced a gross usurpation on the Methodist people—that they have provided for themselves a more ample support than that possessed by the ministry of any other denomination in the United States, and that they have it in their power to control the business of their people to a great and alarming extent. In view of these facts we will learn why the tendency of Methodism has ever been to swell its numbers, with or without piety;—why the ministry in that church may be sought by worldly men for the loaves and fishes in *the church*, and *in the world*;—and, finally, that Methodism, in this respect, as well as in others, is a dangerous power to the piety and peace of the community.

These are grave affirmations.—We will prove them.

I.—METHODISM IS A GREAT MONEY POWER. We mean, that there is great money power under the control of Methodist preachers. What is it? In reply, to avoid any misunderstanding and to simplify the subject, we remark, that our statements will have reference to the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States before its division. This course is proper, and cannot be objected to, because the monied concerns of the *two divisions* of the body have not been so adjusted as to afford *separate* statistics for examination;—and there is no-

thing in the new Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church *South* to conflict with the great fact to be exhibited. With this general observation, we say,

1. *That the Itinerant Preachers have secured to themselves as far as they could, the control of all the Methodist meeting houses, parsonages, &c. &c., in the United States—which are estimated to be worth not less than FOUR MILLIONS OF DOLLARS.* Let us read from the Discipline. We make our extracts from the book of the Church *South*—which agrees with the former Discipline in the places to which we shall refer, except, that the word "*South*" is used instead of "*in the United States of America*," which was the phraseology before the division. The Book reads thus:—"In order more effectually to prevent our people from contracting debts which they are not able to discharge, *it shall be the duty* of the Quarterly Conference of every circuit and station, where it is contemplated to build a house or houses of worship, *to secure* the ground or lot on which such house or houses of worship are to be built, *according to our deed of settlement*, which deed must be legally executed; and also said Quarterly Conference shall appoint a judicious committee of at least three members of our church, who shall form an estimate of the amount necessary to build; and three-fourths of the money, according to such estimate, shall be secured or subscribed *before* any such building shall be commenced."—[Discip. sec. 2: 2 par.]

"In future *we will admit no charter, deed or conveyance*, for any house of worship to be used by us, *unless it be provided* in such charter, deed, or conveyance, that the trustees of said house shall, at all times permit such ministers and preachers belonging to the Methodist Episcopal Church, as shall from time to time be duly authorized *by the General Conference* of the ministers of our church, or by the Annual Conferences, to preach and expound God's Holy Word, and to execute the discipline of the church, and to administer the sacraments therein, *according to the true meaning and purport of our deed of settlement.*"—[Dis. sec. 2: 3 par.]

Again. "Ques. 4.—What shall be done for the security of our preaching houses, and the premises belonging thereto?

Answer.—Let the following plan of a deed of settlement be brought into effect, *in all possible cases*, and as far as the laws

of the States respectively will admit of it. But each Annual Conference is authorized to make such modification in the deeds as they may find the different usages and customs of *law require* in the different States and Territories *so as to secure* the premises, firmly, by deed, and permanently to the Methodist Episcopal Church, *according* to the true intent and meaning of the following form of a deed of settlement; *any thing in the said form to the contrary notwithstanding.*”—[Dis: sec. 2, &c.]

Then follows the DEED OF SETTLEMENT, covering some six pages of the Discipline, drawn up with all the legal care of accomplished lawyers. We will extract sufficiently to establish our point. After the usual form in which the granter and trustees are named, &c.—the deed reads thus—“TO HAVE AND TO HOLD all and singular the above-mentioned and described lot or piece of land, situate, lying and being as aforesaid, together with a'l and singular the houses, woods, waters, ways, and privileges thereto belonging unto them the said [the trustees] and their successors in office, forever. IN TRUST, that they shall erect and build, or cause to be erected and built thereon, a house or place of worship for the use of the members of the Methodist Episcopal church *in the United States of America, [or South,]* according to the rules and discipline which from time to time, may be agreed upon, and adopted, *by the ministers, and preachers, at their General Conferences, in the United States of America; and in farther trust and confidence that they shall at all times, forever hereafter, permit such ministers and preachers belonging to the said church, as shall from time to time be duly authorized by the General Conferences of the ministers and preachers of the said Methodist Episcopal Church, or by the Annual Conferences authorized by the said General Conference, to preach and expound God's Holy Word therein, and in further trust and confidence, that as often as any one or more of the trustees herein before mentioned shall die, or cease to be a member or members of the said church according to the rules and discipline as aforesaid, then and in such case it shall be the duty of the stationed minister or preacher (authorized as aforesaid) who shall have the pastoral charge of the members of the said church to call a meeting of the remaining trustees as soon as conveniently may*

be: and when so met, *the said minister or preacher shall proceed to nominate* one or more persons to fill the places of him or them whose office, or offices has [or have] been vacated as aforesaid."—[Dis. sec. 2.]

There is a "N. B." at the foot of this deed of settlement, which runs thus:—"Let nine trustees be appointed for preaching houses, where proper persons can be procured; otherwise seven or five. The board of trustees of every circuit or station shall be responsible to the Quarterly meeting Conference of said circuit or station, and shall be required to present a report of its acts during the preceding year; provided that in all cases where a new board of trustees is to be created, it shall be done (except in those States and Territories where the statutes provide differently) *by the appointment of the preacher in charge, or the presiding elder of the district.*"—[Dis. sec. 2.]

Now, here is the proof, clear and absolute, brought from their Discipline, that the Methodist Itinerant Preachers have secured to themselves, as far as they could, the *control* of all the Methodist meeting houses, parsonages, &c., in the United States.

Observe.—The deed of settlement stipulates that the trustees to whom the ground is conveyed, shall build thereon a house for the use of *the members* of the Methodist Episcopal church *in the United States of America* [or South, since the division] according to the rules and discipline which from time to time may be agreed upon and adopted at their General Conferences. And the trustees shall at all times for ever hereafter permit such ministers and preachers belonging to the said church, as shall from time to time be duly *authorized by the General Conference*, or by the Annual Conferences *authorized by the said General Conference* to preach and expound God's Holy Word therein.

Observe.—This deed requires that *every vacancy* in the board of trustees shall be filled by the *nominees* of the *minister or preacher* in charge of said church.

Observe.—This deed requires that the board of trustees shall be responsible to the Quarterly Meeting Conference. But it is provided that in all cases where a new board is to be created, it shall be done [unless forbidden by some statute] by the ap-

pointment of *the preacher in charge* or the *presiding elder* of the district.

Observe.—The Methodist preachers do, in this their Discipline, *refuse absolutely to admit of any charter deed or conveyance* for any house of worship to be used by them, *unless its provisions be in accordance with the true meaning and purpose of this deed of settlement.*

Observe.—To prevent this deed of settlement from holding property embarrassed with debt, the Discipline makes it the duty of the Quarterly Conference of every circuit where it is contemplated to build a house, or houses of worship, to *secure* the ground, according to this deed, and *before* any such building shall be commenced, *three-fourths* of the money, according to the estimate, shall be secured.

What is there lacking, in all this Discipline, to render the control of the Methodist preachers over the houses, and parsonages, of the Methodist church as perfect as it could be made? Nothing. The preachers meant to secure the control, and they have done what they intended to do. Dr. Smucker, a distinguished Lutheran minister, of Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, says—“It is the concurrent opinion of the members of our bar that the property thus deeded, *belongs*, not to the *congregation*, but to the Methodist church in the United States, *represented by the General Conference*. I showed the Deed to *seven lawyers*, being all whom I could find when I had it with me, and this was their *unanimous opinion*.” Dr. S. also adds: “The principle was actually decided by *the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania*, as I am informed by a member of the bar.”

To simplify this point yet more, let it be understood,

That, if the Methodist society at Kingsport should wish to build a meeting house *they would not be allowed to do it*, UNTIL the Quarterly Conference had first *secured* the ground according to this deed—and *three-fourths* of the money secured or subscribed.

Again; let it be understood that after the society at Kingsport had built this house, under the deed of settlement, *they would* have no more right to *that house* than the members of the Methodist Episcopal church *in any other part of the United States*, [or *in any other part of the South, since the division.*] The General Conference would hold that house for *the members of the*

WHOLE CHURCH, and *not* for the members of the Kingsport congregation *exclusively*. And, the Kingsport congregation would lose that house, even if they, the very people who built it, should *unanimously* withdraw from the Methodist Episcopal church.

Again. The members of the Methodist church at Kingsport would have no control whatever over this house as to who should preach in it. They would have deeded it away *forever*—to be held by trustees, "*according to the rules and discipline which from time to time may be agreed upon and adopted by the General Conference.*"

Let it be borne in mind that this absolute control of the houses of worship in the Methodist church is possessed, *as far as possible*, in every part of the United States to the estimated amount of not less than FOUR MILLIONS OF DOLLARS. We do not assert that *every house* of worship, in which Methodists claim complete ownership, is thus held by the preachers. It is possible there are some exceptions, from the laws of certain States or Territories being in the way, or other causes. What we affirm, is, that *the preachers have, in their discipline, and in the efforts of the Conference, done all they could to obtain the control of the church property—and that they have succeeded as far as possible*. If this be denied, then let the exceptions be explicitly indicated, and the deeds of conveyance be fairly exhibited. Methodism, we know, like Romanism, will hold off its hands for a while, when it cannot grasp.

2.—*The Methodist Itinerant Preachers have secured to themselves the control of other immense funds and resources—thus:*

"The Chartered Fund" is under their control, amounting, as we learn, to some thirty thousand dollars.

"The Book Concern" is under their control. This capital exceeds six hundred thousand dollars. And the profit has been, and is, we presume, immense. The agents of the Book Concern, G. Lane, and P. P. Sanford, acknowledge in 1842—that notwithstanding the difficulties growing out of the deranged state of the currency had exceeded all former years, in which they lost on exchange alone, \$10,000, yet their profits were, even that year, \$40,000. Let it be understood that the profits of this Book Concern consist in the sale of all the books, tracts, pamphlets, and newspapers, required by the Metho-

dist Episcopal church, aside from all other sales, and that profit must be seen to be immense.

Again. All the voluntary contributions of the members of the Methodist church—whether in weekly class, or society, or quarterly, or annually—and all other quarterly or yearly collections—are under the control of the itinerant preachers.—[Dis. sec. 4 & 5.

What does the reader suppose may be the annual amount of these collections in the Methodist church? Let us try to learn something of its extent. Dr. Musgrave, pastor of the Third Presbyterian church, Baltimore, informs us in his book on Methodism, p. 194, that a respectable clergyman who had been for many years in connection with the Methodist Episcopal church in the city of Baltimore, informed him, that the weekly class-meeting contributions of the members of the church in that city would average ten cents; and the quarterly love feasts, as much for each member.

Upon these estimates Dr. Musgrave shows that the Baltimore Conference, according to the reported number in 1842, would have an income, from collections alone, of some \$6,000 per week. Now take the whole Methodist church to be according to their own estimate—one million of members—and let the voluntary contributions of that number, for all purposes, average 5 cents per week—and we have the income of the church to be two millions and a half of dollars.—Is this too much? Then take the half of it.—Is that too much? If so, then let some Methodist minister who does know give the world an approximation to the amount of the yearly collections in the Methodist Episcopal church. It will be found to be enormous. Let them give the estimate. They have been unwilling to give, and have never rendered such an estimate, as we believe.

We have now established our *First* position, that Methodism is a GREAT MONEY POWER—that the itinerant preachers have secured the control of real estate in Methodist houses, &c., estimated at some *four millions of dollars*—that they have entirely in their management other capital reckoned at over *six hundred thousand dollars*—and that they have the ordering and disposal of all collections at class meetings, love feasts, quarterly and camp meetings;—in fine, the entire income of Meth-

odism, which in aggregate sum must be prodigious, and increasing every year.

II.—*Let us now examine what we may learn from this GREAT FACT.*

(1.)—*We learn that Methodist preachers have practiced a gross usurpation in regard to the property of the Methodist people.*

In the first number of "The Great Iron Wheel," we showed how Methodist preachers had grasped *spiritual power* over the people. In the second number we disclosed the *consummation* of that spiritual power, in *the drill of the class-meeting system*. In this number we have revealed how that spiritual despotism is *fastened* upon the people by the tremendous control of money usurped by the preachers.

Who gave Methodist preachers this authority over the money of the church? Do they get this authority from the Bible? If so, will they tell us where? Did the Priests and Levites have control of the property of the Jewish church? Did Jesus Christ "have the bag, and bare what was put therein?" Did the apostles hold by "*deed of settlement*" the upper chamber in Jerusalem, and the meeting houses of christians at Antioch, Rome, Corinth, and Ephesus? No. Jesus Christ drove the money changers out of the temple with whips of cords,—Paul coveted no man's money,—he warned Timothy against those who made *gain of godliness*,—and Peter cautioned all against those "who through covetousness, with feigned words, make merchandize of us." Have Methodist preachers an example for grasping the money of the people, in the churches of the Reformation? Let them tell us. Did Luther set them the example? Did Calvin show them a "*deed of settlement*" to hold, to himself, and those he might nominate, forever, meeting houses and parsonages? Did Knox tell them how to appoint trustees to manage a chartered fund, and book concern?—and had he class leaders, to make weekly collections, from which, he, and an aristocracy of Presbyterian preachers, made provision for themselves and families? No. Luther and the Reformers never told Methodist preachers how to grasp the money of the people. But Rome has told them. The Pope has told them. Mr. Wesley has told them. Listen. It was Mr. Wesley who said—"If the Trustees will settle the Birstal-house upon the Methodist

plan, I will sign the deed with all my heart; but if they build a house for a Presbyterian meeting house, I will not, dare not have any thing to do with it.”—[Wesley’s Works, vol. 6, p. 679.] No! No! Mr. Wesley would not, dared not have any thing to do with a deed of settlement upon the *Presbyterian principle*, which gave the control of the Birstal-house to the *people who built it*. No! No! Mr. Wesley would only sign the deed if upon the *Methodist plan*—that is to say, his own plan. And what was that? Why, the plan was drawn up, he says, “by three of the most eminent lawyers in London”—and it was a “*deed of settlement*” just like the one in the Methodist Discipline, by which trustees, and their heirs and assigns forever, held the house—*that*, the said John Wesley, and such other persons, as *he* shall from time to time appoint, *at all times* during his natural life, and *no other persons*—may preach therein and expound God’s Holy Word. And after his death, that the said trustees forever, shall permit such persons to enjoy the premises for the purposes aforesaid, who shall be appointed by the Conference—*specified by name in a deed under hand and seal of said John Wesley*—provided always, that the persons preach *no other doctrine* than is contained in *Mr. Wesley’s “notes on the New Testament”* and “*four volumes of sermons.*” —[Wesley’s Works, vol. 5, pp. 233, 234.]

There! There—you have the authority by which Methodist preachers have dared to seek, and have actually secured control over the real estate of the entire Methodist church—Mr. Wesley, by deed of settlement, drawn up by three of the most eminent lawyers in London, *gave to himself*, through Trustees, the control of all the Methodist chapels in England, Scotland, and Ireland!—and at his death, to the Conference *named by himself*, FOREVER! And *that deed* of absolute usurpation by which Mr. Wesley held control over the Methodist church in Britain, is *the very “deed”* [with some alterations, making it a greater usurpation*] by which Methodist

* When Methodists are pressed with the declaration of Mr. Wesley, when speaking of his church—“*We are no republicans, and never intend to be*”—they accuse us of want of candor; and tell us that Mr. Wesley was the subject of a King, and spoke the sentiments of an Englishman! Not so fast, good sirs. The government of England, although a monarchy, is, nevertheless, *under the control of the people*. For the King does not govern. His Prime Minister governs. And he, although *appointed* by the King, is *compelled to resign*, whenever his measures are voted down in the *House*

preachers hold *the same absolute control* over the houses and parsonages, camp grounds, &c., of the Methodist church in the United States! Did the spirit of British freedom sanction Mr. Wesley's usurpation? No! Does the spirit of American liberty sustain the money power of Methodist preachers? No! The Word of God in its doctrines, precepts, and examples, is against this money power of Methodist preachers. The Reformation was to achieve deliverance from this very money power held by the Romish priests. And the blood of patriot martyrs, in England, and upon every battle field of our Revolution was shed,—to make kings, and lords, and bishops give back to the people control over their own money. And yet, in defiance of this voice from heaven, and this blood from the earth, Methodist preachers in America have dared to make themselves, by absolute usurpation of the rights of the people, a great monied aristocracy. We call upon Methodists to overturn this despotism. But if they will not hear—we then call upon the guardians of our civil and religious rights, to speak out, every where, until the people shall understand this usurpation, and arrest it.

(2.)—*The examination of the money power of Methodism proves that the Methodist preachers have provided for themselves a more ample support than that possessed by the ministry of any other denomination in the United States.*

Some wag from the Rio Grande, says, that the horses in that country, feed on air; and, that the Mexicans themselves, live on the same, with a large mixture of red-pepper. Now, gentle reader, have you not been tempted to think this

of Commons, which is a body chosen by the people. And the House of Lords has always been obliged to yield to the Commons, on all contested questions. This is the government of England. Now, was Mr. Wesley's church government modelled after that of his country? No. Had the Methodist people any power in his church? No. Mr. Wesley usurped all the power, and exercised perfect control. But, he had the delicacy, [for he had no fears.—so submissive had he made his people.] to permit his trustees of church property to fill their own vacancies. But our Methodist preachers have seemed afraid of even that hole, through which, by possibility, the people might put in their trembling hands. The preachers fill all vacancies in their trustees themselves! Once more. Suppose we excuse Mr. Wesley for saying "we are no republicans," because he lived under a monarchy—what shall we say to the Methodist preachers, living under our republic, who have set up an Episcopal despotism, MORE INTOLERABLE than the control of Mr. Wesley in England! What say you good brethren. What will be the next dodge?

must be the food of the Methodist itinerancy. When you have heard them tell of their self-denials, have you not been led to imagine that their bodies were only inflated with air, and that their rosy cheeks were just a tinge of pepper which they had eaten, merely to spice their words against Presbyterian salaries? Good reader, how you must have wondered that Presbyterian preachers could only live by bread,—and after all you had given to them, would, like Oliver Twist, “ask for more.” And how you must have been mortified to see that your preachers were still, like Pharaoh’s lean and ill-favored kine, compared with the Daniels, and Hannaniahs, of the itinerancy, fed only upon the pulse and water of Methodism.—Many a love-sick swain has thought his fair one lived upon ambrosia, and nectar. Alas! Had he seen her, just before dinner, or 11 o’clock at night in her mother’s pantry! Just so if our readers will go with us into the crib of Methodism, we will satisfy them, perfectly, that Methodist preachers have entertainment for man and horse, which cost more money than air and Mexican red-pepper.

Let us read from the Discipline:—“1. The annual allowance of the married travelling, supernumerary, and superannuated preachers, and the bishops, shall be two hundred dollars, and their travelling expenses. 2. The annual allowance of the unmarried travelling, supernumerary, and superannuated preachers, and the bishops, shall be one hundred dollars, and their travelling expenses. 3. Each child of a travelling preacher or bishop, shall be allowed sixteen dollars annually to the age of seven years, and twenty-four dollars annually from the age of seven to fourteen years; and those preachers whose *wives are dead* shall be allowed for *each child* annually a sum sufficient to pay *the board* of such child or children during the above term of years; nevertheless, this rule shall not apply to the children of preachers whose families are provided for by other means in their circuits respectively. 4. The annual allowance of the widows of travelling, superannuated, worn-out and supernumerary preachers, and the bishops, shall be one hundred dollars. 5. The *orphans* of travelling, supernumerary, superannuated, and worn-out preachers, and the bishops, shall be allowed by the annual conferences the *same sums* respectively which are allowed to the children of living preach-

ers. And on the death of a preacher leaving a child or children without so much worldly goods as should be necessary to his, her, or their support, the Annual Conference of which he was a member shall raise, in such manner as may be deemed best, a yearly sum for the *subsistence and education* of such orphan child, or children, until he, she, or they, shall have arrived at fourteen years of age; the amount of which yearly sum shall be fixed by a committee of the Conference at each session in advance. 6. The more effectually to raise the amount necessary to meet the above-mentioned allowances, *let there be made weekly class collections* in all our societies where it is practicable; and also for the support of missions and missionary schools under our care."—[Dis. Part. 2: sec. 4.]

"It is recommended, by the General Conference to the travelling preachers, to advise our friends in general to purchase a lot of ground in each circuit, and to build a preacher's house thereon, and to furnish it with, *at least, heavy furniture*, and to settle the same on trustees appointed by the Quarterly meeting Conference, *according to the deed of settlement* published in our form of Discipline. Where this cannot be done, the General Conference recommend *to rent a house* for the married preacher and his family, and that the Annual Conference assist to make up the rent of such houses, when the circuit cannot do it."—[Dis. Part. 2: sec. 5.]

"It shall be the duty of the Standing Committee—[the stewards, or one appointed for that purpose who shall be members of our church,] to make an estimate of the amount necessary to furnish FUEL AND TABLE EXPENSES for the family or families of preachers stationed with them, and the stewards shall provide, by such means as they may devise, to meet such expenses in money or otherwise: *provided* the stewards shall not appropriate the moneys collected for the regular *quarterly allowance* of the preachers to the payment of family expenses. An arrangement, adapted to his extended circuit, furnishes a house, fuel, and table expenses, for bishops and the presiding elders.—[Dis. Part 2: sec. 5.]

"Many too, are the *occasional* distresses of our preachers, or their families, which require an immediate supply, otherwise their hands would hang down, if they were not constrained to depart from the work."—[Ib.]

“It shall be the duty of each Annual Conference to take measures, from year to year, to raise moneys in every circuit and station within its bounds, for the relief of its necessitous superannuated and supernumerary ministers, widows, and orphans. And the Conference shall annually appoint a committee to estimate the several sums necessary to be allowed for the *extra* expenses of such necessitous claimants, who shall be paid in proportion to the estimates made and the moneys in hand.”—[Dis. Pa. 2: sec. 5.]

Now, here we have the *items* which constitute the salary of a Methodist preacher. Let us look at them for an itinerant with only a small family. First, let us spread out the items, and then give an estimate of the amount. You perceive the preacher is allowed, 1. So much for himself. 2. So much for his wife. 3. So much for each child of a certain age. 4. He is allowed travelling expenses. 5. He is allowed house rent. 6. He is allowed at least heavy furniture. 7. He is allowed fuel. 8. He is allowed table expenses. 9. He is allowed for many occasional distresses. Here are nine distinct specifications of support. Let us make an estimate, which we think will suit East Tennessee and Western Virginia:

Annual allowance for the preacher,	\$100
do. do. for his wife,	100
do. do. for say 2 children above 7 years of age, each \$24,	48
do. do. for say 3 children under 7. each \$16,	48
do. do. house rent and heavy furniture, estimated at	45
do. do. table expenses and fuel, estimated at	234
do. do. travelling expenses, estimated at	25

\$600

The above does not include the entertainment of the preacher and his horse while from home on his circuit, which must be at least

100

\$700

Let every reader go over the above estimate. Let him remember that the first four items are fixed by the Discipline. Then let him say whether the other four contingent items are estimated too high. Would any one of our readers say that \$45 is too much for *house rent and heavy furniture*? Or that \$234 is more than enough for the *fire wood and table expenses* of a man, his wife, and five children, living in that comfort and respectability contemplated by the Methodist Discipline,

and in which the families of the Methodist ministers do live? Or is \$25 an over estimate for travelling expenses? Or is \$100 extravagant for the entertainment of the itinerant and his horse during that part of his time absent from his family? Let every reader make the estimates for himself. Of course there will be some variation in the views of different persons and places, as to the amount which ought to be deemed right for the four last subjects of expense. That, however, is an immaterial matter. These are the items allowed in the Discipline. What then is their annual amount, upon any fair calculation? Let us assist our readers by giving them other estimates entitled to the very highest respect.

Dr. Musgrave, of the Presbyterian church, Baltimore. makes the salary of the Methodist preacher with the same family as above, and without reckoning the last item, \$664 66

Dr. Smucker—President of the Lutheran Seminary, at Gettysburg, rates the salary as above, at 693

Dr. Annan—Presbyterian minister—gives 600

Rev. R. S. Storrs, in a letter to the Home Missionary, says Methodist preachers receive in Canada, between 700 & 800

The Christian Intelligencer, of N. Y., the organ of the Prot. Dutch Reformed church gives, including the last item in our estimate, 800

"The Mutual Rights," a paper conducted by Methodist preachers, who after in vain trying to reform the M. E. church, were compelled to leave it, and become Protestant Methodists—their estimate is 747

"Tracts for the Times," No. 4—Episcopalian—calculates the Methodist preacher's salary at 700 to 800

These estimates are all made for *country circuits*. In large towns and cities, where the items of house rent, table expenses and fuel would be greatly higher, the salaries of Methodist preachers would be much more.

Dr. Musgrave informs us that a Methodist gentleman of Baltimore informed him, that the pastor of the Light Street church received \$1200, exclusive of house rent. Dr. Durbin, of the Methodist Episcopal church, [in an action for *libel* in New York, brought by Azor Hoyt, against Rev. Messrs. Waugh, Emory, Bangs, and J. Collard,] testified as follows:—"My salary is \$1250 annually—that of Mr. Bangs I think \$1500 or upwards—that of Mr. Merrill about \$1200—that of Mr. Waugh \$1600—that of Mr. Mason is, I think, over \$1000 and under \$1500." Now, if to this money salary, we are to understand

that these gentlemen received a *furnished house, rent free*, even if *table expenses* and *fuel* be included in the above sums, then the amount would swell up to a very respectable remuneration, certainly.

Observe.—There is nothing in the discipline to prohibit a Methodist preacher from having *one or more domestics* in his family. If then he has such domestics, his *table expenses* must be greater.

Observe.—There are “*many occasional distresses of the preachers and their families*”—all *extra* allowances to the above. What are these “*many occasional distresses?*” We do not know. But every body can see that these “*many occasional distresses*” give the preachers a right to the back door of the Methodist treasury, and to ask for *any thing* they may want, to prevent “*their hands from hanging down,*” and to save them from “*departing from the work.*”

We have said enough to vindicate our affirmation as to the salary of Methodist preachers. But we are not done.

Read.—You see, that if the preacher loses his wife, the *board* of his children is provided for, during the above term of years, *besides the money allowance.*

Read again.—The superannuated, and the worn-out and supernumerary preacher, has his one hundred dollars.

Read again.—The *widow* of the deceased preacher receives her one hundred dollars.

Read again.—The *orphans* of preachers shall be allowed the *same sums* respectively which are allowed to the children of living preachers. And, farther more, if the preacher dies without leaving a support for his children, the Annual Conference of which he was a member, shall raise a yearly sum for the *subsistence and education* of such orphan children, until fourteen years of age.

Read finally—that there are *extra expenses* of the necessitous superannuated, and supernumerary ministers, widows and orphans, to be provided for by each Annual Conference from year to year, by raising money in every circuit and station within its bounds.

We have now established beyond all honest denial, that Methodist preachers have made, for themselves, a *most ample support*. Whether they be unmarried, married, widowers, su-

perannuated, worn-out, or supernumerary,—and after their death for their widows and orphans. It remains to be shown, that, this support is *more ample* than that possessed by the ministry of any other denomination in the United States.

First, the Protestant Episcopalian testimony. And we give their evidence first, because that denomination is rich; and has always been considered able and willing to make suitable provision for its clergymen.

We copy from Tracts for the Times—No. 4. The writer says—"In the country the salaries vary from \$400 to \$600—rarely higher, and generally nearer the former than the latter. In many parts of the west, \$400, regularly paid, is a *very* good salary. Many are the clergymen that I have known, men of good abilities and large families, who did not receive that sum, and perhaps not \$50 of it in cash. Beyond this there are, as a general rule, but few presents and fees."—[Page 18—Methodist Episcopal church and Protestant Episcopal church compared.]

Secondly.—Dr. Smucker, who speaks for the Lutheran church, estimates, as we have shown, the salary of a Methodist preacher, his wife and five children, at \$693, without counting the support of himself and horse while on his circuit. Dr. S. then adds:—"It should be remembered that the foregoing estimates are made for a region of country where the ordinary salaries of the ministers of other denominations rate from \$400 to \$500—rarely above the latter sum, except in a few instances in large and expensive villages, and their vicinity; and *often* LESS than \$400.

Thirdly.—The Protestant Reformed Dutch church, speaking through its organ, the "Christian Intelligencer," for 1834, remarks:—"Certainly the salary of a Methodist itinerant is worth more [with the same family heretofore mentioned,] than the average salary of all the Reformed Dutch, Presbyterian, and and Congregational ministers in the United States. Certainly there are very many of these ministers who would gladly exchange their salaries for the support of Methodist Episcopal Circuit preachers—and this, too, without taking into the estimate the provision made for the superannuated, the worn-out, the supernumerary, the widows and orphans."

Fourthly.—Dr. Musgrave [Presbyterian] affirms that in

country parishes, and in the smaller towns and villages, Presbyterian salaries range, nominally from \$400 to \$500. Certain I am that that \$400 are considerably *more* than the average salary of the country pastors, settled within the bounds of the Presbytery of Baltimore.”

We need not extend these extracts. They are sufficient. Finally, we the Editors of the Calvinistic Magazine affirm that, as we believe, \$400 is more than the average *nominal* salary of *all* the ministers in the Synod of Tennessee, *including Abingdon and Knoxville.*

So much then, as to the salaries of all other evangelical denominations, compared with Methodist ministers, *in the country and small towns.* In *large towns and inferior cities* the nominal salaries of Presbyterians, and the denominations mentioned may range from \$700 to \$1000, something more or less.—[Dr. Musgrave.]

In *the principal cities* these salaries are greater. The Episcopal Tract above quoted, remarks that “a few wealthy congregations may give to an old and beloved pastor \$3000 a year, but such cases are rare. From \$1500 to \$2000 a year is perhaps a good salary in such situations.” The Presbyterian salaries, in these cities would hardly average with the Episcopalians, even leaving out the Bishops.

The sum then of the whole estimate is this:—The salaries of Methodist preachers may possibly fall a little below the average given for the Episcopalian, in the principal cities.—But it must be borne in mind, that the Methodist bishops, before the division of the church, received their salaries annually entirely from the Book Concern, before any salaries were paid to the itinerants. They were sure of their money. The book agents, &c., were a committee “to estimate the amount necessary to meet the family expenses of the bishops.” And if the bishops could make it appear that their reasonable family expenses amounted to one, two, three, or four thousand dollars per annum, there was nothing in the book of discipline to prohibit their receiving as much; for there are no limits prescribed to their salaries.—[See the Discipline before the division.]

Again;—the salaries of Methodist preachers in *large towns and inferior cities* would *exceed* that of Presbyterians, making

the proper advance upon the estimate already given for *house rent, furniture, fuel, and table expenses.*

In the *country* we have shown the Methodist salaries are *much the largest.* We have given eight different estimates of the salary of the Methodist itinerants, and the *lowest* calculation is \$600, without reckoning their support while actually riding from home—while the Episcopalian country salary is at the highest nominally, \$600, and very often under \$400—and for the Dutch Reformed, Presbyterian, and Congregational churches in the United States, the highest country salary by estimation is \$500, and the lowest under \$400. In addition to all this, let it be remembered that these Episcopal, Dutch, Presbyterian, and Congregational salaries are all fair calculations as to what actually is the average of the nominal salaries, *whether the families be ever so large.* Whereas the estimate made for the Methodist *country salary* was for a family of a *given number.* Now, if that number was *increased ever so greatly,* the salary would rise in proportion, in the items of yearly allowance, for *other children, table expenses,* and probably *house rent, and fuel,* in many cases—to say nothing of the "*many occasional distresses of our preachers and their families,* which require an *immediate supply,* otherwise their hands would hang down, if they were not compelled to depart from the work."

Now what reply will Methodist preachers make to this statement? Will they deny the allowances granted them by their book of discipline? No. They dare not. Will they deny our calculation of the items left contingent in the discipline? Very well. Our readers can, as we have said before, make those estimates for themselves. Every sensible man can satisfy himself what *house rent*—what, *at least heavy furniture*—what, *fuel and table expenses,* ought to be put at, in East Tennessee, and Western Virginia; such a man too can *guess,* if he is a Yankee, or *reckon,* if he is a Tennessean, how much the "*many occasional distresses of the preacher and his family,*" requiring "*immediate supply,*" might be worth to a Methodist preacher, who had not to ask the *supply* from *the people,* but just to *agree* with his *brother preachers* HOW MUCH TO TAKE.

But O! say the brethren, "*we don't get what the discipline allows.*" Softly, softly, good sirs. Let us not question your

love of the truth—but *First*, you, and yours, always look like Jeshurun! You are round and ruddy—your horse is fat and well groomed—your wife and children look remarkably happy—they are always genteel, and you often dress elegantly,—the blue frock coat, and frequently the Spanish cloak piled with velvet, speak for themselves. Better than all, your whole air and manner, tell us you feel the world goes well with you. There is neither thought, nor care, nor want of sleep on your faces. *Secondly*.—Disinterested and good men say, as a general fact, that you do receive your salaries. The fact that you have already raised your money allowance twice—from \$64 to \$80, and then to \$100 per annum, shows, that the allowance is *not* a *nominal sum* to be “a *standard* by which the overplus and deficiency may be regulated,” as some of you want us to think. No. Jesse Lee, one of your own men, in his history of Methodism, informs us, that you have, from time to time, raised your own salaries *as above*, by just *agreeing among yourselves*. And that you also *agreed among yourselves*, long time ago, that the old rule, whereby you were to account for all *private gifts* as part of your quarterage, should be rescinded, and that you “*might receive any presents*, and not give an account thereof.” Again:—Mr. Whiting, editor of the Religious Intelligencer, New Haven, [for 1833, p. 793,] one of the most respectable periodicals in America, offered to give the name of the minister, who had been many years in the Methodist connection—and then dismissed to join the Congregationalists, and says, “To the honor of the Methodists, I can say I always received my salary with great punctuality, and uniformly met with the utmost kindness from them.” He adds as a general remark—“That the respectable Methodist preachers do get their salaries, is a fact which we cannot doubt. I can at any time bring forward cases, in which Methodist preachers *have received the notes of the circuit stewards on interest for the balance of the salary for the year*, in cases where it has not been promptly paid.”

Will it still be said, that many Methodist preachers, especially in the West, are poorly paid? Let this be acknowledged with proper understanding of the matter. Let it be so, that many do not receive their full allowance *in money* from the collections made *on their circuit*. How then? Why, the Dis-

cipline says, when they go to the Annual Conference, that *there*, from "*the annual produce of the charter fund, as divided among the several Conferences*"—also "*the annual dividend arising from the book concern,*" added to *all the collections during the year*, which may be sent to the Conference. "*Let the various allowances agreed upon in the fourth section be MADE UP.*"—[Dis. par. 2: sec. 4.]

If it be said that, even after all this, some of the preachers do not receive the whole of their *money* allowance—what does that prove? Why it proves this—that *the Methodist treasury, immense as it is, cannot yet meet, to the full extent, every dollar that is demanded.* That is all. But, the *provision* which the preachers have made for themselves, in *house-rent, fuel, furniture, and table expenses, is* received by them, and their families, from the *fact*, hard, we think to be denied—that, *there they are*, in the land of the living, and ever ready to shout "*great is Methodism.*" Now, the starving never shout—and men never hurrah over an empty corn crib.

We remark in the close of this point, that we have no doubt, the support *actually received* by even the *unmarried* travelling preachers in Holston Conference, will favorably compare with the support actually received, from their churches, by *all the ministers, on the average, in the Synod of Tennessee*—[which extends over about the same region.] Just think. The unmarried Methodist itinerant is travelling all the time.—He is usually a healthy, and often a fine looking young man. He knows by the instinct of a traveller, and a Methodist, *where to stop.* He lives on the fat of the land. *That table is spread so well for nobody else.* Now, what is that style of entertainment worth per annum? And what the manger for his horse? Is it not better, day after day, the year round, than that of any tavern in this country? Shall we say \$1 per day, including all the services for his personal comfort? Is that too much? Then say 62 1-2 cents. He ought not to grumble at *that*, if he had to pay it. That is \$228 12 1-2. His money allowance by the Discipline, is \$100. His travelling expenses, allowed by the Discipline, we have put at \$25, equal in all to \$353 12 1-2.—Now, you may if you please, take off for lack of full allowance, or otherwise, \$53 12 1-2, and leave \$300 as the sum, which the unmarried Methodist preacher receives as his sala-

ry, to say nothing of *presents*, and the “*many occasional distresses*” which may have demanded an “*immediate supply.*” Just let it be \$300—and we affirm that he has then received a *greater salary* than is received, *on the average*, by *all* the Presbyterian ministers in the Synod of Tennessee. We feel sure these ministers do not, on the average, get \$250—many of them not \$100, *counting every thing*, and some not \$50 in money. They might starve, but for other resources, or the labor of their hands. One of these, a noble man, nearly worn-out, and bent with age, was asked whether he had said he would yield his salary for a pony? No, said he, with an amiable smile—“I said I would yield my salary for a horse, and a suit of clothes!”

And these are the Presbyterian ministers, whom Methodist preachers hold up to the people *as lazy drones living on great salaries!!* Methodist preachers—who have grasped from the people as far as they could the whole real estate of the church, valued at four millions of dollars! Methodist preachers—who have secured the control of all the other church capital, amounting to between six hundred thousand and a million of dollars! Methodist preachers—who have the control over all the weekly, quarterly, occasional, and annual collections, amounting to an enormous aggregate! Methodist preachers—who having usurped control over this great money power, in unblushing contempt of all the rights of American citizens, have then coolly sat down and *agreed, among themselves*, to GIVE TO THEMSELVES, unmarried, or married, or widowers, or superannuated, or worn-out, or supernumerary—just exactly the *best possible salaries* which could be made out of the money, *consistent* with making also, just exactly the *best possible* provision for their widows, and the support and education of their children, after death. Yes, let it never be forgotten, but ever kept in the memory—that Methodist preachers have *usurped* control over the money of the people, and do *give to themselves out of that money*, WITHOUT PERMITTING THE PEOPLE TO HAVE A VOICE IN THE MATTER, a *more ample support*, and have made more ample allowance for their families than that received by all the other ministers of the gospel in the land. Yes, these, we repeat, are the men who have gone through the whole country, bewailing the salaries of other ministers,

and calling to the world to *admire their self-denial and poverty!!*

Do we then object to the salaries of the Methodist itinerancy—and the provision made for the superannuated preacher, the widow and orphan? No! No! This would be all right, and worthy of all honor, *if the Methodist people had made it for their ministry.* But we object, and we want the whole community to cry out against *two things* in this matter. *First*, that Methodist preachers have *usurped* power over the money of their people, and out of it thus amply *paid themselves.* And *secondly*, that while they have done this, and are doing this, that, they *CONCEAL THE FACT*, and then *denounce the humble provision made for other ministers by their people.*

[N. B.—In addition to the above, let it be kept in mind, that Methodist preachers have a clear gain over all other ministers, in the fact, that they *alone* have provision for the superannuated, the worn-out, the supernumerary, and the widow and orphan.]

(3.)—*Methodist preachers have it in their power to control the business of the Methodist people to a great and alarming extent.*

Will our readers go back, and read the first "Great Iron Wheel," and refresh their minds as to the *imperial power* over the people, claimed [by Bishop Hamline] to be derived, by the General Conference from God!—then will our readers consider the second "Great Iron Wheel," and see the perfect *drill and subserviency* of the people under the action of the *class-meeting system?*—then let them ponder this article, in which we have demonstrated that the Methodist preachers have secured to themselves the control over the real estate and funds of their church to an immense extent;—after weighing all this, will our readers turn to the Discipline, chap. 1, sec. 4, and consider these words:—"It is *expected* of all who continue in these societies, *that they should continue to evidence their desire of salvation, * * * ** by doing good, especially to them that are of the household of faith, or *groaning so to be;* employing them *preferably* to others, *buying* one of another, helping each other in business; and so much the more because the world will love its own."

This would be a strange article if found in the Discipline of any denomination of christians. But when found in this

Discipline, it has a far-reaching and great meaning. It would be strange to read any where else, that a *desire for salvation* must be *evidenced* by doing good in the FORM of *employing*, or *buying* from, the household of faith, or those "*groaning to be so*," in PREFERENCE to others! But it is something more than strange—it is startling, to see this article in the Methodist Discipline—because Methodist preachers can make their people *believe what this article says*,—they can make their people *believe*, and *feel too*, that it is *expected* of them, that they *evidence* their desire for salvation by TRADING with a Methodist of the household of faith, or even one "*groaning*" to be such—[that is to say, a *seeker*,] in *preference* to others. Yes, a Methodist can be made to *feel*, he is giving *evidence of a desire for salvation by trading with a Methodist SEEKER*, in PREFERENCE to a Baptist, Episcopalian, Lutheran, or Presbyterian *christian!*—Is that possible? Yes. Rub your eyes, or put on your spectacles. Read again. Yes—there it is—no mistake. Well, is it not a fearful and far-reaching article? No wonder there are so many "*seekers*" in the Methodist church;—no wonder there are so many "*groaning*" all their lives to be of the "*household of faith*," and never get in. No wonder Bishop Jane says there are "*fifty thousand*" of them in the church over which he presides.

This article, then, may make hypocrites in the shape of those who are "*groaning*" to enter the household of faith—or in other words, those "*seekers*" of the *trade* of the Methodist church. But besides this, it is a *spiritual power* in the hands of the preachers, which can be used by them, for their *money profit*, as potently as any power wielded by Rome. These preachers, keep in mind, are making money for *themselves*, now, every day, by their chartered fund and book concern, by the sale of books, tracts, pamphlets, reviews, and newspapers over all the land. And every circuit preacher is an acting partner. Well, what is to hinder them from establishing *houses* of mercantile commerce, and trade,—*mills* of manufacture,—and *shops* of work, &c. &c., in every city, and town, and village? And what will restrain them from saying to their people, '*It is expected if you continue in our society, that you will give evidence of YOUR DESIRE OF SALVATION, by doing good, especially to us, who are of the household of faith—EM-*

PLOYING US, AND BUYING OF US IN PREFERENCE TO OTHERS!'—How long will it take Methodist preachers, to use the ghostly terrors of this article, to carry up their capital to tens of millions,—and then *pay themselves* salaries, which will look well by the side of those of the Bishop of London, and my Lord of Canterbury? The day *will come*, unless this foul usurpation of spiritual and money power, is done away. For, let it be considered, that, the Jesuits began, like the Methodists, with vows of poverty. But in time, their palaces rose, like exhalations, over the world, and their wealth, and ambition, shook thrones, and troubled nations.

(4.)—*We learn from our subject why the tendency of Methodism has ever been to swell its numbers, with, or without piety.*

We have shown, that the itinerants in the Methodist connection hold an immense real estate, and a large active capital in *trade*, by which they provide for themselves and families. And, observe, that *this trade* succeeds, *just in proportion* as they can bring *numbers* into the church—for Methodists are almost the only persons who buy their articles of trade—they only, with few exceptions, buy the Discipline, hymns, tracts, books of literature, pamphlets, reviews, newspapers, &c.—Methodists, mostly, contribute in class meetings, love feasts, and other varied calls for money. Of course, then, *NUMBERS are absolutely necessary to the success of the money operation of the preachers, WHEREBY THEY LIVE.* It is, in this sense, a *CRAFT* as truly as that of Demetrius, and the silversmiths of Ephesus. And it is as necessary to the living of Methodist preachers that men should buy their trade, and aid in contributions, as it was to Demetrius, and his craft, that men should buy the silver shrines of Diana. The number of buyers would regulate the demand and the supply in both cases. What matter was it to Demetrius and his craft, whether those who bought his shrines were sincere worshippers of Diana or not? And what matter to Methodist preachers, whether, those who buy hymn books, Disciplines, and papers, are christians or not? One who *shakes hands* with the preacher, as a *seeker*, can buy books, or contribute weekly, just as acceptably as if he was *perfect*.—What a temptation then, to strain every power of mind, and body, to secure *numbers*. Is it possible such a monied corporation can be *supremely* a spiritual body? Must we not

apply to it the text—“Ye cannot serve God and Mammon?”* We acknowledge many men of piety, and zeal for Christ, in the connection;—but can *the spirit of the body be the salvation of men?*

(5.)—*The subject before us, shows, why the ministry, in the Methodist Episcopal church may be sought by worldly men, for the loaves and fishes in the church and in the world.*

Methodist itinerants have made for themselves, substantial independence, and a comfortable provision for their families, while they live, and after they are dead. Many of them have accomplished this by getting religion at a camp meeting, and by easy trial of their *Methodism* before entering the connection. How easy a way to *win the world!* How many men, who could win the world no where else, *will go there?* How many men, will go there, when they think, not only of this easy way to provide for themselves, but when they think of the *chances* of life it opens to them. When they think, how they may travel, in comfort, and elegance, free of care, over hill and vale, in our broad land, and *choose a home from the cottage to the palace.* And, when they think, how the *stirrup of the itinerant may be a step to Congress!* We need not enlarge,—the people are beginning to understand *this* matter.

Finally—*Methodism in this aspect, as well as in others, is a dangerous power to the piety and peace of the community.*

The facts we have exhibited are startling. Methodism is a huge trading company,—its preachers have immense capital usurped from their people,—they can constrain the people to submission by title deeds they hold for all the church real estate,—and they may bind them by terrors of salvation, to *buy and sell* at their bidding. Thus they have the machinery, spiritual and temporal, to enlarge to overshadowing power their numbers and wealth. Is not this money power, held by men utterly irresponsible, dangerous to piety? Once more;—Methodism cultivates the fanaticism of human nature, and the mo-

*To illustrate the observations made under the 4th argument, we give the fact, derived from one to be trusted, who says, he found in one ride of twelve miles, six Methodist families *without the Bible*, and yet *all* had the *Hymn book*—and some also the *Discipline*. The circuit preacher, you see, *sold* all these books, *at great profit*. But he could not *encumber* his saddle-bags *with the Bible*. He makes *nothing* on Bibles. The American Bible Society furnishes these.

ney-seeking and power-loving energies of fallen man, *exactly as Rome has ever done*. Is not this church, then, dangerous to the peace of the community? Who says this? Answer.—All christian denominations in the United States *say this*. Methodist writers, themselves, have *said this*. They, themselves, have written it,—that the itinerancy *is rapidly tending to monarchy and Romanism in our country!* Shall we fear Rome? And shall we not watch Methodism? Look! Roman Catholicism may be compared to some huge Boa Constrictor serpent, which, terribly scorched by the flames of a burning forest, has dragged its bloated mass into our green fields. We gaze, and assail, in alarm, the dying folds of the monster.—But shall we cherish the young Anaconda, which has crawled from the same den? Shall we destroy Rome, and cherish Methodism?

We solemnly call upon the thinking men of our land to understand this power, and speak out against it. We call to the Pulpit, the Bench, the Bar. We call to the people. Look! You have been told that Romanism is like that wave, rolling back to the ocean. Look! it is coming again from the abyss. Methodism is heaving up another wave of death. You see it, in the distance—swelling, and glittering in light. Wake up, and all is well.

A Royal Contribution to Missions.—The King of Prussia has recently given one thousand thalers (about \$750) to the Rhenish Missionary Society, towards defraying the expense of sending its first missionaries to China. The Minister of State, Dr. Eichorn, in transmitting the donation, informed the society that he was charged by the King “to testify the lively interest which his Majesty takes in this enterprise, in behalf of which he invokes the gracious aid and the rich blessings of the Lord.” This may remind the reader of the language of Isaiah: “And kings shall be thy nursing fathers, and their queens thy nursing mothers.”—*Dayspring*.

DONATIONS.—The amount of donations and legacies received into the treasury of the A. B. C. F. Missions, during the month of May, was \$29,678 52.

THE
Calvinistic Magazine.

[NEW SERIES.]

“Earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints.”

Vol. II.

September, 1847

No. 9.

OBJECTIONS

To the doctrine of the final perseverance of the saints considered and answered, in a conversation between an Arminian and a Calvinist.

—
BY J. D. M.
—

No. II.

ARMINIAN.—I have called in, brother; according to agreement, to renew our conversation on the subject of final perseverance.

CALVINIST.—You were never more welcome, brother, and as I have an engagement with my pastor, in about an hour from this time, suppose we proceed at once to consider the other passages of Scripture to which you referred at our former meeting.

A.—There are several passages in Ezekiel; in the 3 chap. 20 verse—18 ch. 24 & 26 verses—and 33 ch. 13 & 18 verses, in all of which the prophet speaks of a righteous man turning from his righteousness and committing iniquity, and dying in his sin. These have heretofore appeared to my mind as unanswerable objections to your doctrine of final perseverance; but I now perceive how their force is greatly weakened by your method of interpretation. You would say that the prophet speaks hypothetically,—that there is no declaration in these passages that a righteous man actually turns from his righteousness, &c.; but that the prophet supposes a case, as a motive—a warning to God’s people.

C.—You will find every other passage you may quote in an objectional way equally weak, against the gracious doctrine of

final perseverance. If Ezekiel meant to represent an evangelical righteousness, and an evangelically righteous man, we can resort to the interpretation of which you have spoken, as sufficiently satisfactory. In these passages God is "simply declaring the equity of his dealings with man,—that all his ways are equal and just," and in proof of this, announces the alarming truth, that *the soul that sinneth shall die*;—that even the *righteous man*, turning from his righteousness, and not repenting when warned, (if such a case could possibly occur,) shall die in his sin:—that his righteousness shall not save him. This is indeed a vindication of the justice and equity of God's ways, and a warning to all the righteous to be watchful, lest they fall from their righteousness. Reliance on the promise of God cannot save a man without holiness;—for without holiness no man can see the Lord. Nor will reliance on the promise of God's preserving power keep a christian, if he lives in unrepented sin; for such "shall surely die." This is the belief of all sound Calvinists. But, at the same time, they believe that all who are truly regenerated, are so kept by the power of God, that they never will apostatize.

A.—Well, I do not urge these passages with much confidence. And now I see how you will explain 1 Cor. 9: 27—*"But I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection; lest that by any means when I have preached to others, I myself should be a cast-away."*

C.—And is not the explanation consistent and scriptural? Paul had no doubt of his own final salvation; for in the preceding verse he says, *"I therefore so run not as uncertainly."* He knew in whom he had believed, and that a crown awaited him in the day of the Lord's appearing; and yet he knew that sanctification and salvation were to be attained only in the right use of Divinely-appointed means of grace; and that to these he must needs resort, and mortify the body and keep it under—or perish. He here teaches that there is an essential and indissoluble connection, between the right use of means and salvation;—a truth which Calvinists hold and teach, far more consistently than others. Paul says he *used the means of perseverance which God had appointed*. And is this fact to be urged *against* the doctrine of final perseverance? Is it not rather confirmatory of our doctrine?

A.—Your view of the passage seems to me to be consistent and scriptural. And here I must acknowledge an error of mine; for I have heretofore thought that Calvinists believed that “*a man once in grace was always in grace, no matter how he might live.*” This, I perceive, is a mistake. You believe that every man must so live a life of self-denial and holiness, as to “*work out his own salvation.*”

C.—Yes, “for it is God who worketh in us to *will* and to *do*, of his own good pleasure,” and who keeps us by his power.

A.—The last expression reminds me of a passage I found this morning in a Methodist book, which strongly confirms all you have said.

C.—What, a Methodist book teaching Calvinism?

A.—Judge for yourself—here is the book. It is the 1st vol. of the sermons of Dr. Adam Clark, and on the 291 and 292 pages, remarking on 1 Peter, 1: 3—5,—“who are kept by the power of God:” he says—“The true disciples of Christ are under the continual watchful care of God, and the inheritance is guarded for them. The heirs in the text are *kept by the power of God*—BY THE MIRACULOUS POWER OF GOD; for nothing less is necessary to keep and preserve in this state of continual trial, a soul from the contagion that is in the world;—nothing less than the *sovereign power of God* will suffice to *keep that soul in a state of purity*, which that power has purified. Thus the power and grace which save us, are *still necessary to keep us*. The power of God preserves the inheritance *for the man, and the man for the inheritance*. This is *salvation—redemption from sin in and during life, and glory after death.*” This seems to me to be a true statement.

C.—This is not only Calvinism, but ultra Calvinism. What, a miraculous power necessary to keep a christian from falling! We believe christians are kept, not by miraculous power, but by the sanctified use of Divinely-appointed means. I thank you, however, for this extract from Dr. Clark’s writings, and am glad to see, as I think I do, that you are losing confidence in your favorite doctrine of “falling from grace.”

A.—I am about to state a case which in my opinion settles the question of the possibility of a christian falling away; and if you can show that it constitutes no valid objection to the

doctrine of final perseverance, I will freely acknowledge my error, and renounce my "favorite doctrine."

C.—Let me hear the case, and I will try to meet it.

A.—It is the case of Peter, who was a christian and a disciple of the Lord. When he denied his Lord and master, he lost his religion, or fell from grace. Afterwards he obtained religion again, and became a most active disciple and distinguished apostle.

C.—If this statement of the case be a truthful one, the question is indeed settled. But you have first to prove this statement to be correct. Your first position I admit, namely—that Peter "had religion," or "was in grace" before he denied his Lord. But the second, "that he lost his religion," and fell wholly out of a state of grace, I deny. In regard to the third proposition, instead of saying he "obtained religion again," I would say, he was more wholly turned from himself and his sin, and more entirely turned to the Lord;—that he was converted again just in the same sense as a christian is daily converted again, who daily "grows in grace."

A.—You admit the first proposition, but deny that Peter's denial of the Lord constituted an entire falling from grace. I will state the case as I understand it, and endeavor to prove the second proposition—that Peter "lost his religion."

After the last supper, our Lord and his disciples went out unto the Mount of Olives. Here Peter said, though all men shall be offended because of thee, yet will I never be offended. Shortly after, they entered the place called Gethsemane; and Judas, and with him a great multitude, with swords and staves, came to take our Lord. He was betrayed and taken. And, as the Lord was led away, "*Peter followed afar off.*" This was his *first error*. He should have remained by his side and shared in his sufferings. Peter entered into the palace of the high priest, and sat with the servants. This was his *second error*—"he sat with the ungodly," while his Lord stood alone, falsely accused and insulted. He is now prepared for an entire renunciation of Christ; and a damsel came to him and said, "Thou also wast with Jesus of Galilee. But he denied before them all, saying, 'I know not what thou sayest.' And in a little time another maid said, 'This fellow was also with Jesus of Nazareth:' and again he denied with an oath, 'I do

not know the man.' And after awhile came to him they that stood by, and said, 'Surely thou art one of them, for thy speech betrayeth thee.' Then began he to curse and to swear, saying, 'I know not the man.'" Does not language such as this manifest a *total loss of religion*? He persists in a *falsehood*, and adds to that *profanity*; for, with oaths and curses, he denied his Lord. Is it *possible* that there could have been *one particle of true religion* in his heart *at that time*? If Peter had religion before this, (and you admit that he had,) is it not most manifest, from his lying and cursing, that he lost it?—*Christian men, neither swear nor lie.* Peter, therefore, must have lost his religion. This conclusion is confirmed by our Lord's subsequent treatment of Peter. He was not acknowledged as a disciple until our Lord's third appearance to his disciples, after his resurrection. The women who came to the sepulchre very early on the morning of the first day of the week, were informed by the angel, that Christ was not there—that he had risen; and he said to them, "Go your way, tell his *disciples* and Peter, that he goeth before you into Galilee," &c. Here Peter is spoken of as separated from the disciples; for, had he been acknowledged as one of them, his name would not have been particularly mentioned, as he would have received the information from the women as a disciple. But, not being owned by them as such, he having *denied his Lord*, it was important to name him particularly, that the cheering news might be communicated to him also. It was not until some time after this, at the third appearing of our Lord to his disciples, that Peter was owned a disciple, restored to favor, and re-commissioned to engage in the work of the ministry. It appears then, in the *first place*, that Peter once had religion. *Second*, that by following the Lord at a distance, and by keeping bad company, he was led to deny his Lord with swearing and cursing, and lost his religion and ceased to be a disciple. *Third*, that he repented, and after a time was converted, or obtained religion again, was restored to the Divine favor and to the christian ministry.

Now, my good brother, suppose you should meet a *real christian*, such as Peter *was* before his fall, in a public company, and should hear him deny his profession of religion—and when at three different times he is charged by three dif-

ferent individuals, as being a christian, he should, with *cursing and swearing, deny it*; would you not think that he was destitute of all religion?—and would he not be disowned by the church as a dishonor to it?—and would not the whole world say “*he had no religion?*” But he *had it once*—where is it now? *He has lost it!* This was Peter’s case. He was once “*in grace*”—then “*out of grace,*” and then “*in grace*” again.

C.—I am glad you have made this statement so full and strong, and I will endeavor to reply in the spirit of christian candor. You will find that you are mistaken in your conclusion, as well as in some of your facts.

A.—If you can make it appear that my conclusion is erroneous, I will agree to surrender unconditionally to the doctrine of final perseverance; for I consider this case the Gibraltar of our doctrine of “*falling from grace.*”

C.—Then I will soon batter it down with the heavy ordinance of truth, and you may prepare to report yourself a prisoner to Calvinism.

The *first* step in Peter’s downfall, according to your statement, is this—he *followed his Lord afar off*. If he erred in this, the other disciples erred more, for Matthew and Mark both say that they “*all forsook him and fled;*”—but Peter and another disciple, followed after our Lord to the palace of the high priest. While the others fled, *Peter followed after*, though at a distance, and thus his courage and constancy are strongly contrasted with the conduct of the other disciples who *fled*. Peter did stand by his Lord, and would have sacrificed his life for him; but Jesus voluntarily surrendered himself to his foes, and the bold disciple stands overwhelmed with astonishment and dismay. Seeing his Lord led away, he followed on to the door of the palace of the high priest, and stood there, while the other disciple, who was *known to the high priest*, went in. Soon, the other disciple, remembering Peter, ‘spake to her that kept the door,’ and brought him in. There the high priest, the scribes and elders were assembled, and Jesus in the midst. And Peter, because he could not thrust himself into the presence of the high priest, and the other dignitaries, remained in the hall with the officers and servants, in the place appropriated to such as

he. He remained among these persons, not as sympathizing with them, or for the sake of their society; but we are expressly told that he remained there "to see the end." How inappropriate and unreasonable, therefore, is your charge, that he "sat among the ungodly," as though he held fellowship with them? Here he saw his Lord surrounded by a crowd of malignant enemies, and wholly in their power. He saw and heard the expression of their malicious joy, and of their purpose to destroy him, and he began to feel *that all was lost*.—What sad perplexing thoughts filled his mind! "O!" thought he, "how I would have gloried to have shed my life-blood for him, one short hour ago. With my stout arm and trusty sword, I would have cut a passage for his escape through the crowd of his foes; but, with a withering rebuke he bade me to put up my sword into its sheath, and he delivered himself up into the hands of his persecutors. How they revile him! Oh! they smite him! and he will permit no effort to be made for his rescue. Alas! all is over now. I thought it had been he who would have redeemed Israel, but he is now doomed, *and all is lost*." And now, with the crushing of his bold spirit, his personal fears arise; and he is accosted by a maid with the charge, "This man was also with him;"—and under the temporary pressure of despondency and fear, he denied him, saying, "Woman I know him not." And a little after another said, "Thou art also of them." And he said, "I am not." And about the space of one hour after, another charged him, saying, "Of a truth this fellow also was with him, for he is a Galilean." And Peter, with oaths said, "I know not what thou sayest." And while he yet spake, the cock crew, and Peter went out and wept bitterly. This was indeed a sad, a fearful offence, but one committed under the peculiar circumstances of a crushing despondency, the pressure of fear, and overpowering temptation. The temptation was sudden,—for these events occurred within the space of two hours. The crowing of the cock arrests his attention—and instead of persevering in his sin, he instantly *went out and wept bitterly*. He had a heart imbued with the love of Christ, and the first look that Christ cast on him produced the evidence of the existence of that love, in the streaming, bitter tears of repentance.

Peter sinned, grievously sinned; but he did not make shipwreck of the faith,—he did not wholly lose his religion. He passed through a fiery ordeal, and was much burned and consumed as to the dross that was in him. But the principle of spiritual life remained. His faith did not wholly fail, nor did he cease to be a disciple. You are mistaken in saying that Peter was not acknowledged as a disciple “until our Lord’s third appearance after his resurrection.” He is recognized as a disciple on the morning of the resurrection, in 20 chap. of John, where two disciples are mentioned—Peter and the *other* disciple whom Jesus loved, who went to the sepulchre, and having entered, and witnessed the truth of the report of the women,—“then *the disciples*,” (i. e. Peter and the other disciple,) “went away again unto their own home.” But Mary stood without weeping. And the message sent by the angel through the women to “the disciples and Peter,” is an acknowledgment of his character as a disciple; for it informs all the disciples, and *Peter in particular*, “that Christ is risen.” Peter needed special encouragement in his deep penitence for his sin, in denying his Lord, and it was this message sent to him in *particular*, that brought him to the sepulchre, where he appears as a disciple. These views you will find sustained by a passage of Scripture in which Peter’s denial of his Lord is predicted. Turn to Luke 22: 31—34. “And the Lord said, Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat: but I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not: and when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren. And he said unto him, Lord I am ready to go with thee, both into prison and to death. And he said, I tell thee, Peter, *the cock shall not crow this day before thou shalt thrice deny that thou knowest me.*” This was spoken but a little while before the event occurred. When the severe trial comes, and thou art “sifted as wheat,” thy *faith shall not fail*, for “I have prayed for thee.” So the Lord says in Amos 9: 9,—“I will sift the house of Israel among all nations, like as corn is sifted in a seive, *yet shall not the least grain fall upon the earth.*” You perceive that this sifting of Peter has reference particularly to events that were to transpire within a few hours, and mainly to his denying the Lord;—for when Peter declares “I am ready to go with thee, both into prison and to

death," he evidently understands that his fidelity to his Master was to be severely tried; and the Lord then informs him when, and how, he shall be tried; even that he *shall, on that day, before the cock crow, thrice deny him*. Observe—Christ predicts his fall; but at the same time gives him an assurance that *his faith shall not fail*, in the words, "*I have prayed for thee.*"—Why, my brother, to assert that Peter "lost all religion," or that his faith did fail, is asserting that *Christ's prayer failed—that his Father did not hear him*.

A.—But Peter denied his Lord with an oath;—and could there have been faith in his heart at that time?

C.—Our Lord knew all that Peter would say, and do, and feel, *when he predicted the event of his severe trial*; and yet he says, in reference to the *whole case*, "*I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not.*" And, if it did fail, *Christ's faith failed! Yes, he failed in prayer "whom the Father heareth always."* Oh, brother, that prayer was heard and answered. Peter's faith did not fail. Though there was a temporary suspension of spiritual animation, he was not "dead in sin," nor did he become a child of the devil; but his faith *revived*, and was made manifest by the flow of bitter tears of sorrow. The very language of the figure teaches us that nothing valuable was to be lost in the trial. He is to be *sifted* as wheat. Why is wheat *sifted*? To cleanse it from dust, chaff, &c. The Lord said he would *sift* Israel; but that not the "*least grain should fall upon the earth.*" No, no; the grain is precious and must be preserved. So Peter was to go through a sifting process for his own good, but the pure grain of grace should not suffer thereby, or be lost. His pride, self-confidence, and other hurtful things, should, like chaff, be sifted out of him; but the pure grain should remain, "*for I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not.*" You Arminians readily admit that the *prediction of Peter's fall* was literally fulfilled; but are slow to believe in the *efficacy of Christ's prayer to succor him, and keep alive his faith*. How is this?

A.—Arminians, in examining Peter's case, hear the falsehoods and oaths of his denial,—they hear no expression of faith, and conclude his faith is gone—that he is wholly fallen.

C.—This looks like unkindness to Peter's Lord. Suppose you were engaged in sifting wheat, and I should step in for a

few moments, to look at the operation. As the machine moves I see only dust and chaff thrown out; and not having looked *into* the seive, I depart. Would I be authorized to report through the neighborhood that your crop was nothing but dust and chaff? Yet you Arminians look at this case of Peter's sifting, and when you see only chaff and tares thrown out, you go away reporting that there is *not one grain of faith there*. As if the *Lord would permit chaff to be sifted;—as if Christ's faith had failed*. The Lord looks into the seive, and sees the precious grains; and while the chaff is blown away, he takes care that "*not the least grain shall fall to the ground*."

Brother, how *can* you doubt the efficacy of Christ's prayer, or God's ability to keep his people? O! it is a cheering, precious truth, that "the Lord forsaketh not his saints—they are preserved forever."—Ps. 37: 28. And the prayer of Christ has an *eternal efficacy*; and his prayer was offered up for *you and me*, as well as for Peter. Come brother, embrace this blessed doctrine.

A.—I will, I do embrace it. I have new light shed upon my mind, and I feel new love rising within my heart. Blessed Saviour, pray for me, that in the time of my sifting "*my faith fail not*."

C.—*Amen, and amen*. "Keep us, Saviour, near thy side."

A.—I join hands with you, brother, in loving and maintaining the blessed doctrine of "final perseverance." The "Lord preserveth his saints," and ever blessed be his name.

C.—It would be very agreeable to me to continue this conversation longer, but I have an engagement to meet my pastor at his study, and it lacks but a few minutes of the time. Why can you not accompany me? It would be very gratifying to him to hear of this change in your views from your own lips; and he will take great pleasure in instructing us, and praying for and with us.

A.—Agreed. Let us call on the good man.

If God give thee a small estate and a contented heart, it is as well, yea, better than if thou hadst enjoyed thy desire. The bee makes a sweeter meal upon two or three flowers, than the ox that hath so many mountains to graze upon.—*Flavel*.

Reminiscences of our Venerable Church.

JOHN BROWN OF PRIESTHILL.

CALVINISTIC Presbyterianism is essentially the same, under all circumstances. Wherever the pure doctrines of the Bible, as explained in the "Confession of Faith," are preached, received and honored, there is *our* church. The history of Presbyterianism is the history of *our* church—hence our love for these reminiscences.

Sabbath-Schools, with all their advantages, are now so common that we scarcely set the value upon them that we ought to do, as the very best *auxiliaries* to the instruction of parents. We are all well acquainted with the origin of Sabbath-Schools, and the name of RAIKES will ever be held in honor. But perhaps it may not be generally known who was the first Presbyterian in Scotland who opened a Sabbath-School. Be it my honored task to tell something of him.

The wicked reign of Charles II. was at an end, and the accession of his brother, James II., with fair promises to all, caused a brief pause in the persecution which had been so fierce in Scotland. Brief it was, but not too much so for the christian workman to be up and doing.

In the south-east of Scotland lived a devoted christian man, respected by all the country round. Neither rank nor riches belonged to him,—an honest living he made by wagoning goods or packages, through the parish of Muir-kirk. His home was a small cot built on the wild heath, far from any neighbors. The place was called Priest-hill; and there he dwelt in rustic happiness, with his dear wife and children.

As he had not joined in any acts of open resistance to the government, he had not as yet been persecuted, and all loved him, with the exception of the worthless Curate, whose ministry had taken the place of one of the "ejected" and godly shepherds; and upon this ministry he could not conscientiously attend. Moreover, the Curate had cause to suspect that many a persecuted wanderer found shelter with the "christian carrier," whose hut in the wilderness was oft-times hallowed even as the temple of God.

During the trying times of the past, many children had been left fatherless, and so this good man, with the love of the Sa-

viour burning in his heart, and his mind enlightened by the continual contemplation of the most sublime truths, gathered these children around his fireside, and taught them about Christ and holiness. O this sabbath-school!—how often must it have seemed as the very gate of heaven. We doubt not the Spirit accompanied this blessed work, while to these young ones was explained from the Bible “the chief end of man’s” existence.

But again the storm was permitted to rage, and to the bloody Claverhouse was this part of the country, Dumfries and Galloway, assigned as his particular domain of carnage. This man seemed possessed of the most awful spirit of hatred to Presbyterianism. Hetherington, whose history is not more poetical than truthful, says, “Claverhouse himself, like a superior fiend, traversed the whole province, cheering on the red exterminators; a bloodier and fiercer glare of destruction marking the spot where he was present, or the path along which he had swept. At times marking out a district, and mustering a sufficient force, he would drive all the inhabitants into one spot, gird them round with the armed soldiery, and compel them to swear allegiance to James, and to take the test and oath of abjuration,—instant death being the penalty of refusal or hesitation. At other times he would collect all the children from six to ten years of age, draw up a line of soldiers before them, and order them to pray, for the hour of death was come. Then, while in the agony of mental terror, would offer them their lives if they would discover where their friends, their fathers, or their elder brothers were concealed; causing occasionally the troops to fire over their heads, to increase their fear and stimulate their discoveries.”

But we return to the pious Brown. It was in the year 1685, in the summer time, and early in the morning twilight, when he and his family had just concluded their usual worship, that he left his home to attend to his daily labor. He had gone but a few yards—the blessing on his family yet lingered on his lips, when his steps were arrested by the tramp of horsemen, and soon the bloody Claverhouse and his troopers stood before him. Not a moment was lost. They carried him back to the door of his own house, and bade him pray, for his last hour had come.

Hearing the rough voices of soldiers, the wife of Brown rushed to the door, with an infant in her arms and a little girl clinging to her side. Transfixed she stood, while her husband calmly knelt on the sod and prayed aloud!—and so fervent, so lofty was his devotion, that tears stole down the hardened troopers' cheeks. Claverhouse seeing this was stung to madness, and three times did he interrupt the holy man, who notwithstanding continued his devotions unconfused. At length he rose from his knees, and turning to his afflicted wife he said, "Now Isabel, the day is come that I told you would come, when I first spoke to you of marriage." "Indeed John," replied she, "I can willingly part with you." "Then," said he, "that is all my desire; I have no more to do but to die; I have been prepared to meet death for many years." He then kissed his darling wife and children, and turning round, he faced his foes. "Fire!" said the ruthless Claverhouse to his soldiers. But the prayer still rung in their ears—the sublimity of the scene overpowered them, and a smothered "No," was heard. Enraged, Claverhouse with his own hand shot down the Covenanter, and as the ball passed through his head and the body fell to the ground, he turned to the horror-stricken wife, saying, "Woman, what thinkest thou of thy husband now?" "I ever thocht muckle good o' him," she said, "but now more than ever." "It were but justice to lay thee beside him," exclaimed the murderer. "If you were *permitted*," replied she, "I doubt not but your cruelty would go that length. But how will you answer for this morning's work?" "To man I can be accountable; and as for God, I will take him in my own hands." And so saying he wheeled about and rode off.

And now they are gone;—and the desolate widow, her little children clinging to her, is alone with the corpse of her loved one. A few years ago, in the days of her youth, the lover had sought and won her maiden hand. But even then, in the sweet days of their courtship, they had talked of the probability of this awful end. But—she was not now alone. The arm of God was around her and supported her, as she took her kerchief from her bosom and bound up his mangled head—as she straightened his stiffening limbs—as she wrapped his plaid around him—as she pressed her two children to her broken heart! No, she was not alone!!

The late Thos. Duncan, one of the most accomplished of Scotland's artists, with a pious heart and a soul keenly alive to the beauty and sublimity of many passages in the history of his own church, frequently devoted his talents to the portraying such scenes as this. I gazed for hours on his picture of this last scene of the murdered John Brown of Priest-hill, and never can I forget the impression then made. M,

A Sermon,

—
 BY REV. JAMES H. GASS.
 —

“And as he reasoned of righteousness, temperance and judgment to come, Felix trembled.”—Acts, 24: 25.

It is now near eighteen hundred years since the temperance question was argued in Palestine, by a prisoner who was in bonds before the Roman governor. And it has been a matter of discussion often since, even to the present day. But it has seldom if ever been argued with such a convincing and alarming effect, as when the prisoner who stood before the Roman governor reasoned upon the principles of the faith in Christ—Acts, 24: 24. He argued the subject of temperance as belonging to the faith in Christ.

Taking the argument of Paul on this occasion, we have an inspired temperance speech—one that was delivered with such point, energy, and clearness, that it made “Felix tremble.” There have been but few, if any, temperance speeches, that were delivered with such a convincing power as that of Paul. In order to present it to the mind of the Roman governor in its true light, he gave it its proper place in his argument, placing it between righteousness and the judgment, drawing his arguments and conclusions from the eternal judgment seat, before which he, together with all classes of men, would have to stand and render up their account.

The importance of the subject of temperance, may easily be inferred from the place in which the apostle puts it in his argument, placing it between “righteousness and the judgment.”

This should cause every one to view the subject in connection with the bar of God. Were we thus to view it, which is the sense in which it should be viewed, surely the drinkers, makers, and venders of intoxicating liquors, would be made to tremble like Felix. It would have been a strange sight to have seen at that time, one who professed faith in Christ standing up and opposing the argument of Paul on the subject of temperance. Yea, methinks it would have been impossible to have found one at that time, and under those circumstances, who was a believer in the faith of Christ, who would have dared to oppose the subject, which came by inspiration from heaven, and which was incorporated with the faith in Christ.

I know there are many who look upon, and speak of, the cause of temperance as something new, and of man's invention. If eighteen hundred years are not enough to constitute it as old as the gospel of Christ, we may go back to Moses, Solomon, Isaiah, Jeremiah, &c., whose testimony was given long before Christ came into the world. They viewed and spoke of it in the same light that Paul argued it before the Roman governor, as we will clearly see, by consulting the Scriptures of divine truth.

The Rechabites were formed into a temperance league, or pledge, by the command of Jonadab their father, and they strictly obeyed him. The consequence was, that God blessed them, and said—"Therefore, thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel: Jonadab the son of Rechab shall not want a man to stand before me forever."—Jer. 35: 19. In the family of Rechab the cause of temperance was strictly practiced, and God's blessing is promised unto them forever, for their adherence to their vow. It may be said that this was not a temperance society. What is a society? Is it not an association of men, or individuals, for a certain purpose? This being true, then there was a temperance society in the family of Rechab.

There has been, ever since the deluge, cause of effort in the cause of temperance. Under the Old Testament dispensation there was much evil done by intemperance, among all classes of men;—even the prophet and the priest were debased by it. See Is. 28: 7, 8—"But they also have erred through wine, and through strong drink are out of the way; the priest and the prophet have erred through strong drink; they are swallowed

up of wine, they are out of the way through strong drink; they err in vision, they stumble in judgment. For all tables are full of vomit and filthiness, so that there is no place clean." Here we have a fearful account of intemperance under the Old Testament dispensation. It laid its deadly grasp upon the priest and the prophet;—thus its fearful ravages were brought into the Jewish church. How loathsome is the account here given by the prophet Isaiah?—"All tables full of vomit and filthiness." Here we may again use the language of the inspired prophet—Is. 56: 11, 22:—"Yea, they are greedy dogs which can never have enough; and they are shepherds that cannot understand: they all look to their own way, every one for his gain, from his quarter. Come ye, say they, I will fetch wine, and we will fill ourselves with strong drink; and tomorrow shall be as this day, and much more abundant."—Here we have the character given of these priests who used strong drink, in the days of the prophet Isaiah. This character may well be given to the priests in our own day, who are making, vending, and drinking strong drink. "They are greedy dogs, which can never have enough, and they are shepherds that cannot understand; they all look to their own way, every one for his gain, from his quarter."—Is. 56: 11. Hence God hath said, "It is not for kings, O Lemuel, it is not for kings to drink wine, nor for princes strong drink: lest they drink and forget the law, and pervert the judgment of any of the afflicted."—Pro. 31: 4. This character is farther described by Habakkuk, 2: 5—"Yea also, because he transgresseth by wine, he is a proved man, neither keepeth at home, who enlargeth his desire as hell, and is as death, and cannot be satisfied, but gathereth unto him all nations, and keepeth unto him all people." This is entirely applicable to the man who makes, sells, and uses strong drink, even now. Yet they flatter themselves that they are doing no evil, while they are dealing out the poison of death to many. But hear what God has said upon the subject:—"Wo unto him that giveth his neighbor drink, that putteth thy bottle to him, and makest him drunken also, that thou mayest look on their nakedness! Thou art filled with shame for glory: drink thou also, and let thy foreskin be uncovered: the cup of the Lord's right hand shall be turned unto thee, and shameful spewing shall be on

thy glory.”—Hab. 2: 15, 16. From this passage we see clearly, that a man cannot be dealing out his poison to his neighbors, and be guiltless. Nay, verily, God says:—“Therefore thou shalt say unto them, thus saith the Lord of host, the God of Israel; drink ye and be drunken, and spew, and fall, and rise no more, because of the sword which I will send among you.” O the fearful consequences of intemperance. “Nor rise no more,” means just what Paul means when he says—“Nor drunkards shall inherit the kingdom of God.”—1 Corinthians, 6: 10.

The question may here be asked, how is this great evil to be checked? Not by stopping the little streams—this will not cure the evil. It is true we may stop the stream for a time, but it will soon break over, and spread wider, and produce more fearful ravages than before. In order to remedy any evil we must begin at the proper point, otherwise our efforts will be vain and fruitless. We must begin at the fountain whence flow these poisonous streams which have been, and are still flowing across our land, producing wretchedness, poverty and death. To reclaim the present drunkards will not stop the evil, while the fountain is still sending forth its poisonous streams, and engulfing the heedless youth while they are viewing and tasting of its deceitful but deadly streams, as they wind their way through every land. May God save our heedless youth from this awful vortex of woe.

You may again ask, what I mean by the fountain whence flow these awful streams of death? I answer, the *distillery!* This is the fountain whence flows those fearful streams, which are filling with such rapidity our penitentiaries, poor-houses, hospitals and grave-yards. Here we must bring truth to bear in such a manner as to cause the maker and vender of ardent spirits to feel that they are doing a work which is making fearful havoc among men. The distillery is the place where all this evil has its origin. All the evils, even pauperism, wretchedness, and death by intemperance, are effects which flow from this cause;—for there cannot be an effect without a cause.

There are but few who do not look upon the drunkard with disgust, and abhor his habits. Even the dram drinker looks upon the drunken sot with scorn; while at the same time, he who makes and sells the poison to him, is fellowshipped, and

treated by many as one engaged in a lawful calling—one who is no violator of the laws of the land; and even his own conscience is often silenced by this argument. I admit he may be no violator of the civil law of the land, while he is making and dealing out his poison to all over whom he can have an influence.

This is not the question at issue. The question is, which is doing the greatest evil, he who drinks, or he who makes and sells intoxicating drinks? I admit that the drinker is doing a great evil, both to himself and family. Yet it is true, that the man who, in this age of light, is making and selling liquor to the drunkard, is doing a tenfold evil to society in general. Which produces the greatest evil or injury, the viper that bites, or he who is bitten? The man who is bitten may, and does suffer the pain, but the pain he feels is the effect of the poison which is diffused through his system; but the reptile which inflicts the wound has done the great evil, or the greatest injury. After he has discharged his poison, he, by a certain process, collects more, ready to destroy the next one who passes heedlessly along. Thus it is with the distiller. He is busily employed in collecting his poison, with which he is slaying his thousands. Yea, hundreds of thousands are thus slain within the United States. Many, yea, very many unsuspecting youth are gradually brought within the fold of this deadly serpent ere they are aware, whose sting is worse than an adder. See Pro. 23: 29—32:—"Who hath woe? who hath sorrow? who hath contentions? who hath babbling? who hath wounds without cause? who hath redness of eyes? They that tarry long at the wine: they that go to seek mixed wine. Look not thou upon the wine when it is red, when it giveth his color in the cup, when it moveth itself aright. At the last it biteth like a serpent, and stingeth like an adder." The adder is a poisonous serpent, which is said to stop its ears, the one on the earth, and the other with its tail, to avoid hearing. This agrees with the account given of the adder by David, Ps. 58: 4—"Their poison is like the poison of a serpent; they are like the deaf adder that stoppeth her ear."

The description here given of the adder, suits the man who is making and selling intoxicating liquors. Their poison is like

that of the serpent, and they stop their ears against all reproof and caution. "They will not hearken to the voice of the charmers, charming never so wisely."—Ps. 58: 5. He is engaged in a business that not only wounds and destroys the body, but destroys both soul and body. For, "No drunkard shall inherit the kingdom of God."—1 Cor. 6: 10. It may be said that it is the drunkard "who cannot inherit the kingdom of God," not the man who makes and sells the article. It is true this passage says the drunkard, but the man who makes and sells the article, is the prime cause of this fearful result. His business is the first cause, and the ruin of both the soul and body of the drunkard, is the effect flowing from this cause. Hence he is guilty of an awful crime. In our civil law, he who is accessory to the death of an individual, is as guilty as he who commits the act. The man who is making and selling ardent spirits, is surely accessory to the death of many—yea, of thousands.

We will notice some facts in relation to this point. 1st.—It is said that there are 500,000 drunkards within the United States, 30,000 of whom die annually. Suppose this to be true, how many have died by intemperance since the year '76 up to this date, 1847? According to the above calculation we have over 2,000,000 who have died within the United States. What an army of human beings, who have fallen before king Alcohol. This host not only died a temporal, but it is to be feared an eternal death. "For no drunkard shall inherit the kingdom of God."—1 Cor. 6: 10. O that God would open the eyes of patriots, philanthropists, saints, and all wishing the happiness of mankind, to see the evil that has been, and is still doing by this soul-destroying, and God-dishonoring business, and cause all with one voice and one heart, to unite in banishing from our land, and from the world, this soul-destroying evil.

We will now notice some of the excuses and objections usually made by those who oppose the temperance reformation.

1.—Many object to the Temperance Society because it does not embrace enough in it;—that is, it does not embrace eating, drinking, &c. &c. Hence they will not unite with those who are laboring to put a stop to the making, vending, and using of intoxicating drinks. In answering this objection, let us

suppose a case or two. 1. Suppose the objector was engaged in clearing up a field of ground upon which there were many logs and much brush. Would he, because he could not at once pick up every log, and every brush, cease to labor? Or would he not take log after log, brush after brush, until he had cleared every obstruction out of his way? Thus we should, and must do with intemperance. We should take hold and labor on in the good cause, until the monster intemperance is banished from our land. 2. No man would think of stopping, or rather, not starting his plough, because he could not with one furrow, turn over his whole farm. Instead of this, he begins at one side or end, and runs one furrow after another until he has turned over all his farm. So we should do in the cause of temperance.

2.—Others object, because so many who profess to be temperate, are acting the hypocrite;—therefore they will not do any thing to help on the cause. Q.—Would such men refuse to labor for, or to receive the real specie coin, because there was some counterfeit coin in the land? Surely not.

Here are some of the excuses of the maker and vender of ardent spirits:

(1.)—“If I do not make and sell, some one else will; and I may as well do it as any one.” I admit you may as well do it as any man. But the question is not whether you have as good a right to do it as any one—but, has any one a right to do evil? This is the point. You may say that you are a free man, and as such you have a right to do as you please. This I will admit for a moment. Now let us apply it to another case. I am a free man, and as such have a right to take the life of my neighbor. Would this argument clear him from guilt, in case he had done the deed? No. Would he not be as guilty to kill him with liquor as with any other weapon?—Hear what God hath said upon this point:—“And it come to pass, when he heareth the words of this curse, that he bless himself in his heart, saying, I shall have peace, though I walk in the imagination of my heart, to add drunkenness to thirst. The Lord will not spare him, but then the anger of the Lord and his jealousy shall smoke against that man, and all the curses that are written in this book shall be upon him, and the Lord shall blot out his name from under Heaven.”—Deut. 29;

19, 20. Thus we see the fearful end of that man, who does according to his own evil inclination.

3.—The maker and vender of ardent spirits, or intoxicating liquors, often excuses himself by saying, “I do not sell to my neighbor, nor sell less than a quart, or gallon, or barrel, and that to be taken away and drank.” Now, I ask, in the name of humanity and common sense, is it any less crime to sell a pound of poison to a man who will use it, than it would be to sell him an ounce? Or is it a less crime to sell the poison of death to a traveller, than to a neighbor? In short, is it a less crime to destroy a man in Alabama than in Tennessee? Who are in Alabama?—or who are travellers? Have they no souls? Or is it a less crime to destroy a soul from home, than one at home? By this argument the maker and vender of ardent spirits condemn themselves, because they admit it to be wrong in the one case—to sell to a neighbor. Now, if it is wrong to sell to a man who lives within one mile of us, is it not wrong to sell to one two miles off? If two, then ten, twenty, fifty, a hundred, or even a thousand miles.

Again. He condemns himself when he says he does not sell it by the 1-2 pint, or pint, but by the quart, gallon, barrel, &c.; for he knows that a quart or gallon will do more harm than a half pint, or whole pint. Thus he is condemned by his own saying. But the grand secret is, his object is the money; and by selling a quart, gallon, or barrel, he can secure more than by selling a less quantity. The love of money often blinds the eyes of men thus engaged, and causes them to stop their ears against every argument on the subject.

I wish now to speak to the distiller, vender, and drinker of ardent spirits, as though I were speaking to them face to face, and ask them to go with me in their imagination to the bar of God, before which their conduct will be tried. I ask each man, maker, vender, and drinker, to count your money, and bear it with you to the bar of God. Then, on the other hand, bring before you all those precious souls to whom you have been handing out the deadly cup. Look at them, in their fearful condition. Bring the poverty, wretchedness, the premature deaths, the oaths, the blasphemy, and all that long and black list of evils done by your business;—put these in one scale, and the sixpences and ninepences that you have gained in the oth-

er, and there weigh them. Now, I ask, while you are looking on this, the winding up of your business, what have you gained? Are you not an infinite loser? Surely the few sixpences which you have gained will be a poor compensation for the ruin of so many precious souls, whose cries will sound in your ear, charging you and your business as being the cause of their unutterable ruin. There you will see in the vast assembly around the bar of God, the heart-broken wives, the murdered husbands, the beggared children, and blasted hopes of parents, all as the effect of your business. Will any distiller, or vender of ardent spirits then be deaf to those cries? Nay, verily, they will pierce their hearts as so many arrows dipped in the blood of ruined souls, and will sting the soul with the piercing pangs of that worm that never dies. Perhaps those who are making and vending ardent spirits, may be ready to say, that it does not concern me whether they make or sell, I will not have it to bear. My dear friend, I ask you to look at the subject with an impartial eye, and let us both view it together. Were I to see you approaching a place of certain ruin with your eyes closed, would you esteem me as your friend if I did not warn you of your danger? Surely you would not. But were I to warn you of your danger, and cry out to you to stop, would you not have cause to esteem me as a friend?

Again. Were I not to warn you of the evil of your course, I would be guilty before God. See Eze. 3: 17, 18—"Son of man, I have made thee a watchman unto the house of Israel; therefore hear the word at my mouth, and give them warning from me. When I say unto the wicked thou shalt surely die, and thou givest him not warning, nor speakest to warn the wicked from his wicked way, to save his life; the same wicked man shall die in his iniquity, but his blood will I require at thine hand." In view of this positive command of God, I ask you distillers, venders, and drinkers of ardent spirits, is it not my business to warn you of your danger?—and that, too, before you go into the presence of the heart-searching God?

Hear, O man, while on your way to the bar of God. Stop, and weigh yourself in the balance of God's Word,—look well to your way, lest you at the last be found wanting. I warn you of the evil of your way, while you have an opportunity to escape the awful doom of the ungodly. Stop while mercy is

held out to you. Fly speedily to the Saviour. Be reconciled to him while he is waiting to be gracious. Break off your sins by righteousness, and turn unto God, "for why will you die?"

Hints for those who need them.

MESSRS. EDITORS:—The circular of our worthy agent, dated Columbia, June 1st, which appeared in your July No., stating that he would not visit the churches of the Synod of Tennessee this summer, and requesting the ministers individually to attend to the matter of making collections, will be followed, we trust, by a response which will gladden our brother's heart, and which will, in some measure, be worthy of the noble cause.

"The receipts of our Board falling short"—"thirty thousand dollars less this year than last year," are startling facts, which Mr. Potter has laid before us, and surely ministers and people will strain every nerve to make good the means necessary for the sustaining of all who are willing to go forth to the heathen.

Ministers ought to have no false delicacy in bringing up this subject before their people. The silver and the gold are the Lord's, and ministers are bound to tell their congregations so, and urge upon them to *give* to the Lord of *his own*. Both as regards their own "sustentation," and as regards the spread and support of religion among the heathen, ministers have seemed to lack moral courage in impressing their own correct views upon the minds of their congregations, and the consequence has been that many of them are not half supported, and extra aid, in the form of agents, costing the parent societies several hundred dollars a year, have been found necessary to bring the churches to any thing like their duty in respect to missions.

Every congregation ought to have a Missionary, Bible, and Tract Society of its own; and quarterly, or half yearly send the funds collected to the Parent Societies. Let the monthly concert be kept up, and a collection made on the first Monday evening of every month at the prayer meeting, and much trou-

ble would be saved. In like manner, let the Bible and Tract Societies have their meetings and collections, and much trouble would be saved.

How has Scotland's Free Church been able to sustain herself, and her numerous schemes of usefulness at home and abroad? Why, chiefly by her *weekly* contributions. Never is a sermon preached in that country, but a collection, small or great, as the case may be, is taken up. Every person, even the little children throwing in their pennies or half-pence, and thus early acquiring the *blessed habit of giving!* Principle is not there appealed to and feeling excited, and all left to evaporate in the atmosphere of Mammon. No! As the spirit kindles with the justness of the claim, the hand acts its part, and draws out from the riches or the poverty of its treasures, the willing offering.

Suppose only forty individuals attend your concert prayer meeting, (a meeting that is kept up with zeal and interest in every worthy church,) and that the gift of each individual averages 12 1-2 cents, this alone would realize \$60 per annum, ready for missionary purposes, and no one would miss it;—and few would think of deducting it from the regular yearly sum which they feel it their high privilege to give as abundantly as the Lord will permit.

But perhaps I have intruded too far. If so, forgive one who is not a *Reverend brother*, but an

OLD-FASHIONED PRESBYTERIAN.

P. S.—One word more. An additional interest would be given to the concert meeting, if the Secretary were permitted to read aloud at this meeting the sum which had been collected at the last.

THE heart of every Christian is a mirror which reflects truly, though it may be dimly, the image of God. But when God breaks the believer's heart by the hammer of his providential discipline, the reflections of his glory are multiplied. Each fragment becomes a mirror, that renders back his image more clearly and brightly than before.—*Ohio Observer.*

Missionary.

ARMENIANS OF TURKEY.—The most interesting items of intelligence received during the last month, are furnished by different members of this mission. God is still carrying forward his work among the people for whose spiritual good they are laboring; and the opposition of the enemy, however zealous and active, and however wisely directed, is utterly powerless against his almighty arm.

Mr. Schneider has recently visited the infant churches of Nicomedia and Ada Bazar; and found much to indicate the presence and favor of the great Head of the Church. There was some opposition at both places; but it is far less formidable than it was a few months ago. The following instance of persecution is mentioned as occurring at Ada Bazar:

“During the visit of the late native pastor of the Evangelical Church of Constantinople to this place, an individual attended his preaching a single time. The poor man was at once imprisoned by a creditor for debt. Though the pecuniary demand was the ostensible object of the imprisonment, the real and only one was his attendance on the Protestant service.—He was retained in confinement sixty-three days, during twenty-four of which his feet were in irons; (the swelling of his feet had not subsided when I was there;) and all this though it is contrary to the laws of the land to put a man in irons for debt! During his confinement he was often urged by the enemies of the truth to retract, they offering him money, or promising to pay his debts, or to make some arrangement in regard to them. When they found him immoveable, they reproached and reviled him, and even spat upon him and struck him. The Governor likewise, doubtless incited to it by the Armenian primates, labored to persuade him to return to his church; and, on one occasion, one of the officers of the Governor threatened to beat him, if he would not yield. He told him to strike; but the man had not courage enough to attempt so unrighteous a deed. But though this persecuted and suffering man, who has a family dependent on him, was in this condition for two months, plied by every means in the power of his opposers, he remained firm to the end. To some of

them he said that if they should tear the flesh from his body, he would not return to them. And what is peculiarly interesting, is the fact that he learned to read in prison. Before his confinement, he could not distinguish one letter from another, but knew simply their names, and the order in which one follows the other; and with this knowledge, slightly aided by a fellow prisoner, he learned to read, so that he can now peruse the Scriptures with considerable ease. He is a man of ready speech, and promises to be a valuable acquisition, if he perseveres."

A letter of Mr. Everett contains an account of several instances of persecution at Constantinople and other places. One of these is as follows:

"Four of the brethren were cast into prison, week before last, on the charge of attempting to force a man to become a Protestant. The facts were found to be as follows. A man had stolen quite a quantity of goods from one of their number, and while they were trying to make him give up the property, or confess the deed, a Turk came up and interfered. He proceeded so far in his rashness and interference that the brethren sent for a kavass and took him before the authorities; but the case was so represented by the Turks that the four brethren and the thief were cast into one common prison. While they were there, great efforts were made with the man who stole the property, to induce him to deny the fact when he should be brought before the judge; but he utterly refused to lie, and said he would confess the truth. After three or four days, therefore, the brethren were released by order of the Minister of Foreign Affairs, without trial; and, by the intercession of the brethren, the thief was prevented from being sent to the bagno."

The course pursued by the Minister of Foreign Affairs in the following case was a severe disappointment to the Armenian Patriarch:

"The brother of Bedros Vartabed, who is a member of the Bebek seminary, while he was at his brother's in the city during a recent vacation, was taken by another brother, and delivered up to the Patriarch. He was very gladly received by the latter, as he had once escaped from his hands. The brother who has the charge of the boy, immediately made ef-

forts to procure his release. He carried the case finally before the Minister of Foreign Affairs, and succeeded in obtaining a trial. The parties were called up, and the Minister asked the boy which of his brothers brought him up; and he pointed to the Protestant. He was then asked with whom he wished to live; whereupon he designated the other brother, as he had made him fair promises if he would make such a choice. The Minister then said to the boy, "That brother does not look like a good man; he is not fit to take care of you. Go with this one," pointing to the Protestant. The boy came immediately over to Pera, and is now at Bebek. The Patriarch is, therefore, thwarted a second time in his attempts to kidnap this lad."

The Herald for August contains a very interesting communication from Mr. Van Lennep, describing the spirit of inquiry which has been awakened among certain Armenians at Aleppo and 'Aintab. The following statement shows the finger of God in the movement at the latter place, in a most remarkable manner:

"When only a few had read the Scriptures, and had had their eyes opened to the errors of their church, a letter came from the Patriarch at Constantinople, stating that, whereas a certain heresiarch, Vertannes by name, had left the capital to travel through Armenia, the faithful flocks all over the country were warned against listening to his deceitful words. He had filled Constantinople with his heresy; a great many priests and learned men, and the Patriarch himself, had endeavored to convince him of his errors, but without success. All people were, therefore, warned against him. When this letter was read in the church, the evangelical men received the first information that there existed other people, besides themselves, who adhere to the pure gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ. And many people said, 'Why, if the Patriarch and learned men have not succeeded in convincing this heresiarch, as they call him, how can they expect us to withstand his reasoning? It must be that he is in the right.' There is another interesting fact. There was a certain priest of great talents, but a drunkard, who, for reasons best known to himself, professed to be evangelical. He went to 'Aintab, and there preached the truth with such eloquence and boldness that many were convinced

by him. His real character was then discovered, and he was sent out of the place in disgrace; but the fruits of his preaching remained."

During a visit which Mr. Van Lennep made to 'Aintab, he found a very strong desire to receive religious instruction; and he even hopes that a few have become savingly acquainted with the truth as it is in Jesus. After he left the place an effort was made to arrest the new movement, which was not altogether unsuccessful. At Aleppo also the opposition of the adversaries was very active and virulent; and one case of persecution occurred which was peculiarly trying. But God will doubtless take care of his own cause, and succor all who put their trust in him!

SYRIA.—The Protestants of Hasbeiya have laid their grievances before the Sublime Porte; and an order has been issued to the Pasha of the district in which they live to give them the requisite protection. The government of Turkey is undoubtedly sincere in its professed desire to grant toleration to all its subjects; but its wishes are sometimes defeated by the local officers. It may be so in this case.

AHMEDNUGGUR.—From a letter of Mr. Ballantine, it appears that five persons have been recently admitted to the church by the brethren connected with the Ahmednuggur station.

WEST AFRICA.—The Herald for August contains an interesting communication from Mr. Wilson, who is now on a visit to this country. Although the number of conversions among the natives has been small thus far, the mission has undoubtedly accomplished much good, and its prospects are certainly encouraging. The state of the country is tranquil, and the French authorities are interposing no obstacles to missionary labor. Popery has a few representatives in the field; but they are doing very little. One object which Mr. Wilson has in view, in visiting the United States at the present time, is to obtain a reinforcement of the mission.

CHOCTAWS.—The churches under the care of this mission are not without some tokens of the Divine favor. Ten persons were admitted to the church at Mount Pleasant a few weeks ago.—*Dayspring*.

Power of Caste.

You may have heard, or have read, what the caste of India is. You may have read of brahmins; but I fear, from all that I have been able to ascertain since my arrival in this country, that it is as yet comparatively little that people know about these things in England. In reference to caste I will give you an illustration, and you will see how it bears on the conversion of the heathen to Christianity in one solitary case. I baptized a man some years ago, and I took the pains to ascertain how many individuals were placed out of caste by that one conversion. You will be astonished to hear that the number was four hundred and sixty one! The brahmins took good care to ascertain all the ramifications of this man's family connections, and found them out even to the extent of his very Scotch cousins. There is nothing left untouched; and it is not merely the man himself that is put out of caste, but it is every one of his connections.

I will relate very briefly a case that occurred a few years ago, in connection with the conversion of one of our native converts, now living and adorning the Gospel. This young man was then sixteen years of age, the legal age at which a Hindoo can be baptized. In his own country he was in point of rank equal to an earl in England. He had four large landed properties, and was possessed in his own person of fifty-five thousand pounds. We placed his position before him in every light of difficulty that we could conceive. We said, "Here are enlightened and educated brahmins, as they call themselves. They are adopting all the habits of Europeans, rolling in their barouches, and living like princes. You can imitate that example, if you remain a liberal Hindoo; but if you put on Christ, all this must be sacrificed. Look at it!" His father was dead, but he had a mother, who loved him with all the tenderness of which a mother's heart is capable. Indeed, I have seldom seen more tenderness gushing from a mother's heart than from hers. She loved him as a mother will love her only son. When we placed before him all these difficulties, he said, "I put the whole into one scale, and I put Christ in the other, and they are lighter than vanity. If you," ad-

dressing himself to me, "will not baptize me, I will go to another." He was baptized, and he is now a common writer in the treasury of Calcutta, in the receipt of about thirty rupees a month.

When I was leaving Calcutta, I shook hands with him upon the beach for the last time; and when I looked upon him I wept, and he wept too. He said, "After all I have sacrificed, are you going to leave me?" I looked at him and said, "Is it come to this, then? Did you make those sacrifices for me?" He replied, "It is enough; I sacrificed them for the Master." Ah! How few are there in England who have made such a sacrifice for Christ as that! We talk of our guineas, as we put them on the plate as a sacrifice. We talk of our ten pounds and twenty pounds as munificent donations. But look at this. Fifty-five thousand pounds and four estates! Look at the loss of all rank and title. The day only before his conversion, he would have been worshipped by the highest brahmin in the country; the day after, the meanest servant in my house would not have performed the meanest office for him!—
Rev. T. Boaz.

Minds and Books.

SOME minds and some books are like toy-shops. They are full of curious things, which are of no higher use than diversion. The whole reading and observation of some men is for amusement. Such live neither for the good of themselves, nor of others.

Some minds and some books are like shops, where only remnants are sold. Nothing is complete. You may find what you need, but there is seldom enough of it. You are struck with the endless variety, and wonder how so much could be collected; but after a wearisome search, you go away disappointed.

Some minds and some books are like shops, where you find vast quantities of rich goods, in the piece. The wise man loves to deal here. He is sure to be suited. He gets the worth of his money. True, little is quite suited to immediate

use, but every thing is easily made useful. Such a mind had Bacon and Burke, and Edwards and Howe. Amplitude more than compensates for exactness. Miners never object that the ore is found in too rich or too large masses.

Other minds and books are like shops, in which you find an excellent variety, already prepared for use. There is something to suit every one. Garments and utensils of every good description meet the eye continually. You wonder at the variety. You wonder more at the skill and judgment displayed in the fitness. Every thing does you good. You are pleased because you are profited. You resolve to do better that you may be happier.—*American Messenger*.

From the Knoxville Register.

A Card.

THE undersigned have had opportunity of attending review examinations at the Female School, at Oakland Grove, taught by the Rev. R. B. McMULLEN. Some of us are patrons of that school, and take occasion, therefore, to state, that the pupils have exhibited, uniformly, a proficiency which we have never seen excelled.

The style and general conduct of the whole school is such as would be most acceptable to parents who feel a deep interest in the intellectual and moral advancement of their daughters. We take special pleasure in stating, that we have never visited any institution where a more delicate and appropriate policy prevails, such as is well suited to elevate the taste and preserve the manners and refinement natural to, and desirable to be cultivated in, the female character.

In this school no sectarian principles are taught. The reverence of the Almighty, and the love of the Bible, constitute the only religion in which the youthful heart is trained. To the parents the duty and privilege are left of directing their children in the choice of a creed.

The first session has numbered twenty scholars, and the progress of each class has been extremely gratifying to the parents. Mr. McMULLEN is a Presbyterian clergyman of high standing.

He finished his studies at Princeton, and his acquirements in the various branches of learning are thorough. In all respects, he is peculiarly qualified for the superintendence of such an institution as he has established, and his known patience, industry and untiring perseverance, assure us that he will give to it permanency and efficiency.

Mrs. McMULLEN, who aids him in several departments, merits, as she possesses, the confidence and commendation of her friends for the station she has chosen.

Such an institution we consider a blessing and a privilege, and we can with confidence and of our personal knowledge, recommend it to the patronage of our friends and the public.

The arrangements of Mr. McMULLEN are ample and liberal. He is in correspondence with, and has propositions from, a gentleman, as a Teacher of Music, whom he expects to employ, and who has been recommended to him by some of the most respectable gentlemen of the North, and is stated by those who know him to be skilful in his art. The next session will be opened, it is expected, with his aid.

The locality of the school is well suited for retirement and study, being just beyond the limits of Knoxville, situated in a beautiful grove.

JAMES PARK,	S. R. RODGERS,
A. ANDERSON,	W. S. KENNEDY,
D. A. DEADERICK,	ROB'T CRAIGHEAD,
J. W. CAMPBELL,	J. P. N. CRAIGHEAD,
W. B. A. RAMSEY,	G. W. HARRIS,
J. G. M. RAMSEY,	WILLIAM INGLES,
JOS. L. KING,	JNO. L. MOSES,
RICH'D O. CURREY,	JAS. C. MOSES.

The undersigned, not having been present at the review examinations of the Rev. R. B. McMullen's Seminary, referred to in the above card, cannot therefore speak, of his own knowledge, of the proficiency of the pupils under his direction the past session. But from an acquaintance with Mr. McMullen; his lady and their assistants, being satisfied of their ability properly and satisfactorily to conduct a Seminary for Young Ladies, he takes pleasure in recommending their school to the patronage of his friends and the public. C. H. COFFIN.

THE
Calvinistic Magazine.

[NEW SERIES.]

“Earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints.”

Vol. II.

October, 1847

No. 10.

A Scriptural Test of Bible Orthodoxy.

THE Prophets of the Old Testament predicted many things in relation to the coming of the Messiah and the Gospel kingdom. Among other things these inspired prophets foretold, that “The watchmen shall lift up the voice, and with the voice together shall they sing; for they shall see, eye to eye, when the Lord shall bring again Zion.”—Is. 52: 8. The middle clause would read, if put in plain prose, “and they shall sing together with the voice.”

This prophetic promise plainly implies, that the ministers of Jesus Christ shall preach in harmony the same doctrines, and sing together the same praises of God without a jarring, discordant note. The reason is given—“*For*, they shall see eye to eye.” They will interpret the Word of God alike, and deduce from the infallible Word of Truth, the very same doctrines, duties, promises, church order and discipline, &c.—they shall speak the same things, and be of the same mind—there will be perfect harmony in their views of Bible truth. How far from this union is the church at present! every denomination earnestly contending for their distinctive peculiarities, and these peculiarities antipodes to each other. How are these heterogeneous elements to be united into one beautiful harmonious body? Such a union will not be brought about by a compromise. It is true that all evangelical denominations agree, in the leading essential doctrines of the Gospel. In a compromise these few doctrines might be retained in a creed that would unite the present sects, and every thing else would have to be rejected. If such a compromise creed were adopt-

ed, in a short time its articles would be explained so very differently, as to give rise to new divisions.

Before the watchmen will see eye to eye, they must possess much more of the mind that was in Jesus Christ than they now have generally. The truth as revealed and taught by the Spirit of inspiration, must be loved above all things. This love must be honest, and so intense, that prejudice, sectarianism, party pride, party zeal, and party ambition will stand abashed before it. The truth must be loved, because by it the eye of faith beholds the uncreated glories of the Triune Jehovah—because the heart is sanctified through the truth, and the believer has communion with God—because it is the power and wisdom of God, in the hands of the Holy Spirit, in the salvation of self-ruined man.

That the watchmen may “see eye to eye,” the principles of interpretation must be settled on such a basis as to place hermeneutics among the sciences, that admit of no doubt or uncertainty. This science must be understood, and the watchmen must conscientiously interpret the Bible according to its rules, uninfluenced by the consideration that it may not agree with his former opinions, or the dogmas of his church—or it may be unpopular, and operate to his injury.

The various creeds of sects ought to be the subject of christian, brotherly discussion. The errors should be pointed out, on the same principle of benevolence that we would show a friend that he had taken the wrong road;—and when the error is shewn, the individual and church who hold the error, should receive the information just as a friend who had taken the wrong road would receive the information that would set him right. Before the watchmen will see eye to eye, there must be an honest purpose to receive the truth, just as God has taught it, and to know what God has said, and what his language means according to the just principles of fixing the meaning of words.

Every lover of the Bible will agree, or ought to agree, that if the Bible has, without doubt, taught any one truth, then it has taught nothing inconsistent with that one truth; and every doctrine that necessarily grows out of that one truth, is equally true; and every part of any creed that does not agree with that one truth, must necessarily be erroneous.

The Bible has taught many truths in language so plain, and

the meaning is so obvious, as to leave no room for doubt and uncertainty. Among these truths is the following:—

The salvation of self-ruined man is so wholly of grace, as to exclude all merit or boasting.

Perhaps no christian will doubt whether this is a Bible truth; nevertheless, it may be calculated to imprint the truth on some minds, to see the proof of its truth.

Self-ruined.—"O Israel, thou hast destroyed thyself; but in me is thy help."—Hosea, 13: 9. "There is none righteous; no, not one." "There is none that seeketh after God." "There is none that doeth good; no, not one." "All are under sin."—Rom. 3: 9—19. See Eph. 2: 1—5, Eccle. 7: 29.

Salvation wholly of God.—"I, even I am the Lord, and beside me there is no Saviour."—Is. 43: 11. "Look unto me and be saved, all the ends of the earth."—Is. 45: 22. "There is no Saviour besides me."—Hosea, 13: 4. "Ye shall call his name Jesus; for he shall save his people from their sins."—Matt. 1: 21. See John 1: 29, Heb. 9: 22, 1 John, 1: 7, 1 Pet. 1: 18.

As to exclude merit or boasting.—"Who hath made thee to differ from another? and what hast thou that thou didst not receive? Now if thou didst receive it, why dost thou glory, as if thou didst not receive it?"—1 Cor. 4: 7. "By the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight. But the righteousness of God without the law is manifested. Even the righteousness of God which is by the faith of Jesus Christ. For all have sinned and come short of the glory of God. Being freely justified by his grace through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus. Where is boasting, then? It is excluded. By what law? Of works? Nay, but by the law of faith."—Rom. 3: 20—27. "To him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt. But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him, that justifieth the ungodly; his faith is counted for righteousness. Therefore it is of faith, that it might be by grace."—Rom. 4: 4, 5, 16.

We might quote many passages to the same purpose, but these are sufficient; and the plain obvious meaning of these texts, if they prove any thing, proves, *that the salvation of self-ruined man is so wholly of grace, as to exclude all merit or boasting.*

We now intend to shew, that the whole system of Bible doctrines grows out of this one truth, or necessarily flows from it.

And in the second place shew, that all heresy, or systems of error, are built on the opposite and false supposition, that man is not totally dead in sin, and that his salvation is not so wholly of grace as to exclude merit or boasting.

1. The whole system of Bible doctrines grows out of this one truth, &c.

If our proposition be true, that salvation is so wholly of grace as to exclude merit or boasting, then we are pardoned and justified on the condition of faith alone, and not on the condition of good works, which would lay a ground for boasting. This is what the Bible teaches, and it follows necessarily as an inference from our proposition.

2d. But justification by faith necessarily implies an atonement of infinite merit. Sin cannot be pardoned through the blood of bulls and goats; its demerit is too great—nothing but the blood of God's co-equal Son, could lay a safe-ground for the pardon of guilt. "Without the shedding of blood, is no remission."—Heb. 9: 22.

3d. But such an atonement could not be made, except by a divine person;—then Jesus Christ is truly and really God.

4th. To men dead in trespasses and sins, regeneration by the Spirit of God, making us *new creatures* in Christ Jesus, is a necessary and important step in salvation. "Ye must be born again." "Follow holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord." But "the new man is created in righteousness and true holiness."—Eph. 4: 24. Unless men are regenerated there could be no saving faith in Jesus Christ; for they, and they only believe, who are born of God.—John 1: 12, 13. But without faith there can be no pardon. "He that believeth not shall be damned," and without regeneration there can be no faith. Now, if regeneration is not wholly the work of the Holy Spirit; then salvation is not wholly of God. It fairly follows, that this work of the Spirit is the work of God—and the Spirit is a divine person—and the doctrine of three co-equal persons in the one Godhead is, and must be true, if salvation is wholly of God.

5th. As salvation is wholly of God, regeneration is God's work; but God cannot work without designing or determining

to work. We cannot conceive of a moral agent working wisely, without designing or choosing to work. Then all who are saved, God designed from eternity to exert on their hearts regenerating grace. But this determination to regenerate their hearts is ELECTION. We cannot suppose that the all-wise God just determined to regenerate some, but did not know who, or how many. Such a supposition would place the infinite wisdom of God below the wisdom of an intelligent and prudent man. When God renews a sinner, he carries into effect his present design. This is certainly true of all he ever has renewed, or that he ever will renew, unless he acts without design. This none will dare say. But God has no new purposes. All his designs and purposes are eternal. And when he renews the last of our race, he will have renewed all he intended from eternity to renew—not one more or less. “He hath chosen us in him, before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy.”—Eph. 1: 4. “Put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness.”—Eph. 4. 24. The plain and obvious sense of the language of inspiration teaches the doctrine of eternal and unconditional election;—and the doctrine must be true if man’s salvation is so wholly of God as to exclude boasting.

6th. If salvation is wholly of God, then the plan of grace originated with God, and every thing necessary to carry it into effect. But this comprehends all the works of creation and providence. The Lord Jesus Christ was appointed from eternity to the office and work of Mediator, for the elect were chosen in him as Mediator before the foundation of the world. For the sake of his work as Mediator, and for the sake of his Mediatorial kingdom, he created all things—all power in heaven and earth was given to him, and even the very angels, that he might employ the whole universe as instruments to carry on his grand and glorious designs as Mediator. He not only made all things, but upholds all things.—Hebrews, 1: 3. “For it became him, for whom are all things, and by whom are all things.”—Heb. 2: 10. Then God must have determined what kind the creation would be as to the material universe—the sensitive and rational creation, and he must have designed how he would rule and employ the whole, to effect his ultimate and chief end. This then establishes the doctrine

of God's decrees and particular providence. God's decrees are the purposes of his own mind about his own agency or providence; and his providence is elegantly and forcibly defined in the following almost inspired words:—"God's works of providence are his most holy, wise and powerful preserving and governing all his creatures, ordering them, and all their actions, to his own glory." Then if salvation is wholly of God, so as to exclude boasting, the doctrine of God's absolute decrees and particular providence must necessarily be true. Paul says to the Ephesians—"In whom also we obtained an inheritance, being predestinated according to the purpose of him that *worketh all things* after the counsel of his own will."—Eph. 1: 11. This is the language of reason—it is the language of God, and accords with the feelings of enlightened piety. This doctrine places God as the governor of the universe, determining to make and govern all things according to the dictates of unerring wisdom, for an end that pleases and gratifies infinite goodness, and by power that cannot be controlled or thwarted by creatures. Is not the interest of God's vast empire safe in his hands? Suppose God does not work all things according to the counsel of his own will, then the universe is left to the millions of creature agencies, some of which are without thought or design, and none of which are directed but by a mere speck of intelligence, that is utterly incapable of proposing any great and benevolent end worthy of God's great and endless kingdom, or discerning what means would be the best to accomplish such an end. Confusion, anarchy and ruin must be the consequence.

7th. If men are self-ruined, and their salvation is wholly of grace, then sin has ill-desert, and must consist in voluntary rebellion, and cannot be a mere misfortune or calamity. Grace is shewing favor to the guilty and ill-deserving, consistently with the public good. Mercy cannot bestow grace, except where justice might punish. Justice cannot punish a mere misfortune or calamity. Of course any favor shown to the unfortunate but innocent sufferer, is not mercy or grace;—it may be pity or commiseration, but not mercy or grace.

8th. Salvation is deliverance from sin, as well as from hell. But God delivers from sin by renewing the heart. This renewing produces love to God, repentance, faith in Jesus Christ,

and all the graces that belong to the christian. Yet all these graces are voluntary exercises, and have as much praise-worthiness, and are as properly rewardable in their nature, as the same amount of holiness in holy angels; and the christian is as much a free moral agent in these voluntary exercises, as angels are free moral agents in their voluntarily loving and serving God. Then God may be the efficient cause of men's voluntary exercises, without diminishing their moral agency, or suspending or infringing on it, or taking away its praise-worthiness, or its rewardable and commendable nature. For the same reason he may be the efficient cause of men's unholy affections, as in the case of hardening Pharaoh's heart; turning the hearts of the Egyptians to hate his people, and hardening the spirit of Sihon, king of Heshbon, and making his heart obstinate, without suspending their moral agency, or impairing it in the least. Nor did God's agency in these instances take away the blame-worthiness, or the desert of punishment of their unholy purposes and affections. If the agency of God in these cases suspended, or took away moral agency or ill-desert, then God cannot renew the heart, and produce love and faith without making the individual an involuntary machine. But what saith the Scriptures? "Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, to give repentance."—Acts, 5: 31. "Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance."—Acts, 11: 18. "If God peradventure will give them repentance."—2 Tim. 2: 25. "But now (God) commandeth all men every where to repent."—Acts, 17: 30.

Then he commands moral agents to repent, although the exalted Saviour gives repentance. And when men do repent, they obey as moral agents the command of God, and voluntarily repent. "They repented at the preaching of Jonah."—Luke, 11: 32. "Joy shall be over one sinner that repenteth."—Luke 15: 7—10. Then while man is a free moral agent he is a dependent agent. *God works in him.* This is divine efficiency to make him a machine? No, but *to will and to do.* This is man's moral agency, and the effect of God's working in him.

We have now seen that repentance and faith are essential steps in salvation. If God does not give them, then salvation is not wholly of God. If man exercises repentance and faith

independently, then he may boast—he has a something praiseworthy and commendable that he did not receive—a something that is suitable to receive a reward. Of course his salvation is not wholly of grace, nor was he wholly dead in trespasses and sins.

9th. If men have not power to do their duty, it would be unreasonable to command them to do their duty, or to condemn them for not doing it. And if God save them, his saving them would not be an exercise of mercy, nor the salvation a gracious favor, but a mere matter of pity or kindness.

10th. The system of doctrine which must necessarily be true, if our general principle is true, is CALVINISM, or the Doctrines of Grace, because they ascribe the salvation of self-ruined man to the free sovereign grace of God alone, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus.

11th. The scheme of doctrine that harmonizes with our general principle, humbles the pride of the human heart, and places him in the hands of a holy God, who is under no obligation to save him—and if he does save him, it will be by sovereign grace alone. This scheme of doctrine crosses the supreme selfishness of the depraved heart, and exposes it in all its naked deformity and turpitude, which rouses all its enmity to oppose and reject it.

12th. All who receive and propagate doctrines subversive of our essential gospel principle, are chargeable with errors that approach heresy.

13th. Denominations may be classed under those who embrace a system growing out of our general principle; or those who embrace a system growing out of a sentiment the very opposite; or those who hold a mixed system, partly growing out of one principle which is the test of Bible orthodoxy, and partly out of the opposite.

II.—In the second place, we are to show that all heresy, or systems of error, are built on the false supposition, *that man is not dead in sin, and that his salvation is not so wholly of grace as to exclude all merit, or boasting.*

Let us try the Unitarian scheme, including Arians, and Socinians. These sects deny the divinity of Christ. But if Christ is not a divine person, then, 1st. There is no atonement for sin, as we have shewn, that a divine person only could

make an atonement. 2d. If there is no atonement, none was necessary for the justification and final happiness of the human race. 3d. Then man is not guilty, condemned, and sinful, so as to need the renewing and sanctifying grace of God. Every reader will easily perceive that this scheme is in direct opposition to the principle which we propose as the test of Bible orthodoxy.

2.—We will next try Pelagians by this touch-stone. This sect rose about the end of the 4th century. They held,

1st. That the consequences of Adam's sin were confined to his own person, and that he would have died whether he had sinned or not.

2d. That we are born as free and unspotted as Adam, when he came out of the forming hand of his Creator.

3d. There is no need of divine influence to purify the heart.

4th. Mankind are capable of arriving at the highest degree of piety and virtue, by the use of their natural faculties and powers.

5th. That the grace of God is given according to our merits.

6th. External grace, or motives, arguments, and means, are necessary to excite men's endeavors; but there is no need of inward grace.

According to this system, man is not dead in trespasses and in sins; nor is salvation so wholly of grace as to exclude boasting.

3.—Will Semi-Pelagianism bear the test? This sect rose in the 5th century. Their scheme is a modification of the doctrines of Pelagius. They held,

1st. That God does not dispense his grace to one more than another, according to election, but is willing to save all men, if they comply with the terms of the Gospel.

2d. Christ died for all men.

3d. The grace purchased by Christ, and necessary to salvation, is offered to all men.

4th. Man, before he receives grace, is capable of faith, and holy desires, and must exercise them before he receives grace, and as the condition of receiving grace.

5th. The spirit operates on all alike, and men may resist the Spirit, or comply with his suggestions.

This system is a mixed one, containing a spice of truth,

which will stand the test, but has grievous errors, as corrupt as could grow out of the false supposition, that man is not wholly dead in sin, and his salvation is not so wholly of grace as to exclude boasting. If God does not dispense his grace to one more than another, then he who improves it may boast over him who does not. If the sinner exercises faith and holy desires as the condition of his receiving grace, then he has something that he did not receive—he made himself to differ, and his salvation is not wholly of God. According to this scheme God tries to convert all, but fails, and is disappointed.

4.—In the 17th century, a Professor of Leyden, by name Arminius, taught and published a system of doctrine, that has borne his name ever since. The peculiarities of his scheme are as follows:

1st. God has determined to bestow salvation on those who he foresaw would persevere in faith, and to inflict eternal death on those who continued in unbelief.

2d. Christ made an atonement for all mankind, but believers only partake of the benefits.

3d. Mankind are totally depraved, and depravity does not come in virtue of Adam's first sin.

4th. There is no such thing as irresistible grace in the conversion of sinners.

5th. Men may fall from faith, and finally forfeit their state of grace.

6th. Man has a self-determining power, to comply with, or resist the influences of the Spirit, and so render them effectual or ineffectual.

It is obvious to every reader that salvation is not so wholly of God as to exclude boasting.

5.—There has been advocated in the United States, for a few years past, some old errors, in rather a new dress, and on that account is sometimes called the *New Divinity*; and too many have been lead off by it from the *good old way*. According to this new divinity,

1st. God created a moral system, and endued with the power of independent action.

2d. God cannot efficiently produce the voluntary exercises of men.

3d. God presides over and governs this moral system by light and motive only.

4th. We never begin to sin, until we first perceive moral objects.

5th. It is essential to moral agents to have an impulse to happiness; which impulse is neither good nor bad, but is the ultimate motive of all our actions—good and bad. It produces every radical change that takes place in the character of man, as the will invariably goes with this impulse to happiness, and the dictates of the understanding.

This system is so unfortunate as not to contain one truth to make it even tolerable. According to this scheme,

1st. The Holy Spirit does not regenerate sinners by creating them anew in Christ Jesus, for God cannot efficiently produce holy affections. Nor is there any necessity for the regenerating influence of the Holy Spirit, as the will always follows the impulse to happiness, and the dictates of the understanding.

2d. Faith and repentance are voluntary exercises;—but as God cannot produce the voluntary exercises of the heart, then he does not produce faith and repentance. Of course salvation is not so wholly of grace as to exclude boasting. According to this scheme God cannot work in men to will and to do of his good pleasure, for man is endued with independent action, and God cannot efficiently produce “to will,” for this would be voluntary exercises.

3d. Thousands die before they perceive moral objects;—then if they are saved; they must be saved without having been lost, as they have not sinned. At any rate, there is no grace in saving them, nor is regeneration necessary in order to their salvation.

4th. If man is an independent agent, and God cannot be the efficient cause of his voluntary exercises, then it is in vain to pray to God to renew the hearts of men; especially if they are not in a situation to perceive light and motive, from derangements by sickness, or other causes.

5th. If man is an independent agent, and God cannot produce efficiently men’s voluntary exercises, then God never did determine, at least it would have been useless to determine on whom he would bestow saving grace;—nor did he choose them in Christ before the foundation of the world, that they should

be holy;—nor can he foreknow who will be saved, as their action is independent;—nor could he predict any future event, which depended on the voluntary agency of men.

But the advocates of this rotten system may say, God both fore-knows and predicts the future actions of men, and elects whom he will to salvation, because he determines men's circumstances, and knows perfectly what effect the circumstances will have. We answer then, man is not an independent agent, but is wholly dependent on circumstances which originate with God, and of which he is the author, and gives them all their influence.

6.—There is another set of opinions, by some called Old Schoolism, that deserves to be brought to the Scriptural test of orthodoxy.

1st. The guilt of Adam's first sin is imputed to his posterity, so that they are justly condemned, and deserve to be damned.

Then the hapless posterity are not *self-ruined*, but ruined by an imputation of the guilt of another. Then, to save them could not be mercy; and if the favor of salvation is bestowed, the favor may be pity or kindness, but cannot be grace.

2d. Original sin does not consist in voluntary sin, but in a moral corruption, that exists in the soul previous to the first volition, and makes it certain that the first voluntary exercise will be sinful, and all succeeding exercises until arrested by regeneration.

If this be so, then sin is a mere calamity, and there can be no grace or mercy in saving from a calamity; as the sinner is under a fatal necessity of sinning—it is unavoidable.

3d. Man has no ability of any kind to do his duty, or to obey God; yet God requires him to obey on the pain of eternal death.

To save an individual from sufferings that were not brought on him by his own improper conduct, and from which he has no power to deliver himself, has no claim to be regarded as an act of mercy; nor is it *grace* to save him from his distress;—but to punish him would be abhorrent not only to mercy, but also to benevolence and justice.

4th. The atonement was made for the *elect only*, by which their debt was paid; and therefore they are justly entitled to pardon.

Is there any grace or mercy in forgiving a debt that a friend has paid to the last farthing? And is it not a satire on common sense, to say that a debt can be forgiven, which has been fully paid?

5th. Christ obeyed the law, and suffered the penalty, as a legal substitute for his people only, the ELECT; but offers salvation to the non-elect, and will punish them eternally for not accepting the offer.

Can there be grace, or mercy, or honesty, in offering an atonement to those for whom no atonement has been made, and God knows the fact, that no provision has been made for them? But he also knows, if the sentiment be true stated in the 3d article—that they have no ability of any kind to accept. An offer, to be a gracious offer, must offer a good—a good suited to the condition of the person. The good must be placed within the reach of the person to whom the offer is made; and he must have power to accept the thing offered; and the offerer must make the offer honestly and sincerely, in the exercise of good will. Remove any of these particulars from an offer, and it cannot be a gracious offer. A master offers a servant, who by crime has made himself a cripple, incapable of moving hand or foot, a medicine that will certainly restore him. But the medicine does not exist, and the master knows it. But if it does exist, it is not placed within the reach of the servant; and if it was, he has no power of any kind to receive or take it.—Can any body believe that the master has made a gracious offer to the servant? Now, suppose the master punishes him severely for not accepting;—would it not be consummate injustice and cruelty, which the veriest tyrant on earth would scarcely be capable of perpetrating! And shall such horrible principles be ascribed to the Judge of all the earth, who can do no wrong?

We are now prepared to make some inferences from the subject.

1st. The term *heretic* is often given to those whose religious opinions differ from others who esteem themselves orthodox, very unjustly. The term ought to be understood, and never used, except it is done with propriety. A heretic is one who obstinately adheres to an error, which is subversive of the essential great principle that is the Scriptural test of Bible or-

thodoxy, after the nature and tendency of the error has been clearly shown to him, yet he cleaves to the error because he loves it, and rejects the truth from selfish and sinister motives. Then the heart, in its preferences, must be taken into the account, in determining the character of a heretic. If his love of error so blinds his understanding that he will not see the truth, and the evidences that prove the opinion to be erroneous, he cannot plead this as an excuse to save him from the guilt of heresy.

2d. Systems built on these different and opposing principles, are as wide apart as truth and falsehood, and as light and darkness. The one says a saint is made to differ from a sinner by an effectual influence of the Holy Spirit, changing his heart. The other supposes the difference is made by a self-determining power, or by an impulse to happiness.

3d. The system built on the fact, *self-ruined man is saved by grace alone, so as to exclude all boasting*, represents God differently from any system built on the false principle, that *man is not so dead in sin and so wholly saved by grace as to exclude all merit or boasting*. The one represents God as a holy, wise, gracious and almighty sovereign, doing whatever his wisdom and goodness dictate, above control. The other represents him, either as an indifferent spectator, or as disappointed in his designs, or thwarted by the uncontrollable and independent agency of man.

4th. They represent sinful fallen man differently. The one represents him as a self-ruined, voluntary rebel against God, and wholly dependent on the mere sovereign mercy of God for holiness and salvation. The other kindred schemes represent man's conversion as owing to a better use, by some, of free will, than has been made by others. Therefore they reject Divine sovereignty, effectual calling, election, and final perseverance. The points of difference are not so much on the questions, is man a moral agent?—has he natural power to do his duty? But the question—has he any heart even to begin to do his duty, until he is made willing in a day of God's power?

5th. If men's hearts were right with God, there would be but little difficulty in understanding and receiving the truth, without any great difference in their views. "If any man will

do his will, he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God."—John, 7: 17. But men love darkness rather than light.

6th. The glorious doctrine of God's eternal decrees, or purposes, and of his efficient agency or providence, extend to all events, to all creatures, and to all their agency, or actions. These doctrines are built on our test principle, as we have shewn. They are also pleasing to God, and to all holy creatures. They are necessary to prove a God of infinite perfections. And they are connected with the highest good of God's intelligent system.

1st. They are pleasing to God, and all holy intelligences. God must love his own decrees, as he was moved to form them all in unerring wisdom, and in boundless goodness, and for the *best possible end*; that a God could propose to accomplish by his almighty power, and these decrees are the rule of his own conduct. "He worketh all things after the counsel of his own will." Among these all things, are the *wills, moral agency*, of angels, men, and devils. Holy intelligences feel as God feels, and love what God loves. They rejoice in a government the best possible, with God at the head, extending from the most minute particulars to the greatest. Is not God most wise, good, and powerful? And is it not desirable that such a being should form and execute a plan of government, embracing all creatures, events and actions from eternity to eternity? What holy creature would not rather trust the universe in the hands of God, than any where else?

2d. These doctrines are necessary to prove a God of absolute perfection. Can an all-wise, good, and powerful God act without a plan? Could a wise man, in the most momentous affairs, act without a plan? Can such a being as God create a universe without designing, in all respects, to what use he would apply it, or what its ultimate condition should be?

3d. The highest good of the intelligent universe. These doctrines are the only evidence we have, that all things shall be conducted and terminate in the best manner. Go off from this ground, and we meet a gloomy uncertainty with regard to what may take place. But if God has made wise and good decrees, and works all things after the counsel of his own will, then, all things will be done in the best possible manner.

7th. The system of truth built on our test principle, disco-

vers, above all others, the moral excellence of God, and the nature of his holy kingdom. It teaches that the glory of God consists in being good, and doing good, on the largest possible scale, and that he is most glorified when his kingdom is made as holy and as happy as Almighty power, under the direction of infinite wisdom, can make it.

5th. This system of truth gives the best opportunity of knowing and enjoying God, as it makes manifest God's character in the clearest manner. Bring a sinner to feel his wants, his guilt and helpless misery. Let him feel true godly sorrow for his sins—then set before him every scheme of religious truth, so that he will understand them all, and he would unhesitatingly choose the one built on our *test principle*, if he were free from bias, and pre-conceived opinions.

6th. In conclusion, we assert, that all heresy arises from an unsubdued, proud, selfish heart, opposed to the nature of truth. Heresy is one of the works of the flesh.—Gal. 5: 20. In all its shapes and forms unfriendly to holiness, and all heresy has the same origin, yet some systems of error may be at a greater remove from the truth than others. It is exceedingly repugnant to the carnal heart to admit entire dependence on the sovereign mercy of God to raise us from sin to holiness and salvation, and that our renewal by grace does not depend in the least on the co-operation of an obedient free will, and external means.

7th. It is objected to christianity, that there are so many systems professedly founded on the Bible, that we do not know what to believe. We answer, the Bible teaches but one system of truth, which may be tested by our principle. And all systems of error are founded on the opposite false principle.

C. N.

PHILOSOPHY OF PRAYER.—It is a certain fact, that whenever a man prays aright, he forgets the philosophy of it, and feels as if his supplications *really would* make a difference in the determination and conduct of the Deity. In this spirit are the prayers recorded in the Bible.—*Selected.*

Presbyterianism.

(Continued from page 112.)

As the Synod of Tennessee has lately called attention to the very important subject of "Presbyterial Ordination," by the publication (in the Magazine, vol. 1, p. 286) of the Report of a Committee of the Presbytery of Union on that subject, "for the examination of the Church at large," I propose to enter, in the present article, on the examination of this subject. I shall commence with the term *ordain*. This term I find about 40 times in the Bible. It means, in general, to *determine*, or *establish*. It means also, to *choose*, to *appoint*, to *constitute*. It is applied to both persons and things. I shall notice the instances where it is applied to persons, by which it will appear that no person is in the Bible *said* to have been ordained by the imposition of hands. The term *ordain* does not occur in connection with the phrase, imposition of hands. Whether hands *were* imposed for this purpose or not, is not now the inquiry. It is asserted only that if they were, the term *ordain* does not show it. There is no law requiring it to be so done, and no statement that it ever was so done. I shall give the Greek, with a leading definition of each word; and for the sake of keeping up the chain of the argument, a few cases also where the term *ordain* does not occur:

1. Cases where *God* is the ordainer: Jer. 1: 5—"Ordained a prophet." Ro. 13: 1—"The powers that be." *Gr. Tasso*, to arrange. Eph. 2: 10—"Christians to walk in good works." *Protismas*, to choose. Ac. 13: 48—"Ordained to eternal life." *Tasso*, to decree. Jude 4—"To condemnation." *Prographo*, to write before hand. Ac. 10: 42—"Jesus to be judge of quick and dead." *Oridzo*, to fix as a boundary. There could be no imposition of hands in these cases.

2. The 212 porters were not ordained by the imposition of hands—1 Chr. 9: 22. They were "chosen," and appointed to their posts by casting lots.—Ch. 26: 13.

3. In Heb. 5: 1. 8: 3, we are told that every high priest taken from among men is ordained, &c. *Kathistemi*, to establish. This was done by *anointing*.—Ex. 40: 13—15.

4. The Saviour was not so invested with his mediatorial office. Having been baptized, he was *anointed* with the Holy Ghost.—Mat. 3: 13—17; Ps. 45: 7; Ac. 10: 38.

5. It does not appear that he so ordained his 12 apostles.—Mark 3: 14. *Poieo*, to make. He says himself he *chose* them. John 6: 70. *Eklego*, to select. And Peter says he chose them.—Ac. 10: 41. *Procheirotoneo*, to choose by holding up the hand, or simply to choose in any way.

6. When a vacancy occurred in the apostolic family, and Matthias was called to fill it, it does not appear that he was so ordained. He was *chosen* by lot, and forthwith “numbered with the eleven.”—Ac. 1: 22—26. *Ginomai*, to cause to be.

7. The Saviour did not so ordain the 70. He *appointed* them.—Luke 10: 1. *Anadeiknumi*, to bring forward.

8. Finally, when he commissioned his apostles to go into all the world, &c., he did not so ordain them.—Mark 16: 15—17.

9. Paul was not so ordained. He says (1. Tim. 2: 7—*Tithe-mi*, to place,) that he was ordained an apostle, a preacher, and a teacher of the Gentiles. But the history of his conversion and first ministry, in Acts, 9: 1—22, and his own account in Gal. 1: 15—23, show that he was not ordained by the imposition of hands. Ananias imposed hands upon him, but for another purpose. He was not authorized to ordain him. God says of him, Ac. 9: 15—“He is a chosen vessel,” &c. *Ekle-gidzomi*, to tell off, or count out.

10. We have no evidence that Barnabas was so ordained.—Ac. 18: 24—30. V. 22—*Ehapestells*, to send out.

11. There is no evidence that Apollos was so ordained.—Acts, 18: 24—30.

12. There is no certain evidence that Timothy was so ordained.

It is not *said* that he was. The term does not occur in his case. Nor is it intimated in the first, or asserted in any notice that we have of him, that he was so ordained. Hands were imposed upon him, (1 Tim. 4: 14—2 Tim. 1: 6,) but it cannot be proved that they were imposed *before* he entered upon his ministry; and indeed the earlier notices we have of him favor the idea that they were not.—Ac. 16: 1—3. 1 Cor. 4: 17. Nor can it be proved that they were imposed for the purpose of ordaining him. The report of the Presbytery above referred

to, does not maintain that they were. It maintains that he was "*appointed*" to the office of an evangelist by Paul himself, but without showing *how*, that the hands of the apostle and of the Presbytery were both laid on him *at the same time*, but neither of them for the purpose of ordaining him;—those of the apostle for the purpose of imparting to him "the miraculous powers of the Holy Ghost," and those of the Presbytery, "as a solemn and public *recognition* of him as an evangelist, and of their *concurrence* with the apostle in setting him apart to that office," that if the Presbytery had imposed hands to ordain him, they would have invested him with an office *higher* than that held by themselves, which could not be.

But suppose the Report to *mean* that the hands of the apostle were imposed on Timothy for the double purpose of ordaining him, and of imparting to him the supernatural gift of the Holy Spirit; then I would ask—if the hands of the apostle invested him with his office, what importance could there be in the Presbytery *recognizing* that fact? Or what propriety in their expressing their *concurrence* with the apostle, if their act added nothing to the authority of Timothy? If it is perfectly farsical for Presbyters to impose hands with the Bishop in the Episcopal church, where it is not allowed that their act adds anything to the validity of the ordination, why should it be less so here?

Again. If the ordination of Timothy was complete without the concurrence of the Presbytery, any ordination which he himself might perform, or any that may have been performed by any apostle or evangelist, would be complete likewise without a Presbytery;—and yet, if there was a propriety in associating a Presbytery in Timothy's case, there would be in every case. But how absurd! A Presbytery of grave and pious men, "having the care of souls," solemnly impressing hands in every instance of ordination, simply to keep an apostle or evangelist company! Or to show that they had *no objection* to the ordination, when, if they had, it would avail nothing!

Furthermore. If the Presbytery had no right to ordain Timothy, what right had they to *recognize* his ordination? What business had they with it, one way or another?

Once more. If, as the argument supposes, the imposition

of hands is essential to ordination,—if the hands of the Presbyters added nothing to the validity of the ordinations in which the apostles and evangelists were concerned,—if there are no cases recorded in which they were not concerned,—if their offices were extraordinary and temporary, and they had no successors, what became of the power to ordain at their death? If Presbyters had no such power while the apostles and evangelists lived, and were not their successors, where did they acquire it at their death?

Is not the truth here this:—That, in whatever way ordinations may have been performed, so far as the ministerial office was concerned, apostles, evangelists, and Presbyters were perfectly equal, possessing a common right to perform all the ordinary functions of the ministry,—that ordination was one of these functions,—and that the peculiarities which characterized any as apostles or evangelists, were superadded to, and conjoined with their ministerial office, but without giving them a *ministerial* pre-eminence over others, and that these peculiarities alone were extraordinary and temporary?

If, however, the hands of Paul and of the Presbytery were imposed on Timothy at the same time, is it not reasonable that they were imposed for the same purpose? And if those of Paul were imposed for the purpose of imparting the supernatural gift of the Holy Ghost, and if those of the Presbytery could not have been imposed for the mere purpose of recognition and concurrence, then they were imposed for the purpose of imparting the same gift. Or, if those of the apostle were imposed for the double purpose of imparting the gift and ordaining, those of the Presbytery were most likely imposed for the same double purpose. The most, however, that can be asserted with certainty, is, that they were imposed at the same time, for the same purpose, and that that purpose was, to impart “the gift,” which is agreed to be the supernatural gift of the Holy Ghost, such as Simon the Sorcerer sought to purchase.—Ac. 8: 20. This much seems to be declared on the face of the text. 1 Tim. 4: 14—Paul was a member of the Presbytery.

But the Report claims it as a prerogative of the apostles to impart the supernatural gift of the Holy Ghost. Is this true? Was this function restricted to the apostles? Ananias was not an apostle. All we know of him is, that he was a “disciple,”

i. e. a christian; and yet he imposed hands on Saul, "that he might be filled with the Holy Ghost."—Acts, 9: 17.

But it is said Paul claimed to have imparted the gift by the imposition of his *own* hands.—2 Tim. 1: 6. Ans. He had before reminded Timothy (1 Tim. 4: 14) that the Presbytery was associated with him, and does not repeat it here. He might have omitted the Presbytery in the second instance, in order to impress on Timothy his peculiar paternal claims, of which he was forward to remind him. Timothy might have been pointed out "by prophesy" to the Presbytery, or to Paul as a presbyter, as readily as to him as an apostle.

13. There is no evidence that Titus was ordained by the imposition of hands.—Gal. 2: 1—3.

14. It does not appear that the Elders (Presbyters) of Lycaonia were so ordained.—Ac. 14: 23—*Cheirotono*, to elect by holding up the hands. The same word here used, is translated to *choose*, in 2 Cor. 8: 19; also in Ac. 10: 41. But did the apostles choose them? Yes, just as Moses did the judges. Ex. 18: 25. They superintended their selection.

15. There is no evidence that the Cretan Elders (Presbyters) were so ordained.—Tit. 1: 5—*Kathistemi*, to establish.

We have now examined, I believe, all the instances in which the term ordain is applied to persons. We have, in these instances, eleven different words translated to *ordain*. And we have seen that no one of them determines the manner in which the ordination, in any instance, was performed. "No rites or ceremonies are mentioned as making any part of the ordination; nor does the connection of the texts show that any are implied." Nay, more—the import of the words in every instance is against the idea that rites and ceremonies were essential, or were used.

We have referred, also, in connection, to perhaps all the cases of importance, by carefully consulting which it will appear, that in no instance is it clearly evident that the ordination was performed by the imposition of hands, and that in every instance there is a high degree of probability that imposition was not essential. It is not denied, however, that hands *may* have been imposed for the purpose of ordaining, or that there is a propriety, and even an importance connected with

it. This will farther appear, if we should consider hereafter more fully, THE IMPOSITION OF HANDS.

PRESBUTEROS.

Missionary.

BORNEO.—LETTER FROM MR. STEELE, FEB. 26, 1846.

Hope for the Dyaks.

THE history of this mission, it is well known, has been peculiarly trying, not only to the brethren who compose it, but to their friends and patrons at home. It is not strange, therefore, that the expediency of continuing the mission should have come under consideration, both in Borneo and in this country. Although there may seem to be no special propriety in the discussion of this question at the present time, this letter of Mr. Steele has its interest and its value.

“We cannot, as do many whom we love, regard this field as hopeless. The term is misapplied; and we still look for the day when the rising Dyak shall spurn the thralldom of the soul which Islamism in power imposes, and stand before the world in energy and moral worth. Now the immediate neighbors to our position are tamely wretched, and destitute of the manliness to secure by honorable toil a sufficiency of wholesome food; and at each annual recurrence of this particular season we are daily importuned by the very personifications of indolence, soliciting what they facetiously term “work.” We use no concealment. There is much that is painful; and this circumstance, that so many with resolute sloth prepare for and encounter months of semi-starvation previous to every harvest, is an oppression to the heart. Still this desperate, this seemingly cherished poverty, is the legitimate child of arbitrary taxation and wanton contempt. Much of the evil is purely political; and suitable appliances and change may rapidly raise from this state of syncope these people of our charge. To the eye of the most incurious observer the Dyak has far more of the man than the Malay; and hope concerning him may be less far from the change to heart-cheering fruition, than multitudes

have determined to believe. Our opinions concerning him bide their time.

Are many heart-sick, that among them the cause of God has no apparent success? The same reason operates upon the Dyak which prevents good citizens at home from receiving, with the heart, that truth on which the conscience fixes its attesting seal. And if there be those who, four years from the date at which our houses rose amid this wilderness, can say "Withdraw;" our reply is simple and but one. If hearing be essential to belief, and preaching be necessarily precedent to hearing, then, as we honor our consecration vows, he who has heard least or not at all of Christ and him crucified, may not with innocence be utterly debarred from gospel truth, while there is a constant increase of privilege in our geographically favored Union, so many of whose millions, as the Dyak, hear but to reject. This letter is written while the evening hours of your day of prayer for colleges are passing; and though recently informed that at our own school of the prophets, so late as September last, not one could be named who hoped to preach the gospel beyond his native land, we will hope while we have life. Lord and Master, may the past day's prayers meet with mercy's answer, to the glory of thy grace!"

To-Day.

What have you done to-day worth remembering? Is there one bright spot to be seen, as you look back? Have you brushed away one tear? Have you gladdened one heart? Have you given wings to one pure thought? Or has the day been wholly lost to you? Remember, the precious days are fast passing away, bearing their record on parchments that no flames will consume. Shall they all be wasted? Will no good influence go out from you to gladden the earth and rejoice the skies? Will no hearths be made joyful by you? no hearts be quickened and animated by the truth? Will you live on, listless and indifferent to all around you—no matter who sins and who perishes? If you have wasted your precious time, commence from this hour a new life. Never lay your head upon

your pillow, without easting your thoughts back through the day, and inquiring what record has been borne to the skies. "It is not all of life to live."—*Selected.*

The Uncultivated Mind.

"I don't believe it," is the language of a barren and uncultivated mind. A person of intelligence may be startled at a new idea, but never contradicts or doubts till he has well examined the subject. Nothing is more trying to the patience of a man, than to converse with unintelligent and ignorant persons, who doubt the truth of every thing they cannot comprehend. Tell an individual who has been brought up in superstitious ignorance, there is no such thing as a ghost, and he will deny it at once. Why do you believe in ghosts? inquire of him. "Because I do," will be his reply. Did you ever see one? "No, but my uncle did." Until such a person becomes intelligent you can do nothing with him. Tell the same individual that it takes the light of the nearest star about ten years to reach the earth, and he will at once reply, "I don't believe it." For the sublime study he has no taste; but he will seize with avidity all the ghost stories, and silly trash that is issued from the press—from which not one substantial idea can be obtained.—*Selected.*

CHRIST IS MINE.—A gentleman took a friend to the roof of his house to show him the extent of his possession. Waving his hand about, "There," said he, "is my estate." Pointing to a great distance on one side, "Do you see that farm? Well, that is mine." Pointing again to the other side, "Do you see that house? That also belongs to me." In turn his friend asked, "Do you see that little village out yonder? Well, there lives a poor woman in that village who can say more than all this." "Ah! what can she say?" "Why, she can say, CHRIST IS MINE."—*Selected.*

“The Great Iron Wheel”—No. 2, Sustained by High Authority.

ROTHERWOOD, Sept. 10, 1847.

Rev. A. Converse, D. D., (Ed. of *Christian Observer*, Phila.)

REV. AND DEAR BROTHER:—You have received some blows on our behalf, and like the mild Athenian to the fiery Spartan, you have said; “Strike, but let me speak.” Or, like a Greater One, you seem to say—“If I have spoken evil, bear witness of the evil: but if well, why smitest thou me?” Let me have a word through your columns.

In the magnificent vision of Ezekiel, chap. 1, the cherubic wheels had rings so high that they were dreadful. And their rings were full of eyes round about them. And they went every one straight forward: whither the Spirit was to go they went: and they turned not when they went.

Is “The Great Iron Wheel” of Methodism like this? Or is it our exhibition of the “rings” which seems so “dreadful” to the brethren. They have gathered round the lifting up of the “Wheel,” and as they have seen how it went with the spirit of the living creature in it, the voice of their speech is as the noise of an host. Alas! it is not that heavenly noise of great waters, as the voice of the Almighty. Ah! no. It is very earthly and sensual. Like the Demetrian uproar at Ephesus, the more part know not wherefore they are confused. Some cry one thing about the Wheel, and some another. One shouts—“It is a mammoth distillery of Anti-Methodistic slander, and general abuse. It is a doggery, gilling out acrid liquor.”—[*Nashville Christian Advocate*.] No, says the New York Advocate and Journal, “It is like the ravings of a lunatic—it bears all the marks of wilful, deliberate, and malignant falsehood. It is so vulgar, so filthy, and obscene, that none but a maniac, or an infidel of the lowest grade, would venture to broach such a supposition.”

This is the notice taken of “The Great Iron Wheel” No. 2, by Methodist papers, as we perceive in the columns of the *Christian Observer* of the 3d inst. The voice of this shouting is very terrible. But it is the roaring of “any sucking dove,”

compared with the thunder, in imitation of the lion, around us in Tennessee. One might think the sky of Methodism would split. So great is the noise, it has somewhat drowned the uproar in the camp-meeting altars. For once we say—Amen! Writers on sounds tell us, that the vibrations of great noises destroy one another, so that the ear will not be disturbed by them. Other philosophers say, the centre of a whirlwind is calm. This must be so, from our experience in the midst of the wind and roar of Methodism.

We deem it proper to notice the charges of falsehood and obscenity preferred against "The Great Iron Wheel"—No. 2.

First.—The article, it is said by the "Advocate and Journal," bears all the marks of wilful, deliberate, and malignant falsehood." Let us see. "The Great Iron Wheel"—No. 2, is a comparison of the Methodist Class-Meeting with the Roman Catholic Confessional.

We copied whole pages from the discipline to this effect:—that the class-leader shall feel it his duty to see each person in his class once a week *at least*, to enquire how their souls prosper,—and that the members of the church are under the *same obligation* to meet the class-leader, with the *penalty* hanging over them of *exclusion* from the church if they do not. Again;—the leader may meet the members in private, (Wesley's Works, vol. 5, p. 187,) and may ask them any questions he pleases touching their religious state,—that three or four true believers who have confidence in each other form a band—only it must be observed, that in one of these bands all must be men, or all women, and all married, or all unmarried. These persons agree to meet once a week at least. Then they are to desire some person among them to speak his own state first, and to ask the rest in order *as many* and *as searching questions* as may be concerning their religious state, sins and temptations. The Leader *must ask at every meeting*, and each member *has bound himself or herself before-hand, to answer* the four following questions:—1. What known sins have you committed since our last meeting? 2. What particular temptations have you met with? 3. How were you delivered? 4. What have you thought, said, or done, of which you doubt whether it be sin or not?

These questions, we affirmed, did cover the whole ground

occupied by the Romish confessional. That there is absolutely no question, by possibility, which the priest can ask, but may be asked by the band-leader. That Mr. Wesley acknowledged, that objections were, in his day, boldly and frequently urged, that all these bands were Popery. That this was the view taken by such men as Bishop Lavington of the Episcopal church of England, and by Dr. Erskine of the Presbyterian church of Scotland. Moreover, we proved that Mr. Wesley admitted the Popish confessional was in no wise condemned by his church—nay, recommended in some cases.

Furthermore, we declared, that the class system secured a delusive peace of mind, by naked confession at another place than the throne of God, just as in Popery. We contended that this was true from the great principle in every man, to seek relief from the burden of sin. Thus, God, in the Bible, says, come confess to me and find peace. But the Catholic church proclaims, come and find forgiveness through the priest. And Methodism teaches, that Christ requires acknowledgment of sins *through the class and band*. Relief, we affirmed, was obtained in all these ways—by confession to God, with or without repentance—by going to the priest, and by confession in the class or band. The relief was various in kind or degree. But ease of conscience was secured in all these modes of finding peace.

This principle in our nature, which finds relief by revealing our condition, is of the widest application. The simple *telling* of bodily pain to a friend or a physician *gives ease*. Every child feels this, and every groaning man, whether he be upon a bed of down, or the field of battle. Nay, the disclosing of pecuniary embarrassments and losses *affords relief*. Every body knows this, from 'Squire Dogberry, in Shakspeare, who confessed he was "a fellow who had had losses," down to little George, who, as he paddles along to school, seeks comfort from brother Ned, by telling him how many marbles have dropped through the hole in his bag. Every body knows this to be true, unless we might find a man willing to "risk his reputation for sanity of mind and integrity of character," by writing "*sylogistically*" in defence of Methodism. Yes, the confession of bodily pain, mental trouble, or conscious guilt, at any time, and any where, *is relief to man*, however different

in kind and degree. The great delusion of Rome, we said, is, to take advantage of this principle at the confessional.—And the class and band have their *power* in the perversion of the same "*want*" of the soul. *Formal absolution*, as granted by the priest, we affirmed, is only the *perfection* of the delusion: *the real absolution is the simple fact, that ease of mind is obtained by making confession in supposed obedience to the will of God.* This relief is as truly found, although not to the same degree, in the class and band, as before the priest. Moreover, we pointed out the gross perversion of Scripture in the priest, and Mr. Wesley, in their gloss upon James, 5: 16. We now add, it is all idle to hunt in Scott, and other commentators, to sustain the class and band. And it is all idle to bring the Presbyterian *enquiry meeting* in comparison with the class system. The *enquiry meeting* is not, usually, for members at all—it is for those out of the church who wish to converse on the subject of religion. But whoever they may be, it is only an occasional act of persons *who come or not, at their mere plea-*

The class, on the other hand, is a *compulsory* meeting. The members of the Methodist church are, by the discipline, *compelled* to attend class, or be *excluded* from the society. It is this *compulsory* feature in the class which makes it so odiously like the Romish confessional. Yes. It is this *compulsory church drill*, with the *penalty of church death*, if you do not come to the *drill*. It is this *leader drill*—this *preacher drill*, week after week, month after month, year after year, which arms the Methodist preacher with the power of the priest, to control and crush the members into a mass, that must become as subservient as that of the priest-ridden Catholic. Like causes must result in like effects,—and the effect is even now as darkness visible.

The above is the substance of the article entitled "The Great Iron Wheel"—No. 2. Every position is vindicated by perfect quotations from the discipline and the writings of Mr. Wesley. How have we been met? By the examination of our argument? No. How then? Why, by the loud outburst everywhere—"Slanderer, slanderer, slanderer—liar, liar, liar." "Wilful, deliberate and malignant falsehood. Raving of a lunatic." "Mammoth distillery of Anti-Methodistic slander. A doggerly, gilling out acrid liquor." What else? Answer—

Complimentary personalities, redolent with the fragrance of Methodism.

The preachers deny every thing, and teach their people to deny every thing. Very many Methodist members have roundly asserted that there is nothing in the discipline about band meetings!! And preachers and people have again and again said, that these meetings no longer existed in Methodist practice. We shall see presently.

We might calmly rest in the midst of this whirlwind, and let the dust fall around us. Or, it would be easy to stand where we are, until assaulted with the weapons of legitimate controversy. But we choose to advance with some battalions and banners of our reserve.

First, let us brush away the swarms of raw militia, who are in the van as sharpshooters, armed with pop-gun shouts—"O! there are no band meetings now,—there have been no band meetings in forty-five years,—we never heard of a band meeting." Now, let us silence this mock-musketry, with a Methodist captured gun. Listen! "We," say the editors of the *New York Advocate and Journal*—"We have attended class meetings and band meetings, again and again, ever since the year 1803." This, we think, settles the question whether there are band meetings in the Methodist church. Here are men who say they have attended them some forty-five years.

We are now up with the main body, entrenched to the teeth behind loose sand, and loaded to the muzzle with shouts of "Slander—Lie—Wilful, deliberate and malignant falsehood—Mammoth distillery—Doggerly—Acrid liquor—hurrah for Methodism!" Hark! Presbyterian cannon—another—another—a bomb—a roar of artillery—nearer and nearer—it is one blaze of light. Listen—we give extracts from a Presbyterian work, whose statements are endorsed by Rev. Dr. Alexander of Princeton—Dr. Musgrave of Baltimore—Dr. Elliot of Pittsburg—the *Christian Herald* of Pittsburg—Rev. J. Moore, of Mifflin, Pennsylvania—T. D. Baird—Rev. Dr. Engles, of Philadelphia, and the *Princeton Biblical Repertory*.

The writer of the work before us, Rev. Dr. Annan, (Presbyterian,) under the head of *Auricular Confession*, quotes from the Methodist discipline some of the passages we have given to our readers, and then says—"They manage this matter a

little differently at Rome, but it is doubtful whether they have a *better confessional* than this. But there is more to come. Among the questions proposed to one before he is admitted to the band, we find the following:—‘Is it your desire and design to be on this and all other occasions entirely open, so as to speak without disguise and without reserve?’ Thus the article stands in the discipline; but Mr. Wesley wrote the latter part originally as follows—‘So as to speak every thing that is in your heart without EXCEPTION, without disguise, and without reserve?’ Popery herself demands no more *thorough confession* than this. And besides, the following questions are required to be asked at every band meeting:—‘1. What known sins have you committed since our last meeting? 2. What peculiar temptations have you met with? 3. How were you delivered? 4. What have you thought, said, or done, of which you doubt whether it be sin or not?’ Confession as managed by the church of Rome is infinitely *preferable* to confession as conducted under the auspices of Mr. Wesley. If the priest divulges what is made known to him under the character of confessor, he is liable by law to suffer death where Popery is established. But in these band societies, the most unreserved confession is to be made in the hearing of a dozen or twenty women or boys, who are at liberty to expose publicly all they hear, without being obnoxious to any penalty at all. After what we have seen, it is not surprising that Mr. Wesley should write a highly commendatory life of Mr. De Renty, (a Roman Catholic.) Nor that the following passage should proceed from his pen:—‘One day he visited a person who, from groundless suspicion, had cruelly used his wife. Mr. DeRenty accosted him with such language that *he was persuaded at length to go to confession!!*’ And of DeRenty himself, Wesley says—‘He made his confession to a priest almost every day till his death!!’ This biography of a thorough papist, Wesley placed in his *christian Library*, and recommended to his followers. Wesley says—‘DeRenty had great respect for *holy persons*, especially for *priests*. Whenever he met them he saluted them with *profound humility*: and in his travels he would *alight off his horse* to do it. And without reply or disputing, with the utmost respect and submission, he exactly followed the order of his confessor.’—(P. 230, &c.)

This quotation is from Dr. Annan's book, entitled, "Difficulties of Arminian Methodism." And here we have the oneness in principle between the class-meeting system and the Roman confessional, as affirmed by us, fully sustained. Listen! "They manage this matter a little differently at Rome, but it is doubtful whether they have a *better confessional* than this." Listen! "Popery demands no more *thorough confession* than this." Listen! "Confession as managed by the church of Rome is *infinitely preferable* to confession as conducted under the auspices of Mr. Wesley."

So speak Dr. Annan—Dr. Alexander—Dr. Musgrave—Dr. Engles—Rev. Mr. Moore—Mr. Baird—the Christian Herald—and the Princeton Repertory. Some of these gentlemen rank with the most noble of the earth for venerable age, or mature wisdom and piety. These men of God sustain our views of the class and band meetings, as perfectly as such testimony can prove any thing. And now, we ask,—Is Dr. Annan's book "a great mammoth distillery of Anti-Methodistic slander, and general abuse?"—and are the endorsements of Drs. Alexander and Elliot "unlicensed doggeries, gilling out acrid liquor?" Is Dr. Annan "a raving lunatic?"—and are all these esteemed ministers of Christ who sustain him, to be ranked with "*the old accuser of the brethren*," as Dr. Converse has been, for publishing "The Great Iron Wheel?" Will Methodist editors say of these distinguished Presbyterians what they have said of us? Will they? Well—be it so. We are content. God grant that we may ever be permitted to stand on the walls of Zion with Archibald Alexander and David Elliot, and with them be loaded with the epithets liar and slanderer, from the lips of Methodist preachers—rather than to be hailed by the whole itinerancy as retailing *truth*, in the way *they are accustomed to tell the truth*.

In view of this overwhelming affirmation of our views of the class-meeting system, we may well ask,—how any man, having the ordinary reading of a gentleman, can stigmatize our article as if it was something new under the sun. We may well ask how any man of information can be ignorant of the fact, that the class meeting was considered to be the Popish confessional in essence, by numbers of the most distinguished men of England, Scotland and Ireland, in the days of Mr.

Wesley, as acknowledged by Mr. Wesley himself? We may well ask, how any reading man can be ignorant that the same opinion of the class has been held since that day, in Great Britain, by men ranking with the purest and the most sagacious? We may well ask, how any man of information can be ignorant that in the United States there has been so much oneness of opinion upon this same subject? And we may well ask, how many Presbyterian ministers of any name, can be found, who will deny the view of the class-meeting system, given by us, by Dr. Annan, and sustained by Dr. Alexander, Dr. Elliot, and the Princeton Repertory? How many Episcopalians will deny it? How many Baptists, or Lutherans will deny it? How many Congregationalists will deny it? Nay, how many Roman Catholic priests will deny that Mr. Wesley's class meeting was an attempt on his part to introduce a *make-shift* for the Roman confessional? These are strong questions. We feel certain of the reply from those to whom they are addressed.

In the mean time, we beg leave to submit the following opinion of a Roman Catholic priest. The quotation is from a Tract sent to us, with many others, by an Episcopalian gentleman, in one of the largest northern cities. The Tract is entitled—"An earnest appeal to the people called Methodists, by Rev. J. A. Mason, *formerly a Methodist preacher*."—(London, printed and published by P. & M. Andrews.) Mr. Mason, in his advertisement, speaks of his conversion to Romanism, and of others who had renounced Methodism, &c. On page 41, he writes—"Class meetings were designed by Mr. Wesley as a confessional, according to St. James—'confess your faults one to another.' And in the band rules he requires the leader to cut to the quick, and search the heart to the bottom." This Roman priest then reasons against this pretension of Mr. Wesley, upon the ground, 1. That Mr. Wesley's leaders had no divine authority. 2. That they were too ignorant. 3. That the people had no right to confess to them—and 4. That they had no security for secrecy.

Certainly no one will deny that this priest, formerly Methodist preacher, believed that the design of Mr. Wesley, in establishing the class meeting, was to make it a substitute for the Roman Catholic confessional. Truly we are at ease upon this

subject. We are certain enlightened men every where bear us out in all we have said of the class and band.

The tendency of the class to give priestly control over the Methodist membership, we will for the present vindicate by a quotation from the New Haven Quarterly Christian Spectator. This was one of the most enlightened publications in the world, and spoke on this subject the sentiments of New England. The article from which we quote is carefully and guardedly written, in full knowledge of all that Methodism had to say—was reprinted in pamphlet, and widely circulated. The writer says:—"The Wesleyan system of inspection and drilling gives to the preacher a sort of influence over the people of his charge, which no other Protestant can possibly attain. The constitution of *classes*, not only secures a minute weekly inspection of every member, and a weekly report to the minister, but gives the minister powerful advantages for controlling every member, through the agency of class leaders, whom he appoints, who are responsible only to him, and whom he changes at pleasure. By this system the laity of that church are trained into an implicitness of deference to ecclesiastical authority, which finds no parallel in any other Protestant denomination within our knowledge. By this system, in its connection with other parts of the economy, the clergy are enabled to prescribe what the people shall read, and what they shall not read—to secure the circulation of their own books and papers, and to shut out others, hardly less effectual than the exercise of a censorship of the press. This power is in the hands of a body of men, like a Popish mendicant order, thoroughly united in spirit, drilled into perfect subordination, and to a great extent divested of all local attachments. The itinerant Methodist clergy differ from the Roman mendicant orders in three particulars, and in little else:—They are Protestants. They are an aristocracy governing each other, instead of being absolutely at the disposal of a superior, accountable to the Pope; and they are not bound to celibacy, and individual poverty. But in every other important respect, the parallel is complete."—(Chris. Spec., 1829, pp. 525 & 526.)

What could be more in agreement with the opinion advanced by us in "The Great Iron Wheel"—No. 2? And we ask again, with what face can any honest man rail against us for

our views of the Methodist class meeting? *The world of piety and intelligence is with us and against Methodism on this question.* Methodism has no countenance in this matter, except from those who have never examined the subject—or from those who are Methodists in heart, whatever name may be assumed:

So much on the charge of *falsehood*.

II.—The question of *obscenity*.—This allegation has assumed all sorts of shapes. Sometimes it has gone the length, that we had impugned the honor of all the females in the Methodist church. The Advocate and Journal does not reach so far, but discourses after this fashion:—"He has given us a few quotations in Latin, supposed to be questions and answers made at the confessional, which he puts into the mouth of two sisters, supposed to be members of a band meeting—Sister Sally Slander-wink, and Sister Susan Slack-twisted. The quotations in Latin for decency's sake we shall not copy, but simply remark, that the whole fiction, for fiction the writer and his endorser (Rev. Dr. Converse) knew it to be, is so vulgar, so filthy and obscene, that none but a maniac, or an infidel of the lowest grade would venture to broach such a supposition. We have attended class meetings, and band meetings, again and again, ever since the year 1803, but never heard, or saw, or thought, or imagined any thing like the fiction of the editor of the Calvinistic Magazine."

Here we are directly charged with teaching that the said *questions are ASKED* in the band meetings—and that the statement is *obscene*, &c. We deny both charges. We have not said that these questions ARE ASKED in the band meetings. And we deny the indelicacy.

We will prove this to the satisfaction of every upright mind.

Let our readers turn to "The Great Iron Wheel"—No. 2, 3 head, and 3 division. What does it say? This—"The class-meeting confessional, *if enforced* as Mr. Wesley planned it, and as it is in the discipline, *would make* the Methodist church the most hideous *school for scandal* in the world." "Two hundred thousand confessionals—in which every married man *would* be telling, &c.—and every married woman, &c. Just think that these questions, (as contained in Den's Theology) *might be asked* by married men," &c. &c.. Then we supposed

two band sisters to ask and answer a few of these Latin questions. We proceed. "These are introductory questions only, which *may be put* to the penitent by the priest—or as we have said, by the members of the band, the one to the other. We have made this selection of quotations from the New Englander on Romanism, July, 1844." Our readers can determine, as they have long ago, whether we have said that those Latin questions *are asked*, or ever *were asked* in a band-meeting. No. *It is a supposed case*. It is the unfolding of what *might be asked*, IF the class-meeting confessional was *enforced* as Mr. Wesley planned it, and as it is in the discipline.

In like manner it will be easy to dissipate into thin air the charge of insulting the modesty of Methodist females. So far from it, *that very article* may help to rouse them to reflect upon the infamous things that would come upon them "if the class-meeting confessional was enforced as Mr. Wesley planned it, and as it is in the discipline." For what are the questions *now* required to be asked by married men of married men—by married women of married women—by young men of young men—and by girls of girls? Listen! 1. What known sins have you committed since our last meeting? 2. What particular temptation have you met with? 3d. How were you delivered? 4. What have you thought, said, or done, of which you doubt whether it be sin or not? These questions do cover the whole ground occupied by the Romish confessional. What intelligent sincere man will dare deny that the vilest questions to be found in Den's Theology, and which the priest is required to ask, may be put to all the members of a band-meeting, and they have bound themselves to answer. No. We have disclosed, in the fear of God, what may be the abominations of the class and band, "*if enforced as planned by Mr. Wesley, and as it is in the discipline.*"

Where is the obscenity? Is the New Englander obscene in unfolding the Romish confessional, and printing five times the number of questions we have given, and much worse? Is Dr. Robinson immodest in lifting the veil from heathenism, in the Biblical Repository? Is Dr. Durbin (Methodist) indelicate in opening that door, in the Naples Museum, and giving us a hint of the impurities of Pompeii? Is the Bible obscene where Paul tells, in the 1st chapter of his epistle to the Romans, the things

of idolatry? Is this all right? But is it all wrong when we seek to know the secrets of the inner class? Is it all pure and proper to tell in Latin what Rome does? But is it all filthy if we tell in the same Latin what Methodism would do "if the class confessional was enforced as Mr. Wesley planned it, and as it is in the discipline?" Obscenity! Why, every thinking man knows that this cry of modesty is hypocritical cant, to hide the class and band. Obscenity! We have nothing to recall. Rather the more earnestly we desire that every Methodist mother may read that very page in the Calvinistic Magazine. Respectfully we urge her to read it alone, with her husband, and to ask him the English of the Latin. Then let her remember that the priest has a right to ask of ladies these questions. After this, will she compare the Latin questions to be put by the priest, with the questions required to be asked in the band at every meeting? Then may she pray God to shield her and her daughters from the horrid consummation of the class confessional; "*if enforced as Mr. Wesley planned it, and as it is in the discipline.*"

Will Methodist preachers yet pretend to be filled with horror about obscenity? Be it so. Will they send an accusing spirit up to heaven's chancery with this word against us? Be it so. Let the recording angel write it down. Let him drop no tear upon the word to blot it out forever. Let it stand. Our master will vindicate that word at the bar of God, and tell us it was righteously said.

Since the April No. of the Calvinistic Magazine, communications of the highest respectability assure us, that what we said *might be* in the class confessional, *has been* enacted there. Take the following from the Christian Observer, (Dr. Converse, of Phila.,) of the 3d of September:—

"A real case of confession to the class meeting—of the confession of a sin and injury which a man of honor, not to say a christian, would blush to think of perpetrating, has been reported to us since this discussion commenced, by a gentleman of the neighborhood in which the parties lived. Decency forbids us to state the particulars. The transgressor made a full confession of his crime to the class—and probably it relieved and satisfied his conscience. But it placed another party in

an awful predicament. The husband of a woman whose name came out in the confession, lost his reason, and after an unsuccessful attempt to commit suicide, died a poor deranged man. In this statement we are referring to facts reported from the class meeting—and the time, and the place, and the names of the parties concerned are all known to our informant.”

It is too true, Br. Converse, that Presbyterians, other denominations, and the intelligent of our country, are dangerously asleep as to the tendency of Methodism.

Your affectionate friend,

FRED. A. ROSS.

Short Practical Sermons—No. 6.

“O Lord revive thy work.”—HAB. III. 2.

THERE is much in the religious world to encourage. Many a beautiful temple is being reared for the worship of the Most High. The benevolent associations of the day, if not fully sustained, are cared for. Money is given, given freely, into the treasury of the Lord. The press is scattering the leaves of salvation as upon the wings of every wind. The missionary spirit is, on the whole, increasing. Many are consecrating themselves to the *missionary work*. Many are going to carry the bread of life to the perishing. Many are bearing to those sitting in the region and shadow of death, the *lamp* of salvation. The church is, in a word, enjoying great *outward* prosperity.

But while these things are so—while the chariot wheels of the Gospel seem indeed to be moving forward—while the kingdom of darkness is diminishing, is there yet no demand for the prayer of the prophet? Is there not *urgent, pressing* necessity for all christians to cry out, “O Lord revive thy work?” While the church is acting so much, as at present, on the *aggressive*, there is danger that *personal* godliness may be neglected—that *individual* piety may decline. I ask, is there not danger of this? Is there no danger that the *closet*

may be neglected, while the attention of the followers of Christ is *taken up* with the *outward* movements of the armies of Israel? Is there no danger that some may excuse themselves from the prayer meeting, because they have given so much to build a church? No danger that some may absent themselves from the monthly concert, because they have contributed so freely to foreign missions? No danger that others may excuse themselves from *teaching* in the Sabbath school, because they helped to purchase the library? While the *world* stands out prominently before the mind, will the *heart* always be watched?

Look now at the history of the American church, during the last few years. Consider the paucity of revivals—the *few* that regularly attend the place of social prayer—the *many* that take no part in the Sabbath school—the palpable neglect of *family* religion, and say, whether the attention of christians be not too much *outward*? Think of these things, and tell me if there be not indeed a demand for the prayer of Habakkuk—“O Lord revive thy work in the midst of the years; in the midst of the years make known; in wrath remember mercy.”

Is there not a decline in *vital piety*? Is there not, notwithstanding the great *apparent* prosperity of the church? I admit that much is done to spread the Gospel, and extend the *visible* kingdom. Now, *too much* is not done in *this way*, but *too little* is done in the cultivation of *heart religion*. The tendency of the age is, to lead the christian away from his closet. The tendency is to lead him to *act*, rather than to *pray*. If I am right, *then* does the christian need grace;—then does he need much grace to resist this tendency of things. There must be *prayer*, or there cannot be well-directed *action*.—Prayer is the only armor in which the christian warrior can fight unto victory. If I am right in supposing that there be a decline in vital piety, there must be, then, a diminution of the spirit of prayer. Then is there need to pray, with the prophet, “O Lord, revive thy work.”

It ought, doubtless, to be matter of rejoicing, that so many beautiful edifices are going up for the worship of Jehovah; but at the same time, it should be the cause of the deepest sorrow to every christian heart, that so few are turning to the Lord. Few indeed are the mercy-drops that are falling upon the *thirsty* hill of Zion. Will there be one church in the Synod

of Tennessee, at its coming meeting, to report a refreshing from the presence of the Lord? Will there be *one* to rejoice over new born souls?

The means of grace are manifold. Multitudes enjoy them. Paul *does* plant, and Apollos water—but small is the increase. "O Lord, revive thy work." Souls are perishing,—not because there is a scarcity of the bread of life. Men are blind,—not because they might not see, but the light that is in them is darkness. And how great is that darkness? Reader, have *you* no prayer to offer, that the set day to favor Zion may come speedily? Have you no prayer for the careless ones who pray not for themselves? Can *you* be indifferent, while so many are indifferent? Can you look on unconcerned while the stupor of eternal death seems to be gathering around so many hearts? Is it nothing to you that souls are perishing through indifference and neglect? Souls *are* perishing, and yet Christians *manifest* but little concern. May the Lord revive his work.

Scarcely could there be a time more fit than the present to prefer the request of the prophet. Men make void the law of God. The *world* is living without God and without hope. Multitudes are crowding the way to death. Multitudes are hurrying to the judgment, bearing the fearful accountability of a Saviour rejected, and salvation refused. There is light, but they see it not. Mercy lifts her voice, but they heed it not. Wisdom points to paths of peace, but to the *many* she points in vain. The *many* walk not in her paths. The language of the poet is still true,

"Broad is the road that leads to death
And thousands walk together there;
But wisdom shows a narrow path,
With here and there a traveller."

God is dishonored—Christ is rejected—salvation is spurned. Could the circumstances in which Habakkuk prayed, "O Lord, revive thy work," have been *more* urgent? Could that time have been *more* appropriate to such a prayer than the present?

THINK before you speak, and you will never be mortified with yourself, or cause a thrill of pain to flash through the heart of a friend.

"The Bible says so."

WE cannot begin too soon to communicate principles to the young, which shall govern their minds for life. Lasting impressions are made on them at an age much earlier than people suppose. It is remarkable that sublime truths are at the same time the simplest. For instance, a very young child may be taught that there is a God; that we are made to do his will; that we are all sinners; that there is to be a judgment; that Christ died for sinners; and that those who love God, shall be for ever happy in heaven.

Children should early be taught that the Bible is the great authority; and that when it speaks on any point, the question is settled for ever. They should be taught to go directly to the Scriptures, to find what is good and what is bad, what is true and what is false. Thus, with the blessing of God, they will acquire the habit of constantly giving up their notions and inclinations, when they find a plain declaration of Scripture. I therefore think it a good sign, to hear a child often use the expression, *the Bible says so.*—*Star of Temperance.*

SACREDNESS OF TEARS.—There is a sacredness in tears. They are not a mark of weakness, but of power. They speak more eloquent than ten thousand tongues. They are the messengers of overwhelming grief, of deep contrition, of unspeakable love. If there were wanting any argument to prove that man is not mortal, I would look for it in the strong convulsive emotions of the breast, when the fountains of feeling are rising; and when tears are gushing forth in chrystal fountains. O, speak not harshly to the stricken one, weeping in silence!—Break not the solemnity by rude laughter, or intrusive footsteps. Despise not woman's tears—they are what make her an angel. Scoff not that the stern heart of manhood is sometimes melted to tears of sympathy—they are what help to elevate him above the brute. I love to see the tears of affection. They are painful tokens, but still most holy. There is a pleasure in tears—an actual pleasure! If there were none on earth to shed a tear for me I should be loth to live: and if no one might weep over my grave, I could never die in peace.—*Selected.*

THE
Calvinistic Magazine.
[NEW SERIES.]

“Earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints.”

Vol. II.

November, 1847.

No. 11.

Does saving Faith precede Regeneration?

—
BY THE REV. F. A. M’CORKLE.
—

If saving faith precedes regeneration—if God regenerates the soul because it has first believed, then grace is not distinguishing, and it depends upon the man, why he differs from another. But if God regenerates the soul before it exercises saving faith, then as the soul is totally depraved, and had done nothing to insure or merit salvation before it was regenerated, then is grace distinguishing, and it is God who makes one to differ from another.

To evade the doctrine of electing grace, our Arminian brethren assert, that the soul exercises saving faith before it is regenerated; and the reason why God regenerates one soul is, because it believes, and does not regenerate another is, because it does not believe. They believe that God purposes to regenerate and save a soul conditionally—if it believe; making its regeneration and salvation depend upon a previous act of the wicked heart; reversing the order of the Scriptures, which say, “As many as were ordained to eternal life believed,” making the belief depend upon, and follow, the ordaining. Our brethren say, as many as believed were ordained to eternal life, making the act of ordaining depend upon and follow the belief. The Scriptures say, All that the Father giveth me, shall come unto (believe on) me;—the faith certain because of the gift. They say, all that come unto (believe on) Christ, the Father shall give him;—the gift certain because of the faith. The Scriptures say, “Who hath saved us and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in

Christ Jesus before the world began." They say, who hath saved us and called us with an holy calling according to our faith and obedience, but not according to his purpose and grace.

We purpose establishing the following proposition:—*That no soul does, or can, exercise saving faith before it is regenerated.*

Faith is the act of the mind, judging from testimony, that a proposition is true. The mind judges that the Bible is true from the testimony of its inspired writers. This, when the heart is not affected with love, is termed by divines, speculative faith—it is not saving faith; "the devils believe and tremble." It proceeds from a wicked heart—a heart that believes the truth and hates it. In saving faith, the heart believes the truth and loves it. In scripture language—"With the heart man believeth unto righteousness." "If thou believest with all thine heart." "Faith which worketh by love." *Faith is believing the truth, and heartily confiding or trusting in Christ alone for salvation.*

The sinner is simply convinced that he is sinful, guilty, lost, unable to justify or save himself—that Christ is willing, able, and faithful to save him. Through the quickening influences of the Spirit he cordially trusts in Christ. This is a complex act or emotion of the mind; it involves good will to its object, approbation of his character, a cheerful devotion to his interests. It is the supreme attachment of a creature to his Creator, in which he heartily trusts soul and body, and all his interests in his hands, to be made the instruments of his glory. This, therefore, cannot be the exercise of a heart of enmity.

Again, the Gospel is all of a moral nature—it is the highest exhibition of the moral government and character of God. It comprises the sum of all moral beauty and excellence that is to be seen by created intelligences. The glory of God—the bright emanation of divine fullness, perfection and beauty, are to be seen in the gospel, "in the face of Jesus Christ." Can a soul cordially embrace it, believe in Christ, receive all moral excellence, without a taste for it? The Psalmist says, "Taste and see that the Lord is good." And faith in Christ is represented by eating his flesh and drinking his blood. "Whosoever eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life." Here we are taught that the believer *has* been quickened, *hath*

spiritual life;—his moral nature is so changed from sin to holiness, that he has a taste and relish for the character of Christ and his excellence. This *must* be the exercise of a new heart.

Again. 1st. Saving faith must either be an act of the soul, which has no moral quality, is neither virtuous nor vicious, or, 2d, it must proceed from a sinful heart and be a wicked act, or 3d, from a holy heart and be a righteous act.

Faith *cannot* be an act of the soul, which is neither virtuous nor vicious, for it is a voluntary act of a moral agent obeying a command of God—"Believe"—when the highest rewards are promised to the obedient, and the most awful penalties are threatened against the disobedient. If it is an act which has no moral quality, then God rewards the soul in heaven forever for an act neither good nor bad, or punishes it forever for not performing that act! Saving faith cannot be the act of a sinful heart. If it is, God rewards one soul forever for a wicked act, and punishes another for not performing that act! "Believe and thou shalt be saved; believe not, and thou shalt be damned." We cannot escape this absurdity by asserting, that the soul, in the act of faith, is impelled by animal instinct, and is no more guilty—though the heart be wicked—than the animal that provides sustenance, or flies from danger. It is not the fact. Faith is a deliberate, voluntary act of a free moral agent, complying with a command of God, which agent has often deliberated, sometimes calmly, at other times feeling the deepest interest for half a century, before the act was performed, which agent is to be rewarded forever as a result of the act. It possesses all the constituents of a moral act. If the agent is unregenerated, it proceeds from a wicked heart—it is a wicked act, and cannot be saving faith. "An evil man, out of the evil treasure of his heart, bringeth forth evil things." Then, if saving faith cannot be an act possessing no moral quality—if it cannot proceed from the wicked heart, it must be the act of a good heart—a heart of love. In the language of the Bible, "Faith worketh by love."

The reader will now be directed to some of the passages in the sacred Scriptures which establish the proposition we have offered.

"He that believeth *hath* everlasting life."—John 3:36. This is spiritual life—the life of a converted soul. The unconvert-

ed are represented as being spiritually dead. When they are converted they are said to be quickened. Spiritual life is then imparted.

“You hath He quickened who were dead in trespasses and sins.” The question arises, is the believer quickened? hath he spiritual life in the first act of faith? The text answers in the affirmative—“He that believeth *hath* everlasting life.” He is therefore regenerated. Thus, he who hath spiritual life is quickened—the believer has spiritual life, therefore the believer is quickened or regenerated.

“Faith worketh by love.”—Gal. 5: 6. If faith worketh by love, wherever there is faith *there must be love*, as it is by love that faith operates, acts, has its being. In the first act of faith there is love, “But the carnal mind is enmity.” Must not the mind that loves be changed? The Bible answers, “Every one that loveth is born of God.” The argument is contained in the following syllogism:—Every one that believeth loveth. Every one that loveth is born of God. Therefore, every one that believeth is born of God.

“With the heart man believeth unto righteousness.”—Rom. 10: 10. If man believeth with the heart, it must be with an evil or a good heart; for it has been shewn that faith is the act of a moral agent, obeying a command of God. The passage says the heart is exercised in the act. The act, then, must possess a moral quality. The heart gives that quality to the act. If it proceed from an evil heart, it is an evil act,—if it proceed from a good heart, it is a good act. It cannot proceed from an evil heart, for “the evil man, out of the evil treasure of his heart, bringeth forth *evil things*,” but it is said, with the heart man believeth unto *righteousness*. It must, therefore, be the act of a good man, who, out of the good treasure of his heart, bringeth forth good things.

Christ said to the unbelieving Jews—“How can ye believe, which receive honor one of another, and seek not the honor that cometh from God only.”—1 John, 5: 44. Here Christ teaches, that a selfish, worldly, wicked heart, which does not honor God, is inconsistent with saving faith—“How *can* ye believe?” Therefore a contrary temper of mind—a benevolent, spiritual disposition, friendly to the divine character, is necessary in order to believe in Christ. No un-

regenerated soul has such a disposition. Hence it must be converted before it *can* believe.

In the parable of the sower, this doctrine is illustrated.—“And these are they which are sown on good ground, such as hear the word and receive it, and bring forth fruit.”—Mark 4: 20. The good ground is the good heart—the seed is the truth; the receiving, if it produce fruit, is believing. It was only the good ground that received the seed and brought forth fruit. It is worthy of remark, that the seed did not change the nature of the ground. The ground was good, the seed fell upon it, and it produced fruit. It is only the good heart that receives the truth, believes it, and brings forth fruit unto righteousness.

In the 13th chap. of 1 Cor. St. Paul declares, that we may have all faith and spiritual gifts, and perform the greatest acts of beneficence, but if we have not love, it vaileth nothing.—The sentiment taught is, that no gift or grace, or benevolent act, is acceptable to God without love. The faith spoken of, may be the faith of miracles, but when he adds 7th verse, that *love believeth all things*, (which are the proper objects of faith,) we are taught that love is essential to, and co-existent with faith—that it is the active and life-giving principle of faith, and where faith is there must be love also. But “Every one that loveth is born of God.”

The same doctrine is taught in the following passages:—“For in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but *faith which worketh by love*.”—Gal. 5: 6. “For in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, *but a new creature*.”—Gal. 6: 15. These two sentences are the same in words, except the last clause—for “*faith which worketh by love*,” in the first, St. Paul put “*a new creature*” in the second. There appears no way to make the apostle consistent, but by viewing the faith that worketh by love, as an act of a new creature. “Believing with the heart unto righteousness,”—that is, faith avails only when it is the act of a new creature—a holy heart.—Hence the believer must be regenerated.

Again. “If any man be in Christ Jesus *he is a new creature*.”—2 Cor. 5: 11. Every believer is in Christ—it is by faith he is united with Christ. Every man in Christ is a new creature; therefore, every believer is a new creature. Or thus

If any man be in Christ he *is* a new creature. If any man believe, he *is* in Christ; therefore, if any man believe, he *is* a new creature.

Further. "They received not the love of the truth that they might be saved."—2 Thes. 2: 10. Receiving not the love of the truth, is the same as *not believing* the truth; shewing that love is indispensable in order to believe. For in the next (11th) verse it is said, "Because they received not the love of the truth, they should *believe* a lie." 12th verse—"That they might be damned who *believed* not the truth;"—that is, received not the love of the truth. Then there can be no saving faith without love. But the unregenerated heart is enmity; hence it must be changed before it believes unto salvation.

In the parable of the prodigal son, Luke 15, we have a touching representation of the conversion and subsequent faith of a sinner, drawn by the hand of the Master. 1st. He *came to himself*—his heart was changed. 2d. He *came to his father*—he believed. With what clearness and decision this settles the question!

Another passage. "Now, the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these, adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, &c.—Gal. 5: 20, 21. Here the prominent works of the carnal mind are arranged in a class—*all wicked*. But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, *faith*, &c.—Gal. 5: 22, 23. Here we have another class of the exercises of the heart, directly opposite to the works of the flesh—*all good*, called the fruit of the Spirit.—This is not the fruit of the Spirit's *convicting* influences, which are to prevent joy and peace, and excite guilt and alarm. It is the *converting* influences of the Spirit, exciting love to God and man, peace with God and man, joy in the Holy Ghost, and *faith* in Christ. Why is *faith* classed among the graces of the converted man, if not the act of a new heart? It is evidently the faith of the Gospel, *pistis*, translated faith throughout the New Testament, and means saving faith,—unless the sentence in which it stands, or the context, forbids. Both of these show that it is the faith of the gospel. It is a fruit of the Spirit, classed with other graces of a converted man. If Paul has not made an egregious blunder in his classification, this decides the question.

Another. "But as many as received him to them gave he power to become the sons of God; even to them that believed on his name, which *were born* not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God."—John 1: 12, 13. This passage positively asserts that as many as believed *were born of God*.

Once more. "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ, *is born of God*."—1 John, 1: 5. There is another plain and positive assertion, that he who believes, *is, at the point of time that he believes, born of God*.

It is admitted by those who oppose this doctrine, that faith follows repentance in the order of nature. Then, if the penitent has been regenerated before he repents, the believer has also, as faith follows repentance. The true penitent is a regenerated man, for he has proper views of sin—sees its exceeding vileness, and its desert of infinite evil as a just punishment. He sees the wickedness of his own heart, and seeing his own ill desert, he *feels* and *acts* properly—abhors himself for his enmity to God, and transgression of his law—confessing his sins, he turns from them. These are the exercises of an humble, penitent, new heart. Any other kind of repentance is not of the gospel, it is "the sorrow of the world, which worketh death."

In accordance with the above views, *metanoia*, the Greek word translated repentance, means "a change or alteration of mind and works from *evil to good*."—See Parkhurst's Lexicon to the New Testament. If the penitent has been regenerated, the believer has also, for faith follows repentance. Accordingly Jeremiah represents Ephraim as saying, "Turn thou me, and I shall be turned, for thou art the Lord my God." "Surely *after that I was turned I repented*."—Jer. 31: 18, 19. Those commentators who believe in the doctrines of grace, shew that the word *turned* means converted. And this is the opinion of Dr. Adam Clarke, a celebrated Arminian commentator. Explaining this passage, he says:—"Converted from my sin, folly and idolatry, I *now*" [after conversion] "felt contrition for sin, or repentance." Here it is clearly taught that repentance follows conversion; but faith is after repentance—hence faith must follow conversion.

Having examined some of the passages, part of which di-

rectly, and part indirectly, prove that man is regenerated when he first believes, some of the strongest of those texts will now be examined which our brethren of the opposite faith rely upon to support their views. The first is recorded in Eph. 1: 13—"In whom also after that ye believed ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise." In this passage, the phrase "ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise," does not mean conversion. The language itself explains the meaning. "Ye were sealed," says Paul, not with the spirit of quickening or conversion, but "with *that spirit of promise*, which is the *earnest* of our inheritance." Christ had promised that he would send his Spirit to comfort and abide with his people. After regeneration they felt the fruit of his operations, in love, joy, *faith*; which are evidences that they are approved by God, and belong to his family, that their hope is genuine, and their inheritance sure. As a seal makes a will or covenant sure, they are sure of the inheritance from the evidences they have of the presence of the Spirit;—*that Spirit*, by promise, as a comforter, is to abide with them forever. The comforts produced by the impression, or seal of the Spirit, are the same in kind, and are an earnest or pledge of the comforts of heaven. They arise from the exercise of love and faith, and of course are after them. "After ye believed ye were sealed." These are the views of Henry, Scott, Poole, Doddridge, Barnes, and Clarke himself, with a slight difference. He thinks that it may mean that the soul is sealed with the *truth* by the *Spirit of Truth*, but does not call it regeneration. If it could be proved that *sealed* here means regenerated, the faith that preceded it must have been speculative, for it is the faith of a heart of enmity, but the faith of the gospel proceeds from a heart of love.

Another passage. "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved."—Acts 16: 31. They say that faith is here made the condition of salvation—man believes, performs the condition, then God regenerates him for it. It is true, saving faith is a pre-requisite, or condition of salvation, as a new heart and supreme love to God are. But no man can make himself a new heart, or love God supremely, before he is regenerated. Yet God requires him to do both. The question may arise, why require man to believe when he is unable to do it? For the same reason that God requires man to make

himself a new heart, or love him supremely. His inability is *voluntary*—an inability of the *will*, (the heart,) which is the cause of his guilt, and does not release him from the claims of God's law. It is the inability of the murderer, who has his heart so intent on murder, that he cannot withhold his hand from the fell deed. This does not release him from the claims of the law, and the obligation to obey the command, "thou shalt not kill."

Is it assumed that man has no ability at all? Still God has a right to command, and man is bound to obey, because man has voluntarily sinned, and *thereby* lost his ability. Just as a creditor may require his prodigal debtor, who has wickedly squandered his estate, to pay him his debt. *He* has caused his inability by *his own wicked act*; and, in the language of the jurist, must not take advantage of his own wrong. These are some of the reasons why God may command man to make himself a new heart, to love him supremely, or to believe on Christ—neither of which he ever can do with a wicked heart. When the Spirit regenerates him, then, and not till then, he believes unto righteousness.

Another question may be asked. If the sinner will never do anything, with his wicked heart, to induce God to regenerate him, why instruct and teach him his duty? For the same reason that you teach a child the catechism, when it understands it not. It treasures it up for future use. When converted, the sinner will have use for the truth which he had previously learned. Again. If he will never repent and believe while his heart is wicked, his feet are fast in the miry clay of sin, and he feels morally unable to get out. Why persuade, threaten, alarm, convict him? To make him feel his dependence upon God's grace—to make him humble and grateful to God for that grace which has saved him, and which enables him to unite in the song of the redeemed, "Not unto us, but unto thy name give glory."

Another. "Without faith it is impossible to please God."—Heb. 11: 6. Here it is implied that with faith man pleases God. If this be so, faith cannot be the exercise of a wicked heart, for "God is angry with the wicked every day." "The plowing of the wicked is sin." "The sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination to the Lord." Can such a person please

God? Again. God is saying to this wicked believer, "Give me thy heart." "Thou shalt love the Lord with all thy heart." He refuses, violates both of these commands, and with a wicked heart believes in Christ, and yet God is pleased with the act! To such an absurdity does this doctrine lead us.

One more passage. "But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God; even to them that believe on his name which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." The writer thought that this text so plainly taught that the man who believes is born of God at the time he believes, or before it, that he simply pointed it out. Let any unbiased man of plain common sense read the passage. If it does not teach (if the verb "were born" is a correct translation) that they were born of God at the point of time, or before they believed, the writer must be dull of comprehension. If not at the time, but after, the proper mode of expression would have been, they believed and then they were born; or, they believed, and after that they were born. The translation of the verb is correct. The Greek word *egenethesan*, is found in the passive voice, indicative mood, 1 Aorist, 3d person, plural number; correctly translated "they were born." "The Aorists are called indefinite in time, but in general they refer to something past, and may therefore be called historical tenses," says Valpy's Greek Grammar. Observe the language. "In general they refer to something past." If here the 1st Aorist refers to time past, as usual, they were born before they believed.

Again. The Holy Spirit represents the regeneration of the soul by the birth of a child. Let us take the representing thing, to understand better the thing represented:—As many children as received their mother's milk, and trust in her, were born of their mother. Did the children receive their mother's milk before they were born? "As many as received Him and believed, were born of God." Did they believe before they were born? If the passage means that they that believed had literally "power" to become the sons of God, all that was wanting was the will, and they would be born again, and be the sons of God. Or if the Greek word *exousian*, translated power, means privilege, or right, to become the sons of God, as God will not withhold from man the enjoyment of his right,

all that is wanting in this case also, is the will of the unconverted believer, and he is born a child of God, which is contradicted by the 13th verse, which says, "who were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." If it is the privilege, or right, of the wicked believer to become a child before he is regenerated, even if regeneration and adoption into his family depend upon the will of God, and are acts of God, there is no grace in those acts.—Look at the facts. The wicked man believes with a heart of enmity. God, for this act, gives him the right to become his son. He may demand his adoption, and God in justice is bound to grant it. There can be no grace in the act. What a multitude of absurdities are we forced into by adopting one error!

Would the reader have supposed that so barren is the Bible of texts to support the views of our brethren, as that these four, with two or three others still more irrelevant, have been presented to the writer as the strongest that the Bible affords?

This is a doctrine of the Methodist and Cumberland Presbyterian churches. The former, consistently, are Arminian throughout. The latter, inconsistently, are Arminian with the exception of the doctrine of the perseverance of the saints. When a man "gets religion," as they call conversion, then they become Calvinistic with him—they believe he will now persevere. They, perhaps, think that the Arminian faith is best with which to "get religion"—the Calvinistic the best to make them persevere. This may be the reason why they are so desirous to preach in the bounds of Presbyterian congregations, and to get Presbyterians and their children to join them. But they inconsistently reject the foundation of the doctrine of perseverance—the covenant of the Father with the Son, to give him a seed, and to secure their salvation. They have not seen in the following, and other texts, how beautifully the perseverance of the saints is linked with, and certainly depends upon the fact that they were given of God to Christ in the covenant of redemption. Says Christ—"All that the Father giveth me, shall come unto me, and him that cometh unto me, I will in no wise cast out." 1. Given,—2. Come—3. Persevere. The two last, with regard to the soul, depend upon the first. If given, they come—they persevere. They come

because given, and persevere because they come;—therefore persevere because given.

Here is *their* plan:—They come first, then are given, then persevere. Perseverance depends upon the mind that chooses to come. A slender foundation. He chose to come—he may choose to fall away. The Calvinist believes that the soul will certainly come to Christ, because given to him in covenant, and will certainly persevere for the same reason—Consistent. The Methodist believes that it is uncertain whether man will come, as it depends upon his own choice, under the common operations of the Spirit—that it is uncertain whether he will persevere, for the same reason—Consistent. The Cumberland Presbyterian believes it is uncertain whether man will come, as it depends upon his own will, with the common operations of the Spirit—that he will certainly persevere for the same reason! A gross inconsistency, and glaring theological blunder.

The Calvinist makes his views and pre-conceived opinions yield to the dictates of the Bible. The Arminian changes the literal meaning of the Bible, and brings it in humble subjection to the dictates of reason. The writer conceives that we should come to the sacred Scriptures with the teachable disposition and humility of a child—that man's reason is too feeble, his vision too limited, and his sight of observation too low, to scan the works of Jehovah, or point out the path of "duty to the Almighty throughout his vast empire—that there is a wheel within a wheel"—that when only a part of his doings is seen, and that with a dim eye, it may appear unrighteous, but when the whole is grasped, every part may be seen as perfectly just. The conduct of the parent may seem improper and unjust to child—the error is corrected by age and experience.

"Thy way, O God! is in the sea,
Thy paths I cannot trace.
Nor comprehend the mystery
Of thine unbounded grace.

As through a glass I dimly see
The wonders of thy love;
How little do I know of Thee,
Or of thy ways above."

When our Father clearly reveals a truth we should believe it. He may not tell us *why* it is so; that will be explained at the proper time, when it will appear that he has done *all*

things right. He is neither a fiend nor a tyrant, that we should cavil at, or suspect his conduct in any case. His infinite wisdom can see what is best in all circumstances, at all times and places. His infinite benevolence will prompt him to desire it, and his infinite power will enable him to do it. *It is done—rightly done—best done.* Without a scruple or suspicion leave it with him: “Even so, Father,” &c. “Unreasonable,” they say. In creation and providence God reveals himself as the God of the Bible—a sovereign—the author of both. See the millions of children born on beds of straw—fed from crumbs on poverty’s table, or heirs of disease. See other millions, born on beds of down—fed from the table of affluence, in the enjoyment of health. These mere pigmies, and those giants in intellect. “Only temporal distinctions,” they say. Not so. Look further. Yonder are millions born and dying in heathen lands—are lost. Here are millions born in christian countries—nursed in the lap of piety, and raised to heaven. The God of the Bible has made these distinctions, whose influence “for weal or for woe,” extend through time and eternity. As these are facts, whose author is God, (too stubborn to alter,) why alter the Bible, which has the *same author*, and teaches the *same truth*?

Will the reader now turn to the following texts in the Bible, which teach that God purposed to save a part of mankind:—Matt. 11: 25—27; Matt. 20: 15, 16; John 15: 16—19; John 17: 2, 6, 9, 24; Matt. 13: 11; 1 Cor. 4: 7; Acts 13. 43; Eph. 1: 4—11; John 10: 26; Rom. 9: 11—13, 15—18, 23, 27, 29; Jer. 44: 27, 28; Ezek. 6: 2—10, and 19: 22, and 36: 21—38; Joel 3: 18—21; Zech. 13: 8, 9. These are selected from about a hundred texts which teach the same doctrine.

The following texts declare that His purpose was formed before they believed:—Eph. 1: 4; 2 Tim. 1: 9; Eph. 1: 5, 11; Rom. 8: 30; Eph. 3: 11; Jer. 31: 3; John 15: 16; 1 Peter 1: 2; Acts 13: 48; Rom. 9: 11—13.

The following declare that he did not form his purpose in consequence of any foreseen goodness, repentance or faith:—Rom. 11: 5—7; 2 Tim. 1: 9; Rom. 9: 11—13, 15, 16, 18; Tit. 3: 5; James 1: 18; Ezek. 36: 21, 22, 25, 32; Isaiah 43: 25; Eph. 1: 4—11; Acts 9: 1—19; Ex. 33: 19; Rom. 8: 28; Acts 13: 48. Many other passages teach the same doctrine.

The Calvinist believes that all mankind are sinners—that God might justly have left them all to perish forever—that in mercy he provided an atonement of infinite value, sufficient in merit to save all—that all are invited to partake—that all may come and partake if they will—that all enjoy the common operations of the Spirit. Here the Arminian cries “stop, enough, enough; God has done enough to save the world;—this is all that God will do for man’s salvation.” Not enough, the Calvinist replies. Stop here, the atonement will be in vain, and all will be lost. Light has come into the world, but men love darkness rather than light. The great supper is provided, but one has his farm, another his oxen, another his wife, to prevent. None will come. Hence it is necessary, if any are saved, that the special operations—the effectual call of the Spirit, be given, to compel, to convert, and make them willing to believe. The lost are inexcusable; they had all the advantages that the Arminian allows to the world. Not the purpose of God, but *their own sins* and *wilful rejection of mercy*, have been their ruin. The interests of God’s government require that some should be lost. Why these are saved, and those are lost, is, because infinite wisdom and benevolence know that it is *best*, all things considered. The reasons will be given when we are best prepared to understand them.—Here is a work of mercy far beyond the Arminian scheme. The advantage is this, it secures the salvation of countless millions of our race, and places the lost in the same condition that the Arminian places the world. This is the only system that makes the Bible consistent—that will make the ransomed soul humble, grateful, devoted upon earth, and make the redeemed soul humble, grateful and devoted in heaven; while it breaks forth in that anthem with the blood-washed millions, “Unto Him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father, to him be glory and dominion forever and forever.”

We think ourselves masters, when we are only stewards, and forget that to each one of us will it one day be said—“Give an account of thy stewardship, for thou mayst be no longer steward.”—*Bishop Horne.*

Election—Objections Answered.

WE shall now, agreeably to our promise, examine some leading objections against the doctrine of Gratuitous Election.

1. "If this doctrine be true, why need I make use of *means* to secure my salvation?"

Answer.—Because the decree of God, instead of taking away, "rather establishes" the necessity and efficacy of means. Conf. of Faith, ch. 3, sec. 1. God's determination to save Noah by means of the ark, rendered the construction of the ark the more necessary to his preservation from the flood. God's determination to save Paul and his companions from shipwreck by the exertions of the seamen, rendered the exertions of the seamen so necessary that none could be saved without them. Though "there stood by him an angel of God, saying, Fear not, Paul; thou must be brought before Cæsar; and lo, God hath given thee all them that sail with thee;" yet, "as the shipmen were about to flee out of the ship, Paul said to the Centurion, and to the soldiers, Except these abide in the ship, ye cannot be saved, Acts 27: 31. If God has purposed to favor you with a smiling harvest through his blessing upon your own industry, then you cannot expect a harvest unless you prepare the soil, and sow the seed. And if he has determined to save the souls of sinners through the means of his appointment, it is plain that none can expect salvation except in the use of those means.

On the principles of Anti-Calvinists, we cannot indeed discover much necessity for the use of means. For if God has already bestowed the enlightening and quickening influences of his Spirit upon all men, so that all are sufficiently able to believe on Christ and become holy, their conversion being suspended upon the self-determination of their own wills; then we cannot see much need of reading, hearing, preaching, or praying, since men can at any time secure their salvation by a simple act of the will. It is only because God has decreed the means in connection with the salvation of men, that they are of the least utility or importance. It is hence that "faith cometh by hearing."

2. If election be true, how can God be sincere in offering salvation to all?

Answer. God must be sincere in inviting all to Christ, because in Christ there is enough for all. He must be sincere; moreover, because he is most willing that his invitation should be accepted. He is sincere, again, because the invitation is made upon terms which are in themselves reasonable, and there is nothing to hinder the sinner's acceptance of it but his own sinfulness, voluntarily indulged. Once more: God must be sincere, because he never has and never will cast out one that comes to him.

Though the Master of the house constrained only a part to come to his feast, that did not prove that he was insincere in inviting others who refused, and who he declared should never taste of his supper. Equally true is it that God is not bound to make all men willing to come to Christ as an evidence of his sincerity in inviting all to come.

But as our Anti-Calvinist friends insist much on this objection, let me ask them, How on their principles they can vindicate the sincerity of their Maker? Let them explain to us how God is sincere in offering salvation to persons who he knows beforehand will never accept it? Let them tell us, I say, how he is sincere in the offer of eternal life to those whose damnation was foreknown to him, and therefore absolutely certain from eternity, and whose condemnation would only be increased by the offer? Is this what some of our brethren call "damning grace?"*

The Cumberland Confession of Faith specifies a class of persons from whom God "withholdeth his grace whereby they might have been enlightened in their understandings, and wrought upon in their hearts." Chap. 5, sec. 4. And the Methodist General Conference, in their volume of Doctrinal Tracts, page 139, assert that "God predestinates or foreappoints all disobedient unbelievers to damnation," &c. Now we respectfully invite these brethren to show how, on their scheme, God is sincere in inviting those from whom he "withholdeth his grace," and who were foreappointed to damnation before the foundation of the world. Here, were we disposed, we might loudly declaim about "damning grace," "mocking helpless creatures," and "crocodile's tears."† But we forbear.

*Language used in a Meth. Tract. †Meth. Doct. Tracts, pp. 169, 170.

We will simply suggest to these brethren the propriety of mastering the difficulties in their own system before they concern themselves much about their neighbors'. Our Saviour's direction is, "First cast out the beam out of thine own eye, and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye."

3. It is objected that election involves the doctrines of "Eternal Reprobation."

We answer: If by eternal reprobation be meant what Anti-Calvinists define it to be, it is very certain that it does not flow out of the doctrine of election. The Cumberland Confession of Faith represents the Calvinistic view of reprobation as "a sovereign determination of God to create millions of rational beings, and for his own glory, damn them eternally in hell without regard to moral rectitude, or sin in the creature." Ch. 3, note; and the Methodist General Conference, in the Doctrinal tracts, page 95—6, explain it as an "eternal decree," by which "God hath predestinated to eternal damnation the greater part of mankind, and that absolutely, without any respect to their works." Now it must be plain to every candid mind that no such ideas as these are involved in election, which simply represents God as resolving to bring some to Jesus Christ, leaving others under that condemnation which their unbelief and other sins merited. But it will be said, "If predestination to life is not for foreseen goodness, then predestination to death must be without respect to foreseen wickedness." But this by no means follows. In the parable, the Master of the house constrained some to approach his feast, without regard to foreseen merit in them; but it did not follow as a consequence, that in excluding forever those who had refused to come, he had no respect to their demerits? What a disposition there is to pervert the plainest matters! God beheld the whole human family in a state of sin and condemnation, all alike worthy of death, and equally unwilling to accept of mercy. And he resolved to rescue a part from perdition, and leave others to the consequences of their unbelief. Does this represent him as predestinating men to eternal death without regard to their character? If out of a number of State criminals some are pardoned by the Executive, does it follow that the rest are unjustly punished without respect to their works?

On what authority do some Anti-Calvinists charge this doctrine of "eternal reprobation" on Presbyterians? They can find neither the words, nor the ideas they attach to them in our Confession. They cannot therefore say that the doctrine is taught by the Presbyterian Church, which is not responsible for any thing not found in her public standards. I repeat the question, Why do some persons charge us with teaching that God predestinated the greater part of mankind to damnation without regard to their moral character? They have never been able to produce any thing from our Confession to countenance the charge. But I desire not to dwell upon their injuries. The Lord shall judge betwixt us and those who thus seek to blacken our character. It is easy at any time to produce an overwhelming amount of testimony to show that the sentiment in question has been repudiated by the Calvinists of all ages. At present, as we are often charged with "softening down the asperities of Calvinism," we will refer you to a few authorities.

In 1618, the Synod of Dort, representing the whole Calvinistic world, in reply to some calumnies, (the same now circulated against Calvinists,) say, that "this their declaration ought to suffice all lovers of peace, and men of moderate dispositions, viz., that God condemned no one; yea, neither had he decreed to condemn any one, unless justly for his own proper sins." So again, in chap 1, art. 15, speaking of the non-elect, they say, "Whom truly God decreed to leave in the common misery into which they had by their own fault cast themselves; and at length, not only on account of their *unbelief*, but also of all their other sins, to condemn and eternally punish them, to the manifestation of his own justice."

Dr. Twisse, who was Chairman of the Assembly that composed our Confession of Faith, and who must have understood its meaning quite as well as some modern Anti-Calvinists, says, "that his opinion is well known, that God doth not ordain any man to damnation, before the consideration of sin." And again, "That God of his mere pleasure created all; but of his mere pleasure damneth none; but every one that is damned, is damned for his sin, wilfully committed and contumaciously persisted in by them that come to riper years."

Dr. Thomas Ridgley, in his *Body of Divinity*, vol. 1, page

491, says, "Since God's permitting sin, or not hindering it, cannot be said to be the cause of its being committed, there being no cause thereof but the will of man; it follows from hence, that God's punishing sin, is not to be resolved into his permission of it as the cause thereof, but into the rebellion of man's will, as refusing to be subject to the divine law. And thus God considered men, when, in his eternal purpose, he determined to condemn those whose desert of his punishment was foreseen by him from all eternity."

"Wickedness foreseen," says Dr. Scott, "is doubtless the cause of the Lord's purpose to condemn, because it is of man's self by nature; but holiness foreseen in a fallen creature, cannot be the cause of his election, because it is the effect of his special grace, and never comes from any other source."—*Comm. on Rom.* ch. 9.

We quote these passages to show what views of the subject have been entertained by Calvinists at different periods. If we turn to the Scriptures, we find St. Paul writing to the Thesalonians, "And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie; that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness." 2 Thes. 2: 11, 12. And to the Romans thus: "Therefore hath he mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth." Ch. 9: 18. And, "What if God, willing to show his wrath, and to make his power known, endureth with much long-suffering the vessels of wrath fitted for destruction." Verse 22. And, "God gave them over to a reprobate mind." Ch. 1: 28. And Peter writes thus: "A stone of stumbling and a rock of offence; even to them which stumble at the word, being disobedient; whereunto also *they were appointed.*" 1 Eph. 2: 8. And Jude thus: "For there are certain men crept in unawares, who were before of old *ordained to this condemnation.*" V. 4. And the framers of our Confession, thinking it right to adhere closely to the language of the Bible, say, "The rest of mankind God was pleased according to the unsearchable counsel of his own will, whereby he extendeth or withholdeth mercy as he pleaseth, for the glory of his sovereign power over his creatures, to pass by, and to ordain them to dishonor and wrath *for their sin*, to the praise

of his glorious justice." Ch. 3, sec. 7.* It is sufficiently obvious, that any objection against this language lies with equal force against the authority of inspiration itself.

It is remarkable that pious persons, of almost every denomination, whenever they engage in prayer, or give an account of their religious experience, bear a strong testimony to the doctrine of Preterition. They freely confess that if the Lord had long since "passed them by," in the open field of their rebellion, and left them to perish in their sins; yea, had he resolved that they should "never taste of his supper," it would have been no more than the just reward of their iniquity. And this is carrying the doctrine about as far as any consistent modern Calvinist desires. It is true that some writers have used the term *reprobation* in reference to this subject; but they have used it to express that act of justice by which God sometimes gives men over "to a reprobate mind." Rom. 1: 28. They have not employed it in the sense charged upon them by their adversaries.

Some bigoted Anti-Calvinists are in the constant practice of holding us up to the world as teaching that God created the greatest part of mankind merely to damn them. And as they are not borne out in their shameful imputations by any thing they can find in our Confession of Faith, they appeal for proof to the writings of Calvin. As though modern Calvinists were responsible for the opinions of a man who lived three hundred years ago! How anxious these brethren seem, to have us embrace some scandalous error, with which they can reproach us! Is this a right spirit? But, say they, as the Institutes of Calvin have been issued by the Presbyterian Board of Publication, therefore Presbyterians are bound to believe all that Calvin believed. Now let us hear what the Board say on this subject: They tell us expressly that in introducing to the public a new edition of that work, "they do not wish to be regarded as

*In the Methodist Doctrinal Tracts, page 8, the above passage is quoted as follows: "The rest of mankind God was pleased, for the glory of his power over his creatures, to pass by, and ordain them to dishonor and wrath." In various places in these Tracts, an attempt is made to prove that Calvinists believe in Predestination to death without regard to sin in the creature. Hence the necessity of leaving out the words, "for their sin," and other important members of the sentence, which, if fully quoted, would have defeated the design. No wonder that many are deceived in regard to the sentiments of Calvinists.

adopting all the sentiments and forms of expression of the venerated writer," that "the doctrines embraced in the formularies of the Presbyterian Church are termed Calvinistic from their *general accordance* with Calvin's interpretation of scriptural truth. But that the admission of this term as explanatory of their general character, is not intended as by any means implying an entire co-incidence in the views of Calvin, or a submission to his authority as an umpire in theological controversies." The Board add, that "it must be acknowledged that some of the doctrines maintained in the Institutes have been more luminously set forth in modern times." And they specify, among other things, Calvin's views of "the Sabbath," "imputed righteousness," and "reprobation," as what they are not willing to endorse. The truth is, that the Institutes are not used as a standard of doctrine by any Calvinistic body with which we are acquainted. They are not even employed as a text-book in our Theological Seminaries. And they are no more the standard of what is called modern Calvinism, than the writings of Luther are the standard of modern Lutheranism. And though Calvin was confessedly the ablest of all the Reformers; though he did more than any other to give shape and consistency to the Reformation; though it is admitted by Mr. Wesley himself, that "he was a great instrument of God, and that he was a wise and pious man," yet it never was alleged that he was incapable of error. Nor can it be pretended that he was the founder of the modern Presbyterian Churches. On what grounds, then, do our opponents require us to endorse every part of his voluminous productions? With far greater propriety might we insist, that our Methodist brethren are bound to receive all the opinions of Rev. John Wesley, because it is well known that he was their founder. And yet this distinguished man, in his letter to John Mason, dated Jan. 13th, 1790, says, "As long as I live the people shall have no share in choosing either stewards or leaders among the Methodists. We have not, and never had such a custom. *We are no republicans, and never intend to be.* It would be better for those who are so minded to go quietly away." *Lond. West. Mag. Ap. 1830.* Will Methodists hold themselves bound to endorse these sentiments?

After all, Calvin did not believe what his calumniators have

endeavored to prove against him, by garbled and mutilated extracts from his writings. In his *Institutes*, Book 3, chap 23, sec. 8, speaking of the non-elect, he says, "The cause and matter of their condemnation is found in themselves;" and again, "Let us rather contemplate the evident cause of condemnation in the corrupt nature of mankind, than seek after a hidden and altogether incomprehensible one." Once more: in his book on Providence, written expressly in reply to the slanders of his enemies, addressing his calumniator, he says, "The first article you take hold of is, that God, by a simple and pure act of his will, created the greatest part of the world for destruction. Now, all that about 'the greatest part of the world,' and 'the simple, pure act of the will of God,' is fictitious, and the product of the workshop of your malice. . . . This way of talking is no where to be met with in my writings, that the end of creation is eternal destruction. Therefore, like a swine, you upset a doctrine of good odor, in order to find in it something offensive. Besides, though the will of God is to me the highest of all reasons, yet I every where teach that where the reason of his counsels and his works does not appear, the reason is hid with him; so that he has always decreed justly and wisely. Therefore I not only reject, I detest the trifling of the Schoolmen, about absolute power, because they separate his justice from his authority. . . . I, subjecting as I do the human race to the will of God, loudly declare that he decrees nothing without the best reason, which, if unknown to us now, shall be cleared up at last. You, thrusting forward your 'simple and pure act of the will,' impudently upbraid me with that which I openly reject in a hundred places or more." pp. 17 and 18.*

But as our Anti-Calvinist friends charge us with holding dangerous errors on this point, let us see whether they are more *orthodox* than others. The Cumberland Confession, as we have shown, teaches that "God according to the counsel of his own will, foreordained to bring to pass," "the damna-

*Calvin's views of reprobation are discussed with much acuteness and learning by "Gotteschale," in his "Letters to Mr. Young," and by the Rev. Wm. Annan, in his "Difficulties of Methodism." The latter points out and exposes no less than fifteen or twenty perversions of Calvin's language and meaning, by the author of the "Methodist Doctrinal Tracts."

tion of the *reprobate*," as an event "for his own glory." Chap. 33, sec. 2, compared with Chatechism, Q. 7. It also speaks of some as "DOUBLY and ETERNALLY REPROBATED," and likens them to "the chymist's mineral, which *will not coin into pure metal*, or the potter's clay which *marred upon the wheel!*" Ch. 3, *note*. And the "General Conference," in their Doctrinal Tracts, teach that God, "according to his own foreknowledge from the foundation of the world . . . REFUSED, or REPROBATED all disobedient unbelievers, as such to damnation." If it be said that this awful sentence is founded upon foreknowledge, I answer: that only gives absolute certainty to its execution; so that here is a class of men known individually to God, against whom a decree of reprobation has gone forth, the execution of which is as certain as the divine foreknowledge can make it. This decree was in existence when they were born; and according to the reasoning of some of our brethren, those unhappy beings must have been "born to certain damnation," and were "created to be damned;" language which is often in the mouths of certain Anti-Calvinists. Where, let me ask, is there any possible salvation for these "wretched reprobates," unless they can "cut their way to heaven through an eternal decree of God?" I need scarcely add that on the Calvinistic scheme, none can be finally condemned, who are willing to be saved on the terms of the Gospel; since God's eternal decree insures a connection between the means of salvation and eternal happiness.—*Dr. Fairchild's Great Supper*.

THE following letter is published because it has been greatly misrepresented and misunderstood.—EDS.

MARYVILLE, January 14, 1846.

Rev. and dear Brother:—Friends united by christian love, the best of all bonds, may not meet often while on their pilgrimage, though they may have both health and strength. Disease and old age lessen the probability of their intercourse on earth. But there are mansions for christian friends in heaven, where disease and old age are unknown, and the fellowship of kindred spirits is uninterrupted by distance or any other cause. And dying is but going home to these glorious and

eternal mansions. There we will be welcomed by all the excellent of the earth that have lived before us—patriarchs, apostles, martyrs, and all, who have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb. There our best friends and kindred wait our arrival. There the joys of the glorified spirit will be heightened by the arrival of dear christian friends and relatives. Over this vast and increasing assembly *the God Man Mediator* will preside forever—the source of all their joys, the Head uniting in indissoluble bonds the holy happy myriads of the redeemed family forever. There will be no need of the light of the sun, for the glory of the LORD GOD and of the Lamb is the light of the city.

Although you may feel you are just ready to enter this heavenly country, yet many a brother and sister, whom you now dearly love, whose health promises many days and years, may have the felicity to get home before you, and have the enviable delight of greeting you on your safe arrival. But Jordan rolls between us and that land God has promised to his Israel. The great Captain of God's Israel made a safe passage of old for the chosen tribes across Jordan. He will make a safer passage (si possibile) over the Jordan of death for every spiritual child of Abraham. How triumphant the conqueror's song! What thrilling ecstasies await the first transporting view of the heavenly Canaan! Why may we not send messages to our friends there by a friend and brother just about to enter? Should you get there before the unworthy writer, who has no hope but through grace, and there meet my once dear son, tell him his father remembers him most affectionately, because he reflected the image of the Saviour while here; and my daily earnest cry to God is, that the two dear babes he left behind may have the image of the Holy Redeemer drawn on their souls by the Holy Spirit; and that they may reflect that image through a long and useful life. O, how many friends whom I hold in affectionate remembrance are there,—Henderson, Blackburn, Eagleton, and others as dear, once ministers here. There, I think, are my parents, my wife's parents, and many of my ancestors. Will they love to hear from the poor weak writer? There you will see your excellent father, and other dear relatives face to face, and sit and converse with them in heavenly places; and there a higher sphere of usefulness will be assigned to yourself than you have filled in the church militant.

Your affectionate brother in Christ. May God pour the fullness of his love into your soul.

ISAAC ANDERSON.

REV. GEORGE MATTHES.

THE
Calvinistic Magazine.

[NEW SERIES.]

“Earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints.”

Vol. II.

December, 1847.

No. 12.

The How and the Fact.

A SERMON,

—
BY THE REV. JAMES M'CHAIN,

—
“How can these things be?”—JOHN 3: 9.

NICODEMUS, the ruler of the Jews, who came to Jesus by night, believed that Christ was “a teacher come from God,” because no man could do the miracles which he did, except God were with him. He was prepared, therefore, to receive as divine truth, whatever the Saviour advanced, on the authority of the Most High. When, however, Nicodemus hears of the new birth, of being born again, his faith begins to falter; he inquires with the utmost astonishment; “how can these things be?” His instructor answers, a thing *may be*, though we know not *how* it is so. There is such a thing as wind, and yet you cannot tell whence it comes, nor whither it goes. The Great Teacher does not in the least explain *how* the soul is born again of water and the Spirit. He requires the Jewish ruler to believe that this change *may be* wrought, that it must be wrought, though he does not understand *how* it can be.

The question in the text is as applicable to all the leading doctrines of Revelation, as to that truth to which Nicodemus applied it. My design is, to suppose this inquiry to be made with respect to several of these doctrines, and to state some of the evidences that they are true and must be believed, though we are unable to show *how* these things can be.

I.—I will first let it be asked, how can there be a *God*? *How* can there be a being who never had a beginning, and will have no end? *How* can there be a God whose power made

all things out of nothing—whose wisdom and knowledge embrace all things—whose presence is everywhere, here with us, and equally in every part of the universe, and of space? *How* can he be almighty and infinitely benevolent, when our world is so full of sin and suffering? If he be all-powerful *could* he not have prevented this state of things?—and if his love is boundless *would* he not have prevented it? *How* can this great being be infinitely just in his dealings with his creatures, while the wicked are often the most prospered, and the most righteous the most afflicted? *How* can there be an infinitely perfect moral governor over the universe, when disorder, injustice, misery, and sin so greatly prevail?

Let him who is able answer these questions. I pretend not to such knowledge. “It is high, I cannot attain unto it.” I will now, in my turn, make a few inquiries, which will prove that, if I cannot tell you *how* these things can be, nevertheless they *can*, and *must* be. If you cannot conceive of an intelligent spiritual being existing from eternity, how can you conceive of dead, senseless, inert matter having always existed, without any beginning? If the creation of all things out of nothing is too inexplicable a mystery for you to believe it, how can you admit that “the things which be” created themselves; that *nothing* created *something*—yes, *all things*? If God be not infinitely wise and omniscient, whence then are the amazing proofs of infinite wisdom and knowledge in the universe? If the Supreme Being be not infinitely benevolent, just, and holy, how is it that virtue and piety *are, on the whole*, in the vast majority of cases, rewarded, and vice and sin punished? How is it that he dispenses so many mercies, and opens so many sources of happiness to his sinful creatures?—The general rule is seen to be, that the Almighty is on the side of righteousness and against sin. There are many exceptions to the rule. These exceptions, and the many imperfections of the present life, clearly point us forward to another state of reward, where all shall be made plain, and shown to be right.

Ask me, then, *how* there can be a God, existing from eternity to eternity?—*how* he could create all things out of nothing, by the word of his power?—*how* he can be everywhere, at the same moment?—*how* he can know all things? Ask me *how* he can be infinitely powerful, benevolent, just and holy,

while there is so much sin and suffering in the universe, I will first answer by the frank admission, that I cannot tell. *The how, the philosophy* of these things, *the mode* of their being, I pretend not to explain or to understand. Again, I will answer that, if you deny the existence of an infinitely perfect God, you admit that *nothing* is the creator of all things. For, you cannot suppose that lifeless matter has existed from eternity, when you deny that mind has. If there were a period when neither mind nor matter existed, then there was a period in eternity when nothing existed. Therefore, from *nothing* everything has sprung which we now see. You maintain that chance displays infinite wisdom and power, and is everywhere present in superintending and upholding the universe. You hold that this is not our state of trial, preparatory to our state of reward—not an imperfect state, to give place to a perfect one, where all the defects and imperfections of this world shall be explained and rectified.

These are the absurdities and the nonsense which you must believe, if you disbelieve that *God is*, because you cannot understand *how* God can be. Therefore the *how*, the *mode* of the divine existence and perfections, the consistency between them and all his acts, no one can fully comprehend, but *the fact* of these things every reasonable man must admit.

II.—I will next suppose it to be asked, *how can mortal man be an immortal being?*

We are laid on the bed of sickness. Disease makes its approach nearer and nearer the citadel of life. At length, the eyes close, the limbs stiffen, the pulse ceases, the breath stops—we die. This is the end of man's earthly career. The eye that shone so brightly, is glazed and dark. The heart that beat so warmly, throbs no more. The face, that beamed so intellectually, is pale and ghastly. The tongue so eloquent, is still. The mind so gigantic, is gone. The body so active, is laid in the grave, becomes food for worms, and mingles with its native dust. *How* then can man live forever, when thus he is dead? *How* can that clay tenement contain an immortal spirit, which escapes from its earthly dwelling in the hour of dissolution, unseen by the eye, unheard by the ear? *How* can the body and soul be so closely united in life, and yet not perish together in death? These questions I pretend not to an-

swer. *How* we can be both mortal and immortal, material and immaterial—*how* there can be soul and body so joined in life, and yet so separate in death, we cannot tell. But the *fact*, who can reasonably doubt? Can that mind, which, like Bacon's, compasses in its mighty grasp the whole field of human knowledge,—like Edwards', penetrates the mysteries of the human soul—like Newton's, soars among the stars as its native element—like Milton's, wings its way, at will, up through heaven and down into hell—like Demosthenes', sways the hearts of millions,—can that mind be the mere creature of a day, made like Jonah's gourd, to grow up in a night and perish in a night? Can these powers, capable of infinite expansion—these souls, made with such inexpressible longings after immortality—these hearts, so insatiable in their cravings, be only like the bird of which we read, which spreads its wings with the rising of the sun, just to fold them in death at his going down? No. Reason, the light of nature, and above all, Revelation, teaches that, though the body die, the soul lives. The earthly dwelling may be taken down, return to dust, and be scattered to the winds of heaven, but the spiritual occupant escapes from amidst the falling ruins, and moves in another state. We see it not taking its flight to other spheres, for it is not made visible to the eye of sense. We hear it not winging its way to an unseen world, for it is not audible to the ear of flesh. We know not *how* it is united to its earthly body. We understand not the mode of its departure from its clay tabernacle, in the hour of dying. We see, however, that the seal of immortality was stamped upon it. We feel that the spiritual gem was too precious to perish with its earthly casket. God says, "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was, and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it."

III.—I will now suppose another inquiry to be made, *how can the human soul be born again by the Spirit of God?*

With Nicodemus you ask, "*How can these things be?*" *How* can the Most High enter into my spirit by his Spirit—make it over anew—change its affections from the supreme love of sin and self to the supreme love of God and holiness, and in fine, new-create it in the divine image? Whence does the Spirit come?—how does he enter?—how does he operate?—whither does he go? Thus the ruler in Israel inquired of the Saviour.

Jesus answered, "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, nor whither it goeth. So is every one that is born of the Spirit." The Holy Ghost is like the wind. He comes, we know not whence. He goes, we know not where. He operates, we know not how. We see not his form, but we see his effects. We hear not his voice, but we witness his fruits. We behold not his entering in, but we feel his presence and power. The *how*, the *mode* of his regenerating the soul, none can tell. But the *fact* of his doing this, millions can prove, and the Scriptures abundantly teach. Will you doubt the *fact*, because you cannot comprehend the *how*? As well might you question the existence of the wind, because you cannot understand *the mode of its operation*—*how* it uproots the oak, prostrates your houses, and lifts up the mountain wave, while, at the same time you see the forest bending to the earth before its might, and your shattered dwellings flying through the air, and the ocean rising up in mountains.

That God regenerates the hearts of men by his Spirit, millions of witnesses prove. How many a blaspheming, persecuting Saul, has been stopt short in his career by a voice from God, and at once cried out, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" How many an Africaner, more blood-thirsty than the tigers and lions of his native deserts, has been transformed into a lamb, meekly following the Good Shepherd! How many a John Newton, sunken into the lowest depths of pollution, has the Spirit of the Lord raised up, and made conspicuous among men for justice and piety! How many millions have there been, who have experienced this renewing of the Holy Ghost, testified to it with their lips, shown it in their lives, and proved it by their death! Many too, among us here present, are living witnesses of this mighty change.

I also turn to the testimony of Scripture. I read, "except a man be *born* of water and the *Spirit*, he *cannot* see the kingdom of God." "He saved us by the washing of *regeneration*, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost." "Being *born again*, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible by the word of God."

Though, therefore, I cannot explain to you *how* the Spirit regenerates the human soul, I prove to you that he *does do it*;

I establish the *fact* of his renewing, by the experience of millions of *christians*, and the abundant teachings of Scripture.

IV.—Let the question of the text now be asked with respect to *the scheme of redemption*.

How can it be that the Most High joined his Deity with humanity in the person of Jesus, was born of woman, and dwelt on the earth? I pretend not to explain the wonderful mystery. I cannot tell *how* my own body and soul are united to form one person, which I call myself, much less can I know *how* Divinity and humanity meet in the Saviour. Still, I must believe the *fact*, since God himself often asserts it. He says of Christ, "The Word was with God, and the Word *was* God." He is styled, "The mighty God, the everlasting Father." He is declared to have "thought it not robbery to be *equal with God*." Yet he is "man"—"the son of man"—having a human body to hunger and thirst, a human mind to grow "in wisdom," and a human heart to rejoice and weep.

How can it be that God the Father sent his beloved Son to live despised among men, and die on the cross for us rebels? *How* can it be that Jesus accepted the humiliating mission, and bled on Calvary, that sinners might live? We can only answer, "Even so, Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight." "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him might not perish but have everlasting life." "Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life that I might take it up again. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself."

How can God, for Christ's sake, pardon returning prodigals who believe in Jesus? On this point we might throw some light. We might show that this plan of salvation magnifies the law and makes it honorable, and pours a flood of glory over the character of Jehovah. Here, however, I will not stop. I will only answer the question, *how* God can, through Christ, forgive the believing sinner, by his own declaration, that he *can* do it—that he *does* do it—and that he *will continue* to do it. "Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." "Him that cometh unto me I will in no wise cast out." "That whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." "Be it known unto you, men and

brethren, that, through this man, is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins."

Yes, brethren, we fully admit that there are many deep mysteries in this scheme of redemption. We frankly confess, that there are some parts shrouded in Egyptian darkness. Upon others, only a faint light shines, like the dawning of day. So far, however, are we from being ashamed of this admitted fact—so far are we from covering it up and regretting it, that we boldly and cheerfully proclaim it to the world—we *glory* in these mysteries of the cross. God's plan of salvation is mysterious to us, because it is too profound for finite minds to fathom it. Take from it its mysteries—bring it in all things down to the compass of our powers, and it is shorn of its infinite glory; it is not that perfect development of God's own self, which we may be forever understanding better and better, and never fully comprehend. Wondrous, then, as are the facts of this plan of redeeming love—incomprehensible, in many respects, as is the *philosophy* of these facts, still we believe them with an unwavering faith, as truths from God's own lips.

V.—Again, it might be asked, *how can God have fore-ordained whatsoever comes to pass, and his intelligent creatures still be free agents?*

How can the Most High have formed from eternity his decrees embracing all beings, all things, all events, small and great, the means and the end,—*how* can he thus have decreed all things, and yet leave the free-agency of his moral creatures unimpaired? I frankly admit that I cannot go far in explaining *how* the doctrines of God's decrees and man's free-agency are consistent with each other. As in the other cases considered, we rest our belief upon *the proof of the fact*, though we cannot show *in what way* the two things can both be true.

In my turn, I will now ask a few questions, proving that the Lord *does* have, and *must* have his purposes, embracing all things. Jehovah is infinitely *wise*. Does he not therefore know what it is best should take place? He is infinitely *benevolent*. Will he not choose, then, that that *shall take place* which he knows is for the best? He is infinitely *powerful*. Can he not, therefore, cause *to take place* what he *chooses shall* take place? The Most High is infinitely wise, and *knows* what it is best should come to pass;—benevolent, and *chooses* to

bring to pass what is best;—powerful, and *does* bring to pass what he chooses as best. Here then are the divine purposes, and the accomplishment of these purposes, the necessary results of the divine wisdom, goodness, and power.

Again let me ask, *how* can a being, absolutely perfect, be without a full and perfect system of operations? Will he leave himself and his government to the sport of chance and circumstances? And is this the government which is over the universe? Is its sovereign thus the sport of his creatures, of uncertainty and accident? The Supreme Ruler must, then, have *some* purposes. His plan must be full and complete, embracing all things. For if it only includes some things and leaves out others, then, there is still much left to chance. Surely in the government of an infinitely perfect God there will be nothing, not even the *least* thing, to be the plaything of circumstances and uncertainty. Surely his infinite wisdom and goodness will choose and determine whatsoever it is best should take place, and his almighty power will perfectly carry out his perfect plan.

This reasoning is also the plain and obvious teaching of *Revelation*. “I will do all my pleasure.” “Declaring the end from the beginning.” “He is in one mund, and who can turn him?” “With” him “is no variableness, neither shadow of turning.” “I am the Lord, I change not.” “Who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will.” “But all things are naked and open unto the eyes of him with whom we have to do.”

If, then, the Lord does all his pleasure, worketh all things after the counsel of his own will—declares the end from the beginning—knows all things, and changes not, then surely he has his purposes, immutable, and embracing all things. By such arguments I would establish the doctrine of the divine decrees.

The free-agency of man, I need not stop to prove. We all know that we are free-agents, we admit that we are, and we act upon this belief.

You ask me, then, *how* can God fore-ordain whatsoever comes to pass, and men still be free-agents? I only answer, I have proved to you the *fact* of their *truth*, though I cannot explain the *how* of their *consistency*.

VI.—It is also a question of the same kind with those before considered, *how can there be a resurrection of the dead?*”

You may point me to the grave, where many were entombed in one common sepulchre, with their remains all commingled, and ask *how* can these decayed, commingled bones and sinews be separated and restored, each to its rightful proprietor? You may tell me of the ashes of martyrs thrown to the winds of heaven, or strewn on the bosom of some mighty river, to be wafted to the ends of the earth, and enquire *how* can these scattered particles be brought back, and form anew the bodies which they once constituted? You may inform me of the flesh of men eaten by other human beings, and say, *how* can each one have his own body in the resurrection, when here are parts which may have belonged to the bodies of several? Again you may ask, *how much*, or *how little* of our earthly body shall be raised up and quickened by the sound of the last trump?

These are questions respecting which the Book of God is silent, and I therefore shall not attempt to answer them. But the *fact* that there shall be a resurrection of all men—the *fact* that there shall be enough of these earthly bodies raised to be truly and properly a resurrection of ourselves,—this *fact*, this *doctrine*, I must cordially believe. *How* all this is to take place I know not, and to me it is a matter of little moment, while I know the glorious certainty that it shall take place.—This knowledge and belief I have when Christ says, “Marvel not at this, for the hour is coming in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice and come forth, they that have done good unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation.” This doctrine I must embrace, when Paul so fully and clearly asserts, explains, and proves it in the 15th chap. of 1 Corinthians. You may ply me with your questions about the *philosophy* and the *mode* of this rising and quickening of my body; you may point me to apparent impossibilities in the way of its coming to pass, but you cannot weaken my belief that it shall occur. Infidels may sneer at the doctrine and pronounce it absurd—professed believers of the Bible may reject and contemn it—weak christians may stagger at the amazing truth, but, thank God! some of us are enabled to hold fast the glorious fact with all our souls, though we cannot say how these things can be.

VII.—The last inquiry which I will suppose to be made, is with respect to *heaven and hell*.

How can there be a world whose physical glories are but faintly shadowed forth, by bringing down the sun from the firmament to represent its light—by bringing up the pearls of the ocean to form its massive gates, each of one solid pearl—by gathering the sapphire and emerald from the mine to make its walls, and the pure gold to pave its streets—by taking crystal water to supply its river of life, and trees, whose leaves are for the healing of the nations, to furnish its fruits? *How* can there be a world, where God, and Christ, and holy angels, and redeemed sinners dwell together in holy fellowship, as one blessed family? *How* can there be a world whence sin, sorrow and sighing forever flee away—where perfect holiness and perfect happiness forever reign?

I cannot tell you, my hearers, what is the precise import of all this splendid imagery? I cannot inform you *how* all these glorious visions, which so outstrip the imagination, are to be realized. I cannot point you to some bright star in the firmament, sending its heavenly light to us, far from the labyrinths of space, and say to you, “there is that blessed place.” But, I can read to you from the Book of Truth, “they shall obtain joy and gladness, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away.” “Come ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world.” “And I will give thee the crown of life.” “Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection.” “And the building of the wall of it was of jasper, and the city was pure gold like clear glass.” And the twelve gates were twelve pearls; every several gate was of one pearl. And I saw no temple therein; for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple of it. And the city hath no need of the sun, neither of the moon to shine in it, for the glory of God did lighten it, and the Lamb is the light thereof.”

While I have such descriptions to read, and such promises to believe, though I cannot tell you *how* these things can be, I know that they can be—that they are, and shall be forever. You may say to me that the vision is too bright to be realized. You may call me a fanatic, when I hold it up before my soul as a living, present reality, paint it out with all the powers of

my imagination, and enshrine it in my heart as the charm of my life. Yet, assured as I am, that God himself has revealed these glories—assured that Paul and John were granted rich foretastes of them, I feel that I am guilty of madness and folly only so far as I fail to live as if heaven were a reality.

Now I will suppose it to be asked how can there be such a world as *hell*? How can there be a bottomless pit, in which the lost are forever to sink? or a lake of fire, on which they are always to toss? or a horrible prison, where they are eternally shut up? How can it be, that they are to suffer agonies for which there is no adequate description—to which there is no mitigation, and no end? At the very thought of this the hair stands on end, and the blood runs cold. Many things about this awful subject are a deep mystery. Where hell is we know not. What it exactly is we cannot tell. Nevertheless there *can* be, there *is*, there *must* be a hell. Reason says so, and Revelation abundantly declares it. Sin necessarily tends to produce infinite evil—to dethrone God, and make the universe a moral chaos. Sin is rebellion against the Most High, and the necessary tendency of rebellion is to demolish the throne of the Almighty. Now, the penalty must be proportioned to the crime. Sin is an infinite evil, therefore the penalty against it must be infinite—must be endless.

The God of infinite love and benevolence declares, “the wicked shall be turned into hell with all the nations that forget God.” He warns men to escape that place where “their worm dieth not and their fire is not quenched.” He describes the smoke of the torments of the lost, as ascending “for ever and ever,” and the wicked, “as reserved unto everlasting fire with the devil and his angels.” I might quote hundreds of passages like these, but he who will not believe these, would not be convinced though hundreds were arrayed. Therefore, awful as it is to think there is a hell, and that millions are already there, and that millions will yet go there, I must believe there is such a place.

I have thus established, my hearers, the great and important principle, that we must believe that doctrine or fact of religion which we can conclusively prove by reason and the Bible, though we cannot see *how* it can be so, or how it can be consistent with other doctrines and facts for which we have

equal proof. I have taken this thought and applied it to several of the most important truths of Revelation, and shown that we can prove their truth; but if we must know *how* these things can be before we believe them, we must reject them altogether. One man says there is no God, not because there is not abundant evidence of the fact of a Supreme Being existing, but because he cannot understand *how* this fact can be. Another denies the immortality of the soul, not because its endless existence cannot be proved, but because no one can tell *how* this is. Thus, many disbelieve the regeneration of the soul by the Spirit, the divinity of Christ and the scheme of redemption, the decrees of God, the resurrection of the body, and the existence of heaven and hell, not because these truths are not fully demonstrated by reason and Scripture, but because the question cannot be answered, "*how* can these things be?"—You must see, my hearers, that the true ground is to believe the doctrine or fact which you can prove by reason and Revelation, though you cannot explain the *how*, the *mode*, the *philosophy* in relation to it. Take this principle and carry it out honestly and fully, and it will make you a believer in the perfections of God, and the immortality of the soul—an evangelical believer of the Bible, and a *Calvinist*.

Let us come with prayer, humility and faith, to the great fountain of truth—let us bow with the teachable spirit of children at the feet of the Great Teacher—let us doubt no more when we hear the voice, "Thus saith the Lord," and then do and practice as we are taught. Then we are safe, and it will be well with us at last.

Reminiscences of our Venerable Church. PRAYER-MEETINGS OF 1596 AND 1844.

"Tell me, O thou whom my soul loveth, where thou feedest? If thou knowest not, go forth by the footsteps of the flock."

IN these days, when each one in Protestant christendom at least can worship under his own vine and fig-tree;—when such is the light that history, the fulfilment of prophecy, and the advancement of every science have thrown upon the Gospel, that men must shut their eyes and be brutishly ignorant, ere

they can be infidel, in these days of honor to the christian and almost disgrace to the would-be unbeliever; how warily should professors of religion search their hearts—how often should they retire within the closet of their own souls, and try every motive of action, humbly and earnestly imploring God's Spirit to enlighten so that they may know if they be *indeed* in Christ.

Have we entered in at the straight gate? Are we walking in the narrow way? Do we live for God? Do we feel that nothing but the love of Christ can fill our souls? Are we not only honest in the sight of all men, but do we believe that, as all we possess comes from God, therefore all that we call *ours* ought to be at His service at any moment? Oh! are not these questions of some importance? or are they irrelevant? Are not we imperatively called on now, in the midst of the carelessness, the coldness, the lethargy, that is everywhere manifest, to prostrate ourselves, not only as individuals, but as churches, before the Most High, and implore Him to "search our hearts and try our reins, and see if there be any wicked way," and "cast out the unclean thing," so that we may arise devoted, determined "to walk more warily in our ways, and to be more diligent in our charges."

In the history of our "venerable Church" we find much by way of example, and to give us courage, in this work of self-examination, humiliation and prayer. And it is with an anxious wish that the "footsteps of the flock" may be followed, that the present reminiscences are now written.

It was in the year 1596. Elizabeth reigned queen of England, and her cousin, James VI., was king of Scotland. The national church of that mountain land had for nearly 40 years been not only Protestant, but Presbyterian. And although there were never more loyal subjects than these same Presbyterian people, yet, acting upon the principle, that in matters of religion they called "no man master," they told their Monarch, "as divers times before they had told him—"there are two kings and two kingdoms in Scotland. There is Christ Jesus the king, and his kingdom the Kirk, whose subject king James the Sixth is, and of whose kingdom he is neither a king, nor a lord, nor a head, but a member!" Such language has rarely been heard by royal ears; and it must have been grating

to one who looked forward to the day, when, as England's monarch, priests and prelates would kneel before him, humbly seeking for preferment.

It was in these times, that by the ambition of worthless men, and the duplicity of this "God's silly vassal," trials were being heaped upon the church, and the birth-right of these free protesters seemed well nigh taken from them. Why was this permitted? "God doth not willingly afflict." Men paused and reflected. There must be a reason. And individual ministers and members searched their own hearts in solitude.

The month of March approached, when the General Assembly was to meet. It did meet, and its first business was to listen to an overture from John Davidson, the humble Pastor of the village of Preston-Pans, concerning the necessity of searching into the cause of the recent evils. Unanimous approbation was given to this proposition, for each man there was conscious that *he* had need of humiliation and repentance. And so a day was set apart for prayer.

As confession is the first step to reform, the members of the Assembly determined to meet by themselves, and, confessing their sins, make promise before the majesty of God, to serve him more devotedly. The 30th of March was a day long to be remembered. We can almost imagine that we see these men of God—four hundred Ministers, besides Elders—solemn and serious, as they walked forth on that morning to the place of meeting. We can in a moment transport ourselves to where they sat, with bent heads, each communing with his God.—John Davidson has been called to lead their devotional exercises; and as he reads and comments on the 33d and 34th chapters of Ezekiel, so deeply searching are his words, and so earnest and humble his confession of sin, that though no tongues of flame are seen, yet the Holy Spirit is felt to be amongst them, and tears of penitence flow from every eye. There is a moment's pause, and then the Minister in a soft whisper recommends that each man for himself do silently acknowledge his personal guilt before God.

For fifteen minutes an awful stillness reigns, broken only by heavy sighs and sobs, as each man searches apart the "dark chambers of his own bosom." But again the voice of prayer; again the words of impressive admonition, and then as "with

one heart and one soul?" they rise, and lifting up their right hands to heaven, they renew their covenant with their God!

"There have been many days," says Calderwood, "of humiliation for present judgments, or imminent dangers, but the like for *sin and defection* was never seen since the reformation."

And need we turn over historical pages, to find the result of this day's blessing? The sovereign God, whose eye pierces eternity, saw the fiery trial through which his church was soon to pass, and in his own unfathomable mercy and loving kindness, he now called these his servants into the fitting attitude to receive the spiritual food which was then given, and again and again given, and never withheld, while she passed through the dreadful conflict.

Are we not called now into the same attitude? True, we have no conflict with the powers that be; but have we no warfare with pride, and luxury, and greediness of gain, and coldness in God's service, and a thousand other enemies that might be mentioned? There is such a thing as the resisting of God's Spirit. Nay, verily, not only individual christians, but whole churches thrust him from them, and walk according to their own devices. Let us beware. Let us examine the "footsteps of the flock," and let us follow in them.

But again. Two hundred and forty-seven years have passed away, and there is a bloodless but most complete revolution in Scotland. For some time there have been a turning and a shaking of sentiments and principles. Some, like Daniel, have opened their windows and prayed aloud,—others have closed themselves from the light, and prayed beneath their breath; and others prayed not at all. But the time has come at last, and men who would not sell their religious freedom for a mess of pottage, must leave the Erastian Establishment forever.

Another year has passed away, and all have been more or less called upon to sacrifice for "the soul's peace, Christ's love, and kingly honor." Friendships have been broken, brethren have been separated, and all have been called in some way to suffer the "contempt of the proud, and the scorning of those who are at their ease;" but by God's grace they have been enabled to walk in the "footsteps of the flock" right fearlessly, and even cheerfully.

A retrospect of this past year was one of deep interest, and it might have been thought by all, that songs of gratitude only were needed on such an occasion. There were individuals, however, who looked on the retrospect and trembled. Personal religion, they thought, might perhaps be lost sight of in the cause of the Church generally. Much might be observed that was not of God; self-confidence, pride, a "giving all the goods to feed the poor" without "charity." O yes! amidst much which bore the stamp of God's Spirit, much could be seen which bore the impression of man's foolishness. And good men wept in secret.

It may be that John Davidson of old was thought of; we know not, but this we know, that a motion was carried in the General Assembly, that the 21st of May should be kept by its members as a day of solemn humiliation and prayer, in reference to the state of religion.

We can never forget the description of that meeting, as related to us by an eye-witness, (who is now, we do not doubt, a member of the "general assembly of the first-born,") and as nearly as we can, we will now use the words of our beloved departed friend:

"Well, the 21st came, and we all met at the church where Charles Brown was to conduct the exercises. O! it was a solemn day throughout! There sat Dr. McDonald—dear good man, we call him the apostle to the Highlands. He has seen sore affliction, but his prayers of faith have been answered,—he is now a happy man. There sat Dr. Gordon; he is always serious, but then he seemed just to have arisen from his knees. And there were Henry Grey, and Guthrie, and Candlish, and Cunningham, and *our own beloved Chalmers!*—blessings on him. O, it was a day to be remembered in eternity! All the Ministers and most of the Elders, and the Divinity students, were there. The house was crowded—but all was still as the grave. The Rev. Charles Brown conducted the meeting. I give you the substance of his remarks, which were published, and perhaps you will be disappointed in them, for Mr. B. is not such a man in point of talent as many I have mentioned; but that discourse answered the purpose for which it was spoken, and it seemed as if the Holy Ghost accompanied each word with power to every heart, and the blessings of that day

never can be forgotten. I would not lift my head, for I wept as I had done in childhood. But I was not alone in my weeping, for unrestrained tears told plainly that those whom we looked upon as "princes in Israel," were now but as little children. O my friend, that was a blessed day!"

And what has been the result. The full answer to this question can only be given in eternity. Some little may now be said. A revival of religious feeling, more or less in every congregation belonging to the Free Church of Scotland, has been going on ever since. This world's honors are considered by many of the most influential in rank as nothing, so that Christ be gained. The schemes of the church for extending the Gospel are abundantly supported, and Ministers are not only upheld, but enabled to proclaim the whole truth of God to saint and sinner. God's blessing is now apparent on that Church.

O! we know that God not only gives the praying heart, but that he is ever willing to hear and answer prayer. As Ministers—as elders or deacons—as private members of that dear Presbyterian church which has been so highly privileged in by-past days—LET US PRAY!

M.

What we have not done, and what we have done.

THE abuse heaped upon the magazine by the Methodist editors and preachers is so bitter, that one would suppose it had been attacking the very foundations of their faith, and aiming not only to unchurch, but to unchristianize them. I say editors and preachers, because their people, by one device or other, are kept from reading our pages, and know little about our work, except what they hear from these sources.

Now, I ask, what has the magazine done? Has it attacked a single doctrine essential to christian character as held by the Methodists? Has a single fundamental principle of their theology been attacked? Not one! The great saving doctrines of the Gospel they are admitted to hold in common with us. Fundamentals have been attacked, however, but they are not the fundamentals of Christianity—but of Methodism. And

hence the alarm and the excitement. These were known and felt to be weak points, and nothing short of a most vigorous defence could save them. Had the attack been directed against their Gospel doctrines, their castle of Ulloa, there would have been comparative quiet under a sense of security behind their impregnable walls and bulwarks. But when the bombs begin to fall in the defenceless city, all is bustle and alarm.

I propose to take a hasty view of this controversy, beginning with the Witness of the Spirit, which, though not published in the magazine, is in a measure identified with it, as its author is one of the editors.

This tract was necessary to expose and explode an error, which, there was reason to fear, might insinuate itself into all the churches. That it was a doctrine which the Methodists claimed as peculiar to their church, entitled it to no exemption—but the contrary course, as from their numbers and influence it might in their hands be productive of the greatest mischief. Let our Methodist friends reflect for a moment upon the effect that might be produced, not only upon the minds of those without, but upon weaker christians of other demoninations, on hearing it constantly proclaimed by the preachers and people of a leading sect, “we only have the true witness. You have the form but not the power of godliness. If you want to be happy come join us.” Let them reflect for a moment, and I am sure we need offer them no further apology for that publication. If John Calvin, instead of John Wesley, had originated or revived the doctrine of the direct witness of the Spirit, it should and would have been treated in the same way.

Now what next? What has the magazine done? Why, it has (passing minor points) commenced a review of the Methodist discipline. And what is that? Is it something too sacred to be talked about, or written about? I dare say Mr. Wesley would not have thought so, good man as he was, but would have said to all, “scrutinize, examine, investigate it—weigh it in the balances.” Nor have you thought so, brethren, of the Confession of Faith—a book entitled to at least equal respect with your discipline. Nor have you, in referring to that book, shown any more forbearance than has been shown to your discipline. Nay, far less; for you have spoken of it, and quo-

ted from it, and held it up as the worst of all books;—so much so, that there is hardly a member of your church who does not believe that it contains doctrines that are “unscriptural and of evil tendency.” If this be not true, then I am greatly misinformed. And if it is true, why then complain?

But I am passing by one little matter which was seized upon at the time, and held up as a slanderous charge, brought against your whole denomination. It was the copying into the magazine from another paper, a little scrap, detailing improprieties which had occurred in some Methodist church in the far west.

Without taking the time or the trouble to inquire whether it was true or false, the editors of the magazine were denounced as publishers of wilful falsehoods. And now, having touched upon this charge of slander, which has been resounding from your pulpits and presses ever since, let us go on and dispose of it. We shall see that, in each separate instance, it has been just as groundless as in the one just referred to.

First, it is alleged that the whole Methodist church has been stigmatized as tories. I utterly deny it. No, brethren—we believe you to be as good whigs as are in the land. But it was necessary, in rebutting charges preferred by you against us, to remind you of a fact which we would all willingly forget—that is, that the Methodist preachers in the revolution were *not* whigs. But I am happy to say, that in this instance at least, it does not follow, that because the “fathers have eaten sour grapes the children’s teeth are set on edge.” No. We look upon you as true and faithful subjects of this government, and we do hope you will give us no occasion to change our opinion, by carrying out your published threats—to control the elections.

In sustaining this charge of slander, you frequently refer to an expression in the Iron Wheel, No. 1—“debauched pietism.” You have shown great obliquity in attempting to construe these words into a charge against the purity of morals in your church, when you ought to know, (I will not say you do know,) they had no reference whatever to moral character.

Something has been said, in one No. of the Iron Wheel, about the honesty of members of the Methodist church.

Of the truth or falsehood of this I will affirm nothing;—and yet, in the mixed masses of seekers and converts, who are

jumbled together in the Methodist churches, (the former largely predominating,) we should hardly expect to find as much integrity of character as in those which are at least intended to consist wholly of the latter. Nor can we reasonably expect the man who believes his religion may be laid aside and resumed again, to adhere as rigidly to the precepts of the Gospel as he who believes if he fall away, it would be impossible to renew him again to repentance.

And now for the charge of assailing the purity of female character. For this you deserve the severest rebuke. It is so false, so groundless, and so malignant. Such a thought never entered into the minds of either editor or contributor to the magazine, and we defy you to lay your finger upon a single sentence that can be tortured into such a meaning. Near of kin to this charge is that of obscenity, and equally gratuitous—based, resting principally, if not solely, upon some Latin quotations, which the writer would have been criminal in omitting; as much so as the witness upon the stand who should suppress part of the truth, lest he might, forsooth, offend against delicacy.

And in reference to these two last charges, is it not remarkable, that we have heard no complaint except from our Methodist friends? These charges, if true, would constitute offences against the community—against society at large; and yet no one of our nine hundred subscribers, and of our four times nine hundred readers, has discovered this obscenity? "Medicus" is not an exception, for he is a Methodist in disguise, by his own showing—denying that very feature in Presbyterianism which has been considered a leading characteristic, and has been most spoken against; heading his first number with a quotation, which, though scriptural, is more rude and offensive in its application than any thing that has fallen from the most violent Methodist partizan.

So far, I have, in the main, been stating what the magazine has *not done*. But there are things which the magazine has done, and these I am free to admit; and our Methodist brethren too, must admit them, or deny their own authorities.

And first, it has shown that the clergy of that denomination are well paid, and that provision is made for themselves, their wives, and their little ones—extending in the case of the first

to infirmity and old age. This has not been done as a reproach, (I at least admire this feature in your discipline, and only wish our Presbyterian preachers were half-so well provided for,) but to correct popular error—that the Methodist preachers were more hard-working and self-denying than their brethren of other denominations. This, if ever true, has long since ceased to be so, and at the present day I do not know a finer *opening* for a young man who wants to seek his fortune than that of circuit riding.

First comes the salary. Bread and water made sure. The horse and equipments. Good clothes,—the preacher must not be ragged. Good cheer,—for he arrives by appointment, usually, at the best houses, for the poor must not be oppressed—consequently good society. Fine, healthful exercise on horseback. With these advantages, the improvement both of the mental and physical man must be rapid. In the constant and frequent changes from family to family, and from circle to circle, he must acquire information—his mind must expand. The physical man, too, will share in the improvement. His hands will soften—his complexion brighten up, and his manners improve. Having undergone these changes and improvements, what a field lies open before him for matrimonial enterprise. He may be courting all the time, and if unsuccessful upon one circuit, next year carries him to another—his office all the while securing his admission into the best families. I am almost carried out of myself as I draw the picture, and could wish I were young again, that I might be a circuit rider.

Again. The magazine has shown the *tendency* of class and band meetings—nothing more; and their similarity to the institutions of another church. A single instance, perhaps, has been given, of evil growing out of them, because challenged to do so. And who can deny the truth of these things? The systems have been laid side by side, and the comparison fairly made. And that evils have grown out of one of them at least, (the band meeting,) we think we find evidence in the fact that they have fallen into comparative disuse.

Thus I have hastily summed up, as well as my memory serves me, the head and front of our offending, and would say in conclusion, brethren, give us argument and not railing. No

longer charge upon us offences which we have not committed, nor designs which we have never cherished. We wish not to uproot nor destroy; but we would guard our own people, and the people at large, from errors which, we believe, exist in your system—errors pernicious to yourselves and offensive to your brethren, because you vainly fancy that they give you a pre-eminence over them.

Nor would we have you cherish these errors any the more fondly because you may believe that, as a church, the Lord blesses and prospers you—for this he does, we believe, only to a very limited extent. You have numbers, it is true, but they are mere sutlers and camp-followers, and are out of all proportion to the evangelical portion. Your system reminds us of Jack Downing's plan for increasing the number of American citizens—by capturing the Mexicans. I make the remark with no feeling but that of pity, for my heart mourns and bleeds over the condition of seekers, in the Methodist church, as being the most dangerous in which frail human nature can be placed. Mere numbers are no evidence of the favor of God, else the Catholic might claim it. It cannot be otherwise than that your numbers should increase, so long as the access is so easy, and the inducements are so great. A simple shake of the hand with a preacher, conferring a title to the highest privileges that Heaven has conferred upon man.

After all, and as a last word, allow me to say that, in the Methodist church we believe there is deep, ardent, saving piety. We hold you not to the doctrine of perfection, though you teach it,—nor do we say that you have no religion because you refuse to commune with a Roscite, any more than we would that Peter had none, because he refused to eat with the Gentiles.

J. K.

We are happy to be able to inform our subscribers that one of the editors has received a letter from the Rev. Dr. HODGE, of Princeton, in which, in compliance with our request, he promises to write something for our magazine, feeling this to be a call of duty which he is not at liberty to decline, though he has so many and so pressing claims to meet.—EDS.

A Narrative of the state of Religion

Within the bounds of the Synod of Tennessee, during the Synodical year, ending October, 1847.

TO THE CHURCHES UNDER OUR CARE.

Dear Brethren:—Notwithstanding the hoary hairs and exhausted strength of some of our venerable and beloved fathers in the ministry, forbid their attendance with us at our stated sessions of Synod; and notwithstanding others of our brethren have been severely afflicted within the last year, still, through the distinguishing mercy of the Great Head of the Church, we are all yet alive. For this, we devoutly thank God. And we are also gratified to learn that, while many of your number have, during the past year, fallen asleep in Jesus, as we trust, no visible marks of the Divine displeasure, no signal mortality, has visited any part of our extended boundary.

We feel it to be our duty also to note, that whilst other lands have been famishing for the want of daily bread, a luxuriant soil, a salubrious climate, and a benign Providence, have laden our fields with rich provisions, and poured upon our tables the contents of the horn of abundance.

Although it is not permitted us to report the addition of much numerical strength to our churches, yet we have evidence from what follows, that the great body of our membership have been gradually growing in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

1. A regular and increased attention to the stated means of grace, and to the benevolent Societies of the age, with the exception perhaps of the Temperance cause, gives *evidence* of this, and *promise* of future blessings from God. The cause of Missions, especially Foreign and Domestic, has evidently obtained a strong hold on the hearts of our people, and must react in blessings on our heads. God has said, the liberal soul shall be made fat, and he that watereth shall be watered again. The commencement made by Holston Presbytery in favor of Domestic Missions, which has been published in the Calvinistic Magazine, is still pursued with increasing zeal by that Presbytery. We learn, with pleasure, that the same work is espoused by New River Presbytery also. We have great hope in the feasibility and success of this movement.

2. A very praiseworthy and exalted emulation in building houses of public worship, now pervades our churches. Our members no longer feel willing to live in ceiled houses, while the house of God lies waste. This is evidence at once of confidence in the rectitude of their designs, and of permanency in their operations.

3. Another distinguishing evidence of coming prosperity, is the growing zeal of our ministry and people for truth and righteousness. For while they are actively engaged in contending "earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints," they forget not that "without holiness" of heart "no man shall see the Lord."

A STATISTICAL VIEW.

PRESBYTERIES.	Licentiates.	Ordinations.	Installations.	Dismissions.	Deaths.	Ministers.	Churches.	Candidates.	Receptions.	Secessions.
Union,		1				17	32	4	1	1
Holston,				1		10	12		1	
New River,	1					6	9			
Kingston,				1		8	16			
Chattahoochee,	2					4	8			
Total,	3	1		2		45	77	4	2	1

FRANCIS A. McCORKLE, MODERATOR.

GIDEON S. WHITE, *Clerk, pro tem.*

The following note is from Mr. Ross:

If not too late, put in the forthcoming No. a pointed N. B., requesting every subscriber to correct with his pen the error in my last article, (the letter to Dr. Converse.) Request the word "not" to be struck out, page 323, nineteenth line from top, in the sentence—"Relief, we affirmed, was (*not*) obtained in all these ways." That "*not*" destroys the sense of the entire argument, and makes a flat contradiction in the very paragraph.



059172109742785