

THE
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,

AND

EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY:

DEVOTED TO THE PRINCIPLES OF THE REFORMATION,

AS SET FORTH IN THE

Formularies of the Westminster Divines,

AND OF THE

CHURCHES OF HOLLAND.

Edited by a Minister of the Associate Presbyterian Church.

VOLUME X.

In vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men. . . . *Matt. xv. 9.*

ALBANY :

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY CHAUNCEY WEBSTER.

.....
1833-4.

Period, 1718.55
v. 10

THE
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,

1833-1834

AND

EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

JUNE, 1833.

ART. I. Letter from Rome.

ROME, (ITALY,) MAY 1st, 1833.

REV. AND DEAR BROTHER,

I AM NOW on the eve of leaving Rome, where I have been for a month. In this famous city there is much to admire and much to deplore. It was once styled the Eternal City and Goddess of the Earth; and the immense remains of Antiquity, here to be seen, excite the astonishment and admiration of every beholder, and prove the grandeur and magnificence of this ancient Mistress of the world. If the ruins are so great and wonderful, what must have been the splendour and magnificence of the city itself in all its pristine glory. Its ancient walls, fifteen miles in circumference, are still standing, precluding access to the city except through the gates, some of which were constructed before the commencement of the christian æra. The extensive and massy remains of ancient Baths, Aqueducts, and other public edifices, especially the palace of the Cæsars, are exceedingly interesting. But the most astonishing ruins in Rome, and perhaps in the world, is the Coliseum or Amphitheatre, which covers more than five acres, whose outer wall, at present, is more than one hundred and fifty feet in height, and which contained room within for more than seventy thousand spectators, who sat and saw, for amusement and sport, men murdering men, and Christians killed by wild beasts!

In this city are still to be seen the ruins of ancient Temples, in which, about two thousand years ago, the heathen "worshipped devils, and idols of gold, and silver, and brass, and stone, and of wood, which are by nature no gods." Most of these ruins are repaired, and converted into places of Roman Catholic worship. The Pantheon, which contained a collection of the Heathen Deities, and which was built long before Christ was born, still remains nearly perfect, and is considered one of the finest specimens of ancient architecture. Here too, are to be seen the very altars on which the ancient Romans offered in sacrifice, those victims which the scripture says, "they sacrificed to devils and not to God." And here too, are to be seen a multitude of the very idols, which the ancient Greeks, and Romans, and Egyptians, and other heathen nations, worshipped. In the collection is to be seen Jupiter, Mercury, Diana of Ephesus, and idols from Egypt, and other parts of the world, conquered by the Roman arms. "Professing themselves to be wise, they

became fools, and changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man; and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things;—who changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator who is blessed forever. Amen.” But alas! how much better is Rome Christian, than Rome Pagan! How much better is the reign of Anti-christ, than the reign of heathenish darkness, and Pagan idolatry, and superstition! This imperial seat of the Cæsars has long since become “the seat of the Beast,” “that man of sin, and son of perdition, who opposeth, and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he, as God, sitteth in the Temple of God, showing himself that he is God;” and hath persecuted unto the death, multitudes of the faithful followers of the Lamb.

The Roman Catholics have here many most magnificent churches, as they call them, adorned with precious stones, and sculptured and carved work, and garnished with images, altars, paintings, and crosses; before which they bow down to worship. Some of these images, particularly the paintings, more especially some in the Pope’s Chapel, are executed and exhibited in a manner which not only religion forbids, but common decency condemns. These images, altars, crosses, and paintings, are set up, not only in their chapels, but in their dwelling-houses, by the highway, at the corner of the streets, at all places of public resort, and even in the ruins of antiquity.

The Pope and Cardinals, and other priests, are “clothed in fine linen, and purple and scarlet, and decked with gold, and precious stones, and pearls.” They perform their ceremonies with great pomp, apparent solemnity, and seeming sanctity. It is truly most affecting to witness their abominable idolatries, superstitions, and will-worship. The humiliating scene prompts the spectator to exclaim—Is this worshipping God, who is a Spirit, in spirit and in truth? Are these the “beauties of holiness?” Where are “the saints of Cæsar’s household?” Where is the Apostolic Church of “Rome, beloved of God, called to be saints,—whose faith is spoken of throughout the whole world?” One may see here what Paul saw at Athens,—“a city wholly given to idolatry.” And one might say to these Roman Catholics what that fearless and faithful Apostle, when his spirit was stirred within him, said to those polite Athenians, “I perceive that in all things ye are too superstitious; God who made the world, and all things therein, seeing that he is God of all, dwelleth not in temples made with hands; neither is worshipped with men’s hands as though he needed any thing. Forasmuch then as we are the offspring of God, we ought not to think that the Godhead is like to gold, or silver, or stone, graven by art and man’s device.”

The Roman Catholic religion is a strange compound of heathenish idolatry and superstition, with the abrogated rites and ceremonies of the Mosaic economy, and the doctrines and ordinances of Christianity, most impiously corrupted, and perverted. Nothing it seems can be done in religion, without bowing down before an image, picture, or cross. There is more reverence paid to the Pope, Cardinals, and other dignitaries, than to the Most High. There is more praying to departed saints, especially the Virgin Mary, than to God. There is more trusting in self, than in Jesus Christ for salvation. It is said that the more intelligent, in the higher classes, both among the priests and people are sunk into infidelity. To the rest, religion is a system of pharisaical self-righteousness, and formality. It is a system of error, blasphemy, and iniquity, which robs God of his glory, and is fully fraught with total and eternal ruin to the immortal souls of men. Where this “mystery of iniquity prevails, there is

the reign of tyranny, temporal and spiritual; there is the dominion of darkness and death."

The Cathedral of "St. Peter's," is the largest and most magnificent building of the kind in the world. It cost fifty-seven millions of dollars, before it received all its grand and costly decorations. Among the multitude of the wonderful things which it contains is a bronze image of the Apostle Peter, sitting in a chair raised upon a pedestal. Some have said that this is the very image of Jupiter worshipped by the ancient Romans, but it is most probable that it was cast out of the fragments of an immense image of that supreme heathen deity, as it is an exact copy of an ancient marble statute of that Apostle, kept in the lower part of the building; and as it represents him holding keys in one hand, and with the other making a gesture, as if in the act of preaching, or rather, pronouncing a benediction. The front part of the right foot projects over the pedestal, and thus conveniently exposed, the great toe receives the kisses of all classes, from the Pope, down to the poorest beggar, which ceremony has been so often repeated, that the solid metal is half worn away. This degrading ceremony, is also performed upon the images, relics, and even upon wooden crosses, erected in public places. The adoration of relics, of which there is no scarcity, is common. On a certain day in "St. Peter's," there is a brilliant display of these pretended precious and sacred things, particularly the sponge, in which, vinegar was administered to Christ, a part of his seamless vesture, and a piece of the very cross, on which he was crucified, said to be brought to Rome from Jerusalem, by Constantine's mother. The people firmly believe that the saints, especially the Virgin Mary, can work miracles. Over the doors of the chapels, is written, "perpetual plenary indulgences for the living and dead;" and frequently over the altars, "mass for the souls in purgatory." Billets are stuck up in public places announcing the death of great personages, requesting prayers for their departed souls. Labels are often to be seen directing to the repetition of certain prayers for a definite number of times, and to the performance of certain ceremonies, such as kissing an image, cross or relic, and promising for these things indulgence for a large but definite number of days. In and around Rome, are many great and grand buildings, said to be erected by Constantine, one of which, about three miles from the city, is built over what is shown to be the tomb of the Apostle Paul and about three miles farther, is pointed out the spot, where he suffered martyrdom. The Apostle Peter's tomb is said to be in the lower part of the Cathedral, called by his name. Immediately before the high altar, and above the Apostle's grave, is a circular opening in the floor or marble pavement of the building, surrounded by many large lamps, kept constantly burning. Around this opening, the Pope and the people bow down, to pray to him, whom they believe to be the foundation of the Church, and the keeper of the keys of the kingdom of heaven. The Vatican is like a city for magnitude, and like a palace for the vast number of its great and grand apartments, which are some of the first specimens of architecture in the world. The Vatican library, one apartment of which is nearly half a mile long, is adorned with paintings and antique pillars of marble, and contains, besides an immense collection of books, many very old, and rare manuscripts of the holy scriptures, and the writings of ancient profane authors. Some of these manuscripts are exceedingly beautiful specimens of hand-writing. Some of them are written in letters of gold, and ornamented with exquisitely fine paintings, in brilliant colors on the margin. In this place are kept among many other rare and curious things, the instruments of cruelty, with which the primitive Christians were tortured to death. The Vatican museums are very extensive, con-

taining the choicest specimens of the fine arts, both ancient and modern. Among the things of this immense collection, are to be seen the paintings of the most famous modern masters, which make a person wonder, that with canvass and colour alone, objects can be so represented as if life and reality were before your eyes. These museums contain vast numbers of antique statues of the most renowned men of antiquity, and antique images of the idols of ancient Greece and Rome, and other parts of the world. No wonder that the fine arts are brought in modern times to such a high degree of perfection in Italy, for it is the very genius of the Roman Catholic Religion, to give the greatest encouragement to sculpture, painting, music and architecture. It is a religion well adapted to please the eye, and ear, and corrupt heart of man. To see the Pope arrayed in his splendid pontifical robes, with the golden tiara or triple crown, bespangled with precious stones, upon his head; to see multitudes of cardinals, canons, prelates and priests gorgeously dressed and decked, bowing down obsequiously to kiss his hand or embrace his foot; and to see the pomp and apparent solemnity, sanctity and sincerity with which their ceremonies are performed, is a scene well calculated to delude the poor ignorant people, and excite them to blind devotion. They are kept in the most abject state of ignorance. When asked for a bible, they give directions to go to the priests. When asked to repeat the ten commandments, they invariably omit the second, of which they know nothing, and divide the tenth to make up the number. Although they seem to feel their religion to be a galling yoke, and an intolerable burden; yet they love to have it so, because it gives them liberty to live in sin, and at the same time, to entertain the firmest hopes of heaven. If we were to judge of the excellence of religion from the morals of the people in Protestant and Roman Catholic Countries, there is not much reason to fear, that in the comparison, Popery would fall before Protestantism, as Dagon fell before the Ark of God. To mention but one or two things, in these catholic countries, it is rare to find a person possessed of common honesty; and the public services of the Sabbath, are over by mid-day, and the afternoon and evening, by both priests and people, are devoted to pleasure and pastime. The Pope's temporal power and pomp is wonderfully brought down, although his spiritual authority and influence is great, not only in Europe but other parts of the world. He has not now, as he once had, crowns and kingdoms at his disposal, and inexhaustible treasures to lavish away, at his pleasure. But propped up by the Emperor of Austria, this "mystery of iniquity" still worketh and will work "until he that letteth will take it out of the way." How long shall "the man of sin and son of perdition oppose, and exalt himself above all that is called God?" When will "the Lord consume that wicked one, with the spirit of his mouth, and destroy him with the brightness of his coming?" When will the reign of Anti-Christ be over, and the fall of the Mystical Babylon, and the Kingdom of the Beast be finished? "How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge the blood of the Martyrs of Jesus, who loved not their lives unto the death?" O, when will divine light, truth and holiness universally prevail, and gloriously triumph over all ignorance, error, superstition, idolatry and ungodliness?

Surely if Protestants were better acquainted with the sad state of spiritual blindness and bondage, in which the people in Roman Catholic Countries are kept, they would prize their christian light, liberty and privileges more highly, improve them more diligently, and pray more frequently and fervently for the destruction of every Anti-Christian principle and practice. Let them bless God for the glorious Reformation, which has been productive of both civil and religious liberty, to so many

millions of mankind. Let them beware of trusting in whole or in part to their own righteousness, but hold fast the doctrine of justification by the free grace of God, through faith in the imputed righteousness of the Lord Jesus Christ. This was the corner stone of the Reformation, which was sealed by the blood of those who "were slain for the word of God, and for the testimony of Jesus, which they held." Having made a good profession before many witnesses, let them "hold fast the profession of their faith without wavering, for he is faithful, who hath promised." In a world so full of error and ungodliness, let them "contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the Saints." Let them cling closely to Christ and his cause, so much despised and opposed in countries called Christian and Protestant. Let them beware of formality, delusion and hypocrisy, lest they "hold the truth in unrighteousness," and the "light in them be darkness." Let not their lives belie their profession, but adorn the doctrine of God their Saviour, walking in all his ordinances and commandments, blameless. It will be more tolerable for poor blinded Roman Catholics in the day of judgement, than for enlightened Protestants, if they misimprove the light, liberty and privileges, which they enjoy. If "judgement begin at the house of God, what shall be the end of them, who obey not the gospel of God?"

There is no place of Protestant worship within the walls of Rome, but beyond one of the gates is a room used for the Episcopalian service.

Had I time and space, I could give you more interesting particulars, but I know not how nor when this letter will reach you.

Yours in the bonds of Christian affection,

THOMAS GOODWILLIE.

ART. II. *The Parts of the Revelation that exhibit the Church in our own Time, considered.*

[Continued from Vol. IX.]

I SHALL NOW offer some observations on the *opposition* which the serpent makes against her. It is said to have been the remark of an eminent minister, that all the opposition which has been made to the church, has been either by *force* or *fraud*; and he had good authority for it; for the spirit of God has classed it all under the same two heads, in the following words: "He (Christ) shall deliver the needy when he crieth, the poor also, and him that hath no helper. He shall spare the poor and needy, and shall save the souls of the needy. He shall redeem their soul from *deceit and violence*," &c., Ps. lxxii. 12, 13, 14. Now, the opposition here made by the devil, is classed precisely under the same two heads. He "persecuted her," ver. 13; this is violence or force, and he cast out of his mouth water as a flood after her; this comprehends fraud and deception of the most deep and hellish sort.

As to persecution or force, I am of opinion that the devil still pursues the woman in this way. It is true we have not very lately heard of any one being beheaded, or burnt, for believing in the truth. But force can be applied in various ways and under various false pretences. The Emperor Julian did not persecute any one directly and formally, for professing the truth, but he made such laws as he knew a Christian could not in conscience obey, and then he put them to death for not obeying the laws. And we have lately seen an instance, in this blessed and free country, of something not exceedingly unlike this, in the case of the

Cherokee Missionaries ; enough to prove that this malicious serpent-cunning has still a place on the earth, and has not ceased entirely to act. When laws are made, the keeping of which is a direct violation of the institutions of the Christian religion, it is unquestionably pursuing the woman by force ; and such are some of the standing laws of this country respecting Sabbath mails. When the property of such as are in public capacity, adhering to the truth, is taken from them iniquitously, by a course of law, it must be classed under the same head. When the apostatising part of the professing community, "speak evil of the way of truth," and set forth a host of calumnies against those that continue to love it, it really amounts to force, and though not so frightful to the eyes of flesh as the old fashioned way, of first excommunicating and then handing over to the civil power to be burnt as heretics, it is equally pregnant with the bitter hate of the serpent, and not less disastrous to the cause of truth ; neither is it by any means unproductive of evil consequences to this temporal life.

And I am persuaded that if a fair calculation of these different ways of force were made, that the modern way would, in the aggregate, mightily preponderate over the old way. The Pope was obliged to direct his power against individuals, or very small numbers at a time, but we have contrived a system of such prodigious power, that it can *thrust* away from the truth a *whole generation*. Indications of that same spirit, which soaked the earth with Protestant blood, are still numerous, and it only waits for the removal of restraints put on it by the providence of God, to use similar violence again. Indeed every error is, when consistently and fully followed out, a principle of persecution, as necessarily as its opposite truth is a principle of meekness and peace.

I have said that the waters which he casts out of his mouth as a flood, comprehend fraud and deceit, under which I class all unscriptural tenets and doctrines of men, whether they respect matters of faith or of practice. That this is the meaning of it, is inferable from the distinction that is here made in the serpent's opposition, between persecution and the waters of the flood. For as the former includes all the different ways in which *violence* is done to the woman, so these waters must, in like manner, include all the different ways by which he has endeavored to blind her understanding, and lead her astray. These waters are "cast out of the mouth," and what else but doctrines or sentiments can the *mouth* cast out ? and when we consider what is meant particularly by the devil's *mouth*, in this place, it is still more manifest that doctrines are included.

The *mouth* in question, is that which Daniel beheld in "the little horn speaking great things," ch. vii. 8. These great things are, in the explanation, called "words against the Most High," ver. 25. In the next chap. they are called "casting down *truth* to the ground," ver. 12. And Revelation xiii. 5, 6, "there was given to him a mouth speaking great things and *blasphemy*—and he opened his mouth in blasphemy against God, to blaspheme his name and his tabernacle, and them that dwell in heaven—ver. 14. And he *deceives* them that dwell upon the earth." This mouth, in 2 Thess. ii. 4. 9, 10, 11, claims to be above all that is called God, or that is worshipped, and as God to sit in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God."—It speaks "with all deceivableness of unrighteousness"—and "strong delusion that they should believe a lie." These texts not only prove that this mouth casts forth the waters of erroneous and false doctrine, but that it also rejects the testimony of God in the Scriptures, and claims to *itself* the right to give out what shall be and what shall not be matters of faith and practice. All this is represented as from *one mouth* ; but it cannot be taken properly for one only, any more than

we can understand by the "man of sin," only one individual. For this is a *mouth* which continues to speak these *great things* through the whole 1260 days or years. It must, therefore, have a succession of persons and generations, disposed thus to speak in the service of the dragon.—And I see no reason for confining it to a succession of Popes and the clergy under him. It must include *every mouth* that speaks under the influence and for the interest of the dragon during this period—every mouth which puts aside the testimony of God, to make way for its own dogmas. For upon the same principle that the Spirit here sets down the doctrines of the Pope and his creatures, to the account of the dragon, while they avow and profess to be abhorring such a connection, and to be serving Christ alone, we may justly set over to the account of Popery every doctrine which it comprehends, although it be taught by those professing to abhor Popery. The justice of this will appear from the fact that the Apostle John, in his first Epistle, sets the heresies that were rising up in his own day, to the account of Anti-Christ, even before Anti-Christ had, in his own proper form, come into existence. And from this instance we also learn that it is just to call those doctrines popish, which may be fairly deduced from any popish tenet, although the Pope or his clergy never expressly avowed or taught them. It will, no doubt, be perceived that this ascribes a wide and deep course to the *waters* of the dragon, and includes many a mouth, this day, which would open itself wide to pour forth indignation upon an application of this sentiment.

The consideration of the term "*waters*," will lead us to a similar conclusion with respect to the nature of this opposition. Waters are used diversely, to signify deep afflictions. The Psalmist says, "I am come into deep waters." Sometimes to denote the invasion of an overwhelming army :—"Now, therefore, behold, the Lord bringeth up upon them the waters of the river, strong and many, even the king of Assyria." Isa. viii. 7. But the waters in question are distinguished from these, and all others, by this circumstance, that they are the waters of the *mouth*. The waters of the mouth are the counsels of the heart, expressed by the *words* of the mouth. This is clear from Prov. xx. 5, "Counsel in the heart of man is like deep water, but a man of understanding will draw it out."—Compare with chap. xviii. 4, "The words of a man's mouth are as deep waters, and the well spring of wisdom as a flowing brook." More particularly the counsel of God, as expressed in the doctrines of grace, and the preaching of the Gospel, are very often set forth under the term *waters*. The following are a few instances :—"With joy shall ye draw *water* out of the wells of salvation." Isa. xii. 3. "Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters," chap. lv. i. "Thou wouldest have asked of him and he would have given thee *living water*." John iv. 10. "He that believeth on me, as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of *living water*," chap. vii. 38. "And whosoever will, let him come and take of the *water* of life freely." Rev. xxii. 17. Now, it must be kept in mind, that although the Lord Jesus here discovers to his servants that these waters of opposition to the woman come from the mouth of the dragon, this has not at any time been avowed by those that pour them forth, but the very opposite of this; they have always professed that they were the doctrines of the Gospel—the true grace of God—the true doctrine of the Bible,—the only doctrine that can lead to salvation. They come professing to be the water which satisfies and refreshes the thirsty soul, and not the poison of dragons, which kills it. There has never yet been a sentiment brought to bear on the faith or practice of the saints, for which this much has not been claimed, There is not a single teacher of errors, this day, among the thousands, that will not claim for his doctrine the name of Gospel—"glad tidings of

great joy." Yet they are those waters "that have become wormwood, and many men die of them, because they are made bitter." Rev. viii. 11.

Having determined the meaning of these waters, let us next take notice of the comparison introduced. These waters are cast forth "*as a flood,*" for multitude—for having no regular channel—no barrier—because they are turbid and filthy—and because they beat with incessant violence against whatever stands in their way, until it yields and is carried away. All these points of resemblance to a flood could be easily pointed out in the doctrines of the dragon, at any given time within the 1260 days, but never with greater ease than at present. Their multitude can scarcely be calculated, whether we consider the number employed in pouring them forth, or the multifarious ways and methods used to convey them, or the multitude of different opinions that are propagated. If you subtract from the aggregate of all that is called Christian doctrine in the world, only that which teaches to expect justification by faith in the righteousness of Christ *imputed*, it would scarcely be discernibly diminished. And if the number of those who teach this doctrine were to be cut off, it would be only like cutting off two witnesses from the whole body of professed teachers, or like taking Elijah away from the number of Baals prophets. I need not offer any proof that this flood has no regular channel. This is a thing that has always been manifest. There is, in many instances, the semblance of respect to the order which God has set up in his word; while in other instances it is openly discarded in part or in whole, and a new order, of men's contriving, set up in its stead. But even where it *seems to be* regarded, it is only because it stands not in *the way* of these waters. It takes but little acquaintance with what has been doing for fifty years past, to know that powerful efforts have been making to subvert the whole order of the Reformed Churches, and to form religious society upon a new model, altogether different. Doctrine, worship, and practice are all conducted on a new plan. Christian and ministerial fellowship is carried on upon a new footing, and is itself a new thing. The work of the church, as defined in the word of God, is laid off in parcels, and undertaken by as many new voluntary associations, upon their own assumed principles, but as a matter of choice, and not of indispensable obligation. Neither need there be much illustration offered, that it has no barrier. The word of God is no barrier to it, because it is either not consulted at all, or it is assumed without proof to be on their side. Creeds and Testimonies are cried down by popular acclamation as antiquated forms. Oaths, Covenants and Ordination vows are no barrier; new light shows a man how to get over them, with the greatest ease. Sound argument is confuted, by simply paying no attention to it. Fairness, candour and common decency are readily surmounted by zeal for the souls of sinners. They must be compelled, literally compelled to come in. They must be assailed, (yet so as they shall not know how,) in their dwellings, in the schools, where their children are taught common education, in their places of worship. The new doctrine must be thrust in before them, and they compelled to swallow it.*

Consistency of character is no hindrance, because until now, men had not found out the *right way*—all the past was but the errors and the bigotry which they had inherited from their half enlightened fathers. This *flood is turbid and filthy*. It is such a flood as follows a storm. It comes after "the winds blow and the rains descend," and beats against the house of the soul, and that which is founded only on the sand will fall.

* Not long ago the congregation of a certain Rev. Dr., in the State of New-York, were surprised to find in every pew of the meeting house, a copy of the constitution of another ecclesiastical body!! Such is the spirit of this Jesuitical age.

That it is filthy, you may easily perceive, for those who swim in it as their native element, and those who drink it as the thirsty ox doth the water, continue as filthy and polluted as ever. The flood of opinions and doctrines, now overflowing is nothing at variance with vanity and ostentation of the most disgusting and shameless degree, or with deceit and hypocrisy, or with a carnal conversation, or a worldly mind, or with pride and self-sufficiency, all which, the scriptures denominate abominable filthiness. Such things and others of worse name, still are not only to be seen, but maintained and defended in those who are earnest and sincere in these doctrines.

Farther, as an evidence of the filthiness of these waters, you will observe, that it is perfectly congenial to the dog, who has returned to his own vomit, (the professor who has apostatized, and returned to his old sins,) to lap them, and to the sow who was washed, to wallow in them. Filthy, brutish, sensual men, who cast off all regard to divine institutions, or who never had any; find nothing in the many new schemes of religion, so opposed to their lusts as to hinder them from taking part, or even from going foremost in them. This *flood beats with incessant violence against whatever stands in its way till it yields.* To cause the woman to be carried away, is its main design; to cause her to be carried away from her place, and from those that nourish her. And I understand it, that if she would drink of these waters, if she would embrace the new doctrine and order of things, if she would get over her covenant engagements to the Lord Christ, and her scrupulous tenacity to points of present testimony, points of Church government, worship and discipline, and would follow the multitude, saying "a confederacy" to all she met, and cease to be peculiar in her views and practice; she *would* be carried away. To effect these things, is the design of this flood. The multiplicity of its opinions is to confound and perplex a man, so that he may lose his way, and in that manner be carried off. The disregarding of all sound argument set up against it, and all objections made to it, and the assuming the correctness of its own opinions, and incessantly pressing them on the attention, is another way by which this flood comes away. And it is admirably calculated for the purpose, for it is well known that what has been invincible to force, and could not be gained by argumentation, or compassed by art, has often been effected by incessant importunity alone. The success of the widow's importunity with the unjust judge, may, without impropriety be adduced as an illustration of this. By these means, this flood has carried away many a particular Church already, and it is obvious to every one, whose eyes are yet open, that it is now bearing down upon the remains of the Reformation Societies with tremendous pressure. And what the event, as to them may be, God only knows; but there are many, very many things to justify a fear, that they will all give way. But though they should, the woman will be preserved.

I shall now make some remarks *on the means by which the woman is to be preserved.* And they are *three* in number; two wings of a great Eagle, that she might fly to her place,—a place prepared of God, where she is to be fed and nourished,—and the earth opening its mouth and swallowing this flood, which was designed to carry her away. As to the first, the two wings of a great Eagle is the symbol, and its meaning follows—"that she may fly." Under this is couched a promise and an assurance, that so long as flight shall be the duty and safety of the woman, God in his providence, will provide the means and make a way for it, and the means will be adapted to the end. When she has to make her escape from a flood which is overflowing and passing over every where, and coming unto the hiding-place, and reaching even to the neck, it would serve her little purpose to be swift of foot only, but God provides what

is adapted to her emergency—*Wings of a great Eagle*; by these she can leave the earth, and mount up to the lofty summit of her eternal rock, Christ, where no flood can reach her.

Let the reader here carefully observe, that her safety is represented to be in flight. In order to understand how to use this means of safety, observe, that it is flight from a flood of *errors and human inventions*, as already explained. To fly from these, is to “cease from the instruction that causeth to err.” The moment that she shall perceive the waters of this flood, although it were from the mouth of him, who had hitherto poured forth the water of eternal life pure as crystal, she is to prepare for flight, nor is she to linger a moment, looking at his fair countenance, nor the height of his stature, nor his fame, nor any other external attraction, which he may possess. She is to take heed that she go not where the waters of this flood are come, or are *coming*. Instead of being allured by their popularity and their noise; she is to be alarmed by them, and regard them as a coming destruction. If a man will, in this manner, fly from false and unscriptural doctrine and corruptions in worship, and government, he will always escape and be safe. Ah! had Eve thus fled from the waters of the serpent’s mouth, what ruin and misery would have been prevented. Had Israel in the wilderness, fled thus from the first invitations to the sacrifice of Baalpeor, happy would it have been for them and their children. Had the first Christian Church fled from the first approach of this same flood, in the various unfounded opinions and gross heresies that made their appearance from time to time, and still more in the incipient movements of that spirit, which has prompted mortal man to take the name and sit in the seat of God, showing himself that he is God, what confusion and darkness, what wickedness and bloodshed would have been prevented, and the simplicity and beauty of the Apostolic institutions would have come down to us. Or later still; had the Reformed Churches fled from the heresies and innovations, which sprung up among themselves, they might have been this day happy among themselves, the praise of earth, and the terror of all their foes. But what end serves this reasoning? With all this amount of sad experience before them, the men and women of this generation, with mad determination, run in the face of it, charmed by the old serpent, they are by myriads, rushing into his open mouth, and drinking up the waters of death and eternal damnation. “What harm is there in going to hear?” “What evil in hearing a good sermon?” they say. And so in spite of all advice, counsel and intreaty, and in defiance of promises and solemn engagements; and in the face of Christ’s authority in the discipline of the Church, they go. O ye deluded men! why will ye not read the harm in our world *lost*? To you officers in the Church, and you people who are striving against *occasional hearing*, as it is termed, and endeavouring to preserve unity and consistency together, it must be great consolation and encouragement to perceive that your course agrees with this flying from the serpent’s flood. How much reproach soever may be cast upon your opposition to the fashionable practice, and how many soever of the carnal, the proud, the hypocritical, the worldly and inconsistent, it may keep out, or drive out of your fellowship, and how much soever it may augment the number of your bitter enemies; yet know certainly, that it is one of the means which God has appointed for the *safety* of the woman. It will therefore never break down any congregation, or destroy any Church. To you who are wavering on this point, and you who have decided to give way to the current practice of hearing any where, what you are pleased to call a good sermon; let this passage be a warning. Instead of flying from the flood, you go to meet it, and so far as your influence goes, you cause the woman to be carried away.

In order to be effectually out of the reach of this flood, the woman must by her wings, leave the earth and mount up heavenward. And there is in this part of the figure, more intended than simply to flee from erroneous doctrine. She must fly from an earthly mind, earthly attractions, and as far as may be practicable, carnal and earthly company. If she will build her nest in any of these, or even thoughtlessly linger upon them, she will in spite of all the soundness and orthodoxy of her creed, be overtaken by the flood, and by and bye she will become so indifferent and lukewarm as to have no insuperable difficulty in opening *her mouth* with the rest to swallow it. This may be seen exemplified continually in the case of individuals, who, becoming completely absorbed in some worldly business, overlook all the soundness and excellency of their profession, and also their own solemn adherence to it. And if their purposes can be better served, by leaving their own society and falling in with some other, it is done without much hesitation; or if they must be without all religious society together, in order to effect their object, they will finally venture even there. In like manner, when a congregation or an ecclesiastical body seeks to be great and conspicuous in the view of men, on account of her multitude, her men of talents and renown, her wealth, and her weight of influence on the course of politics, she is connecting herself with the earth, and putting herself in a fair way to be carried off by the flood.

Or, when the generality of the members of a Church, have become cold and indifferent in their affections, untender in their walk, careless and negligent about personal religion, and the state of matters between God and their own soul; and the same time are most intent on the attainment of a worldly object, what one soever of those many that are commonly pursued by carnal, ungodly men, it may be, the public profession of such a Church, however pure and scriptural, and her discipline however correct, will not keep her from being carried away. Have not the members of the Associate Church some cause here for serious reflection? Is she not in some danger from this quarter? And if she shall be carried down the stream, (which God forbid,) will not her pure scriptural profession *double* her condemnation? Will she not be a *witness* against herself? Ought not every one then, who has any regard for her public cause left, to be seriously alarmed *in time*?

I am aware that this flight of the woman into the wilderness, has been otherwise interpreted, and in particular, that it has been applied to the retreat of sundry Christians at a very early period after the torrent of Popish corruptions began to set in upon the visible Church, into desert places, and remote and obscure corners of the earth. The retreat of those afterwards called Waldenses, into the vallies of Piedmont, has been particularized. And this may very well be admitted, as a particular and special application of the prophecy. For it has often happened before, and may happen yet again, that removing from one place of this world to another, may for a time be a means to shield the woman from this flood. So, those good and worthy men, who left their native country, and sought shelter in the wilderness of North America, (now the New England States,) found it to be. But this interpretation would be altogether too narrow to admit the whole signification of the woman's flight. I have already shown, that it is a flight from the waters of error, wherever they may make their appearance. And they frequently spring up in the midst of a people, who were once noted for their purity, which the history of these New England Churches but too fully proves. And the case often occurs, in which flight from one place to another, is impracticable, or if it could be accomplished, would not serve the purpose. Yet so long as this flood keeps pouring forth, it must be the duty of the

woman to fly; and there is still given her wings to do so, and therefore, this flying must have a more spiritual and comprehensive meaning in it. It may appear to be a difficulty on the interpretation, because it is said, that "they shall feed her *there* (in her place) 1260 days," from which, it would seem to intimate that her flight was ended before these days began. But this difficulty assumes, that the place of the woman is to be understood, of some particular location on the earth; whereas these words with the help of the history of the woman, enable us to determine certainly, that such a place cannot be understood. For no such place has been yet found, where the woman has securely rested during the 1260 days so far as past. And I hope to show, in illustrating the nature of "*her place*," that her flying thither and her being led there, may well stand together without any incongruity, during the whole period under consideration. And I shall now offer some observations on *her place*, which is the second means of her safety.

(To be continued.)

ART. III. Church and State, No. 2.

AN article has appeared in Number 9, Volume IX, of the Religious Monitor, the title of which is:—*Reasons for the previous publication of the purpose of Marriage*. It refers to no former article, as the object of attack. Yet many evil and profane tenets are denounced in it, which it is remarkable if any christian has ever uttered or written. "Decrees that it will not exercise the authority, with which the King of nations has invested it. Am I my brother's keeper? To construe that we, who are conscientious, should be compelled to drop it, in order to suit the political notions of a few justices of the peace, or the fastidious delicacy of the young. Lay the authority with which" &c. The want of a signature may for aught I know, be supplied by the peculiarity of style. "To legislate *down altogether*. One evidence more to the *ten thousand* that *WERE*. To *prostrate* their authority to *mantle up* iniquity." And this phrase, "matter and form," being marked with quotations, may remind the reader of "CHURCH AND STATE." But what if that be an error of the printer, who recollected these words since last September. It cannot be, that the honest zeal of this author, with the pen in his hand to write a defence of publication, would, had he ever read "Church and State," have passed the errors of it, without a particular and pointed exposure, would have adopted a method, which so closely resembles the "clandestine." Yet by commencing conversation without reference to any thing previously spoken, he has conferred on me the privilege of a respondent, and it is my design to exercise it.

The SEVEN PROPOSITIONS, will, upon examination appear to have reference to the following things:—1. The nature of marriage. It is "a civil, a political, and religious contract." 2. The just extent of legislative power. 3. The just extent of executive power. 4. The divine right of the rule of publication, or the right of Church and State to execute it. 5. The same thing, or the duty of people to submit to the rule. 6. The same thing, or the duty of punishing and censuring those who neglect the rule. 7. The duty of censuring magistrates for not enforcing the rule. But this proposition divides itself, as we shall see, into two.

1st. The divine right of publication, which is the same with his 4th, 5th, and 6th, propositions.

2d. The Church's power to legislate a rule, which is not a "correlate" but a *contrary* of his 2d proposition.

We commence with the nature of marriage. And this is one of those subjects, which, as our author justly observes, "will bear a second hearing."

"Marriage" says he "is a divine institution." This is a truth, taking the words in their native import, and detached from what follows. This truth had been explicitly stated in "CHURCH AND STATE." Marriage is divine, with respect to its author, who is God. But had this been all that was intended, this proposition need not have appeared as the leading one of the seven. It is so divine as to be religious. It is indeed said, "I am not speaking of the contract, but of the appointment of the marriage contract." This shows that the author, if he here speaks of the contract, is not aware of it. It also shows, that when he does here speak of the contract, it is the contract proper of which he speaks; it is the subject-matter of the divine appointment. The subject-matter of every divine appointment is unalterable. It consists of all those parts, which are essential to *the being* of the thing. Other things may belong to *the well-being*. But these fall under another distinct appointment. It is the appointment of marriage, of which our author designedly speaks. It is therefore marriage itself, of which he undesignedly speaks. But a contract is made up of obligations. If the obligations, therefore, come under by a couple, do not fill up the measure of the divine appointment, these can never constitute a marriage—nor make the couple, man and wife. And any obligations, which fall without the divine appointment of marriage, do not belong to the marriage contract, and cannot affect its nature. How strange is it then, that he should define the nature of the marriage contract to be sometimes one thing, and sometimes another. That he should define the subject-matter of a divine appointment, as varying with the times, and circumstances, and even with the motives of the parties? "And were I to define the contract," says he, "as it is entered into by the parties, I would be obliged to call it sometimes a civil contract, sometimes a political one, and sometimes a religious one, or chiefly so." Now, for what reasons he would be obliged to call marriage by so many names, he has not told us; nor what it is that constitutes marriage, such a mystery, when entered "as it should be," that it becomes quite nameless. He would have to describe it. "And were I to say what it should be, when entered with a due regard unto its end, supreme and subordinate, I would have to give a description of it." The supreme end of all things is the glory of God. The subordinate end of all things, is either *immediate*, or *remote*. But it is only the *subordinate* and *immediate* end of an institution, that determines its nature. For example, the immediate end of eating and drinking, is to sustain animal life. Wherefore eating and drinking are natural actions, yet the supreme end of those actions is the glory of God. And the subordinate, but remote end of them, when done "as they should be," is, to use our author's language "the good of man in *all* his relations." For to use his reasoning also, God hath said:—*It is good for a man to eat and to drink, and to enjoy the good of his labour.* And that would be "*good for man.*" And again, "it will be allowed, that the covenant of life was a great, a good, a marvelous condescension; but without the institution, [natural but divine] of *eating and drinking*, man could not have enjoyed that good, he could not have entered into that covenant as the federal head of the human family." Therefore eating and drinking are religious institutions, upon his plan of reasoning. But he strengthens his argument thus:—"It is a good of great magnitude to have society in the worship of God, and in all spiritual and religious exercise; and marriage was designed to bring that good

more fully and constantly within the reach of man, than it could have been by the occasional visits of holy angels." All religious society, it seems, besides that of angels, comes within the reach of man by marriage. And if Adam could not have been a federal head without it, society could never have been reached without it. The reason implied in both cases is plain; the human race could not have been propagated without marriage. Substitute propagation, then, the necessary and *immediate* means of all this good, instead of the necessary and *remote* means, marriage, and the features of the argument are unchanged; but presented in a nearer and more distinct point of view. All the good of religious society among men, comes by propagation. If never a man nor woman had to this day, been born into the world, what would this author, and myself, and every other child of Adam, have done for society? We would only have had the occasional visits of holy angels. "It is also a good, though much inferior to the two preceding, to have society in *all* the affairs of this terrestrial life; and for this also marriage was designed." Particularly, may we not add, that by the propagation of the species, mankind, otherwise helpless, might have society in time of war?

But dismissing for a moment, the logic of this argument, let us examine its divinity. The multiplying of the human species, was no less necessary to Christ's federal headship than to Adam's. For it was necessary, both to his incarnation, and the actual existence of the elect seed. To have noticed the second Adam and his covenant, in the above reasoning, so explicitly as the first and his covenant are noticed, would have given the idea a bolder aspect. But it is the same idea, and it is necessarily suggested by the mention of religious society, besides that of angels. Hence, as there never could have been a covenant of works made with Adam, as the federal head of the human family; so there never could have been a covenant of grace made with Christ, as the federal head of an elect seed, without marriage. Thus the institution of marriage, is made antecedent, in its nature and operation, to the institution and operation of both covenants. Moreover, if marriage be in every sense, necessary and essential to the covenant of works, it must in the same sense be necessary and essential to the covenant of grace. That it is a necessary antecedent, will not be designedly plead by many. But if marriage be, as this author and some others appear to infer from Malachi, ii. 15, necessary either as a consequent, or means of the covenant, it is in the former case, a new covenant benefit, and in the other a new covenant ordinance. Eating and drinking will be the same thing; will together with marriage, be religious institutions, or the purchase of Christ. His radical error here, is, that the end, no matter how remote, determines the nature of the means. This principle has often been used to prove, that magistracy includes in its essence, a profession of the true religion, belongs to the covenant of grace, to the mediatorial government of Christ. Let him tell his readers how he will refute these errors, in a consistency with the above principle, implied in these words:—"Neither was it exclusively for the good either of the State, or the Church, on account of which it might have been styled civil, or ecclesiastical."

But to detect this root of error in all its ramifications, observe—

1st. The instituted means of obtaining a certain end, is not, in all cases, naturally and antecedently necessary to that end. Were it even true, that the propagation of mankind is the immediate end of marriage, it would not follow that without marriage, and natural generation, the human family could not have existed, and Adam could not have covenanted with God as their federal representative. If Adam knew his federal character in entering the covenant, it was enough for him. The means were God's. And God had other means than marriage and natural generation,

lying within the immensity of his eternal wisdom and power. Else whence came Eve? Whence the human nature of Christ? These cases, it is true, were miraculous—they were deviations from the common and instituted course of divine operation. But antecedent to the institution of that course, no one of those methods was more miraculous than another. The divine will might have determined that to be natural, which is now miraculous, and that to be miraculous which is now natural. And so far is it from being true, that Adam could not have entered the covenant as a federal head, without the institution of marriage, that the Scriptures plainly teach, he did enter into covenant in that character, without that institution, and without any assurance that marriage ever would be instituted. Gen. xxviii. 17; compare verses 18—24.

2d. Marriage has not the propagation of the race for its *immediate* end, nor is this one end of it of any kind. It is indeed customary for moralists and divines to attribute this to marriage as *one* of its ends, by a kind of euphemy, no other mode of propagation having, in the establishment of God, a moral existence. But ALSTEDIUS gives a definition which is more accurate. "It is instituted by God that the human race might be propagated and preserved, *according to an established rule and order.*" The preservation of this rule and order is one end of marriage. It is not the *seed*, but the *holiness* of the seed, which is made one *remote* end of marriage in that expression of the prophet. Yet it is the holiness only which was common to the old covenant, and the first Adam—the holiness in which man was created. But all this on the supposition only that *Eve* is the *one* person created. To some learned men this appears unnatural, and I may venture to say, it is at least very doubtful. Understand Adam to be the one person created, and all his offspring to be the holy seed (Heb. seed of Elohim) sought by the creation, and the meaning will be thus:—"Did not God create one man Adam, including in him the woman and all mankind, and reserved to himself the Spirit, (Heb. *And the residue of the Spirit was to him*) by which these should each in their appointed time be quickened into life and being? And why create all mankind in one? That this one, being the son of God in moral likeness, and communicating this likeness to all his personal species, all might in this manner be the sons and seed of ELOHIM." See Luke iii. 38. Acts xvii. 26, 29. The subordinate and immediate end of marriage is in the language of the Almighty and Beneficent Creator—a *help-meet* for man. It is, that *man*—each of every human pair, (not *the* man only) might in all *natural* necessities and toils, have an auxiliary corresponding to those necessities. I say *natural*. For help in morality, help in religion, I deny to be one end of marriage. This kind of help may arise from marriage. Yet it is not proper to it, but accidental. And, provided a person's *natural* wants did not interfere, religious help and society may be obtained to better advantage without marriage than with it. 1 Cor. vii. 33, 34.

3d. If propagation were the immediate end of marriage, still the production of society would not be the remote end. It is absurd to assign any thing as the cause of some good to a person, when the absence of that cause, yea and of that good, supposes the person's non-existence. But this absurdity has been already exposed.

4th. If the remote end of marriage were to produce religious society, still this would not render the covenant of marriage a religious one, although entered "as it should be." It has been shown that not the *remote* but the *immediate* end of an institution can determine its nature.

But what would be the consequence of marriage being, in any part of it, a religious contract? No person, in that case, who is not religious, could, without profaning a thing sacred, presume to get married. Our author, then, if he be a minister, should keep the irreligious back from

marriage, as he would from the Lord's table, till they get religion, or make a profession. If it be here alleged, that marriage being productive, more than any other contracts which obtain among men, of serious temporal changes, and that new natural, moral and civil relations arising out of it, and new religious duties possibly, though not necessarily, resulting from it, it ought to be entered with due consideration, and with a supreme regard to the glory of God;—then I say, where, and by whom, has this been denied? After all, marriage is but a natural and civil institution. It is but a temporal benefit, and is not of the purchase of Christ. It is among the passing and perishing things of this world, which the Spirit teaches us to treat with comparative indifference. 1 Cor. vii. 29—31. It belongs to the children of this world, it belongs to Christians as still partaking with the children of this world, to marry and be given in marriage. Luke xx. 34. "And because Christ plainly affirms marriage to belong to this present world," says the Wirtemberg Confession, "but the administration of the things of this world consists in political laws, constituted according to right and probable reason."

In fine, a religious covenant must have God for a party—at least must have religion for its immediate end. There is but one religious covenant or contract, for present entrance—the covenant of grace. There are but three, or at most but four, divinely authorised methods of formally expressing an accession to the terms of that covenant:—Baptism, the Lord's supper, explicit, formal covenanting, and—which is the same thing with immediate respect only to a certain specific end—the ministerial vow. If marriage be, in any of its parts or obligations, a religious covenant, it must imply in itself a renovation of the covenant of grace—it must be a sacrament. To imagine marriage to be, in any part of it, a religious contract, and yet deny it to be a sacrament—is to grope for a middle ground between Protestants and Papists, which does not exist.

But as the author's divinity is unsound, so his politics are wild. He will have marriage to be sometimes a *political* contract—and that as distinguished from *civil*. Had he termed it either of these alone, it would not have implied any error. The term *political* is often taken in a liberal sense, as synonymous with *civil*, and opposed merely to *ecclesiastical*. But *civil* and *political* being distinctively used, the latter must denote something which has *immediate* relation to the state. For the state has a remote, and—as a civil person—even an intimate interest in many contracts which are not political. Contracts which are political must either have the state, *as such*, for a party, or some duty toward the state for its immediate object. Such contracts are framed between the constituent members of a state, "in their primary and conjunct capacity," or more simply, by "WE THE PEOPLE"—These are called Constitutions. Between the people compacted into one state and the officers of the state—These are oaths of office. Between state and state—Such are treaties. What other political contracts there are, and how the matrimonial vow can be one of them, when entered "as it should be"—are questions which I must at present refer to others more learned.*

"PROP. 2. God has not left it subject to human legislation, in any thing appertaining to the right and orderly constituting of the relation between the parties." Here he ought to have defined what is "necessary to the right and orderly constituting of the relation." By this vague expression, he has reserved to himself a retreat hereafter, by refusing, possibly, any

* "No ideas or definitions are more distinguishable, than those of civil and political liberty. Political liberty may be defined to be the security with which, from the Constitution, form and nature of the established government, the subjects enjoy civil liberty. Civil liberty is nothing more than the impartial administration of equal and expedient laws."—CHRISTIAN.

construction which common understanding can put upon his words. The sum of his illustrations adds but little additional light to his meaning. It is this: "God himself has legislated on this subject—in other words, he has not left it subject to human legislation. For to suppose any *such* thing left to human wisdom, would be to admit—blasphemy." That the subject matter of a divine appointment is not left subject to be moulded or changed by human wisdom, or by human folly and caprice, I have, in opposition to this author, shown above. Nothing, therefore, which is essential to a marriage, and nothing which is necessary to render the deed of contract—considered in itself, and abstractly from times and circumstances—pleasing to God, is left free to human legislation. But the mode and form of administration, and the penalties for the violation of divine and of human laws on this subject, are matters left free to human legislation. He denies all legislative power both to church and state. For he denies it on things about which God has legislated, and it would be tyrannical for man to legislate on any other. Such things having no moral relation, it would either be idle, or an invasion of men's natural liberties to interfere with them. He refers to Lev. xx. "where God specifies sundry cases, and the punishment to be inflicted by the magistrate." This is one of the proofs that it is blasphemy for man to legislate on this subject. God has done it himself, and fixed by unalterable laws "the penalties to be inflicted by the magistrate." Among the crimes specified in that chapter are those of adultery and witchcraft. He hereby maintains the *judicial law* of Moses to be binding under the new dispensation, and that all adulterers and witches are to be punished with death, and that to hold the contrary is blasphemy. This error, like many others contained in the REASONS, is an exotic plant—it never grew upon Seceder soil. It is likewise most unscriptural. Eph. ii. 15. Heb. x. 28, and xii. 25. But if he disclaim this sentiment, so plainly implied in this proposition and its illustrations, he will then admit that the penalty for those crimes, enacted by God, is abolished. He will admit that these crimes must now pass unpunished, else men must enact new penalties, "which is to admit—blasphemy." Which is his choice?

We have at least one plain example in each Testament of ecclesiastic enactment, in things which either vary according to circumstances, or are indifferent. The amount and time of pecuniary contribution to certain religious purposes in Nehemiah's time, were fixed by "ordinances made for themselves." Neh. x. 32. The use of blood and of things strangled was prohibited in the Synod of Jerusalem, by "decrees to be kept." Acts xv. 29, and xvi. 4. To define circumstances, times and forms, is a power which has been claimed and exercised by all the Reformed churches. The SYNOD OF DORT declare themselves as follows: "Although it be useful and good that church rulers institute and establish among themselves, some set order for the preservation of the body ecclesiastic; yet they ought studiously to beware lest they decline from any thing which Christ, our only Master, has instituted. Wherefore we reject all human inventions, and all laws, which by any person may, about the worship of God, be introduced, so that the consciences of men do in any way become restricted and tied down by them." The church of Scotland, (OLD CONFESSIO) speaks thus: "Not that we judge that the same policy in all things ought to be constituted, and precisely the same order in particular ceremonies for all ages, times and places. For as ceremonies invented by men are only temporary, so they not only may be, but ought to be changed, when they are found rather to favor and promote superstition, than to edify the church of God." In perfect accord with both the above, is the language of the AUGSBURGH CONFESSIO "The apostles decreed to abstain from blood. Who now observes it? Nor

yet do they commit sin who do not observe it. Since not even the apostles themselves were willing to burden the *conscience* with such a servitude, but only for a time prohibited it, to avoid offence. For the *perpetual will of the Gospel* is to be considered in regard to the decree. Scarcely any canons are kept accurately, and many are daily becoming obsolete among those who, with the greatest diligence, circulate traditions. Nor are men's consciences safe, unless this rule of equity be observed—that we know those canons to be kept, not from any opinion of their necessity—and that conscience will not be wounded, although the traditions become obsolete.” From this uniform sentiment of the Reformed churches have arisen, the many rules in Books of Discipline, Books of Policy, Forms of Process, and Directories for Worship; the subject matter of which is indifferent; which often may be and ought to be changed; which never were intended to be observed as *divine rules*, from any opinion of their necessity, that the consciences of men might be restricted and tied down by them; which are daily becoming obsolete, in defiance of the greatest diligence to circulate them; which are often permitted to expire peaceably, among the strictest Seceders, by general consent, or extreme old age. Let any man read the First and Second Books of Discipline of the church of Scotland, the authority of which is acknowledged by an express act of Synod not to be superseded or repealed to this day; let him read the DIRECTORY candidly, and believe the W. M. ASSEMBLY mean what they say, and then let him affirm, if he decently can, that he, or his minister, *attempts* to observe the one half of those rules, in letter or spirit. But upon our author's principle, all those rules and canons are legislated, not by man, but by God; else the churches were guilty of blasphemy in enacting them. And here the hidden design of this ambiguous proposition may be discovered. He saw the absurdity of saying in so many words, “that Synod could make a divine rule.” But to avoid this, he alleges that so many of the rules in the Directory and new Book of Discipline, as “we whose consciences” choose to have a fancy for, are not made. They all existed prior to these enactments; neither may be nor ought to be changed; ought to be kept from an opinion of their necessity; ought to restrict and tie down consciences of men; stand upon an equal footing with any precept of the moral law; and, although they be nought but canons and traditions of the church, “matter and form” of which are indifferent, yet they shall bind the civil administration. But how he can, consistently with himself, call it blasphemy to legislate on subjects on which God has legislated, and yet maintain, as we shall see afterwards, that a rule which is “matter and form” of it, indifferent in itself, the church ought to enforce on all persons and in all cases, is a difficulty which he is still under obligations to the public to explain.

Two inferences are appended to this proposition, which merit notice only by their *truism*. They both amount to one thing: the Supreme Being is supreme—*both in Church and State*.

(To be Continued.)

ART. IV. *An Examination of Christ's Words to Peter.*

Math. xxi. 18, 19. "And I say also unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven."

In this passage we have what may be called the main plea of the Roman Catholics. Here it is supposed that Peter and his successors are invested with that authority, which is the vital principle and great foundation of their religion. Take away their explanation of this text, and the whole superstructure reared and resting upon it for ages, falls to the ground. In these words of our Saviour, it is supposed that Peter is set forth as the Rock on which the church is built, and that the keys are given to him as an emblem of his authority to decide in all controversies, to decree and reverse his decrees, to admit and exclude in the church below, and in the kingdom of glory. It is therefore of the utmost consequence, in judging of the claims of the Roman Catholic church, to be acquainted with the true meaning of these verses. And no one can examine them with any degree of intelligence and candor without being convinced that however weighty and permanent the truth which they teach, they are but as a foundation of sand to that house of idolatry, tyranny and blood which has been erected upon them.

In order that any thing may be made of these words in favor of the supremacy of the Roman Pontiff, it will be necessary to show, in the first place, that Christ here gives to Peter a peculiar and superior authority over the other apostles, and the whole church, though in other places we find the apostles, and the prophets and apostles together, called the foundation on which the church is built; and the same power of binding and loosing is given to all the apostles which is here given to Peter. Eph. ii. 20. Rev. xxi. 14. Matth. xviii. 18. It will be necessary, in the second place, to show that Christ gave up his own place in the church to his supposed successor or vicar; in other words, that he ceases to be the Rock and Foundation of his church, and hath parted with the power of loosing and binding; for the principal ceases to act in his own person when he appoints one to act as his substitute or vicar. It will be necessary to prove, in the third place, that the words of Christ teach that Peter was to have an uninterrupted line of successors, possessing the same authority over the church, though the passage contains not the least hint of this, and the inference is as destitute of all reason as if it were said, because Luther was the first of Reformers in Germany, Calvin in Geneva and Farrel in France, therefore they must have a perpetual line of successors, and there must be primates in these different countries. A fourth thing to be proved is, that this line of succession is to be found in the Roman church till the time of its division, and then that it ceased in the Greek, and remained in the Latin church, about which things this text and the whole Scriptures are as silent as the grave. It must also be proved that the chair of Peter was fixed at Rome, never to be moved from that place; though of this also the Scriptures are entirely silent, and though his holiness has not always been able to keep his seat in "the eternal city." (Quere. How long might the succession be interrupted by death, and delays in election, and how long might the chair be removed by pestilence, or war, or the imprisonment of the Pope, before the charm of succession and of place would be lost?) Last of all we must have proof that the Pope of Rome is pointed at by these words, or by some evident marks as the sole representative of Peter in all ages. The power, the nature and extent of it, the succession, the place, the person, are all vitally important in this matter. And to the difficulties attending all these things, the verses in Matthew are no more than a straw to remove so many mountains.

In the words referred to, Christ says to the Apostle, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." Two different views are entertained respecting what is meant by "this rock"—some supposing it to be Peter, and others his confession that Jesus was "the Christ, the Son of the living God." On this, as on many other subjects, the Fathers take opposite sides. Some suppose the confession of Peter to be intended, it not being then understood how important a different explanation would be found for supporting the pretensions of the Pope. Among these are Theophylact and Chrysostom. On the other hand, Cyprian, Jerome, and Tertullian understand the Rock to mean Peter. However, Erasmus, who, though a Catholic, was of a different mind, makes an apology for the two former, and quotes the words of Augustine to prove that they considered Peter as called this Rock only as a type of Christ. Yet if we suppose that Peter is here called a Rock, what more is said of him than of all believers,—they are all lively stones in the building of mercy, and the church is also said to be built on the other apostles and on the prophets, as well as on Peter. It is evident that in respect to all saving benefits the church is built on Christ alone; for "other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Christ Jesus." But besides the rock on which a house is built, the first materials laid upon it are called the foundation. In this respect the apostles were eminently, and all the primitive Christians were in a more general sense, the foundation first laid on Christ, on which succeeding churches were built. Paul speaks of the churches begun by the ministry of others as foundations on which he chose not to build; and again, "nevertheless the foundation of God standeth sure," which means the church which God was beginning to build. Peter himself, in his first Epistle, (chap. ii. 4, 5 &c.) is very far from making himself a vicar-stone, or foundation, substituted for Christ. He invites all to come to Christ himself, the living stone, and speaks of all believers as with himself lively stones in this building. The coincidence between the name of Peter, which signifies a rock, and the words which follow, is the chief reason for referring what is said to him. In opposition to this it hath been noticed that the words are not precisely the same. The Greek *Petros* is only the derivative of *Petra*, and even if our Lord used the Syraic language, the manner of speech would lead us to suppose a similar variation; for he says not, thou art Peter, or a Rock, and upon thee, or upon this, will I build my church, but by repeating the word *Rock* together with the relative, he intimates a difference. And for this variation of the word there was no necessity, if in both cases it referred to the same person, for *Petros* signifies a rock as well as *Petra*, and the change would seem unnatural if both words referred to the Apostle. Most interpreters have therefore understood what is said as applying to the confession of Peter, or rather to Christ himself, the subject of his confession, and in the most proper sense of the term, the only Rock and Foundation of his church.

The words of Peter in owning Jesus to be "The Christ, the Son of the living God," may be regarded as referring to the words of the Prophet (Isa. xxviii. 16,) where Christ is called the foundation laid in Zion, a tried stone, a precious corner stone, a sure foundation, or as Peter calls it in his citation of these words, a *living* stone.* And the words of Christ's answer may be regarded as referring to the same prophecy, as if he had said, "Thou hast owned me to be the Christ, the Son of the living God, and so that living stone and sure foundation on which the church is to be built, and in this confession thou hast shown thyself

* *Wolfii curæ.*

worthy of thy name. Thou art Peter, a rock, a living stone in the building of mercy. Farther, I assure you that according to the predictions to which you have referred, upon that rock which you have confessed, I will lay many other stones like yourself, and thus build my church—and being built on such a rock, it will be a *sure foundation*, the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.” The chief objection against this view of the passage is, the distance between the reference and the thing referred to. But in many instances references are to be determined, not by the juxta-position of words, but the evident relation of things. An example of this will be found as strange, as what must be supposed here, in John vi. 48, 49, 50, where Christ speaking in the 50th verse, of the bread that cometh down from heaven, refers not to the manna spoken of in the verse immediately preceding, but to the true bread spoken of in verse 48th. The general language of the Scriptures would also lead us naturally to this view of the words; Christ is so often spoken of as the rock, the corner stone, and the foundation of the church, to the exclusion of every other. If Peter be made the vicar of Christ, and the foundation of the church, to whom we are to come to be determined as to what we are to believe and do;—if we are to come to him for the pardon of our sins, and if it be through him that we have entrance into the everlasting kingdom of God, this is not to lay another foundation beside Christ, but another foundation instead of him.

The gates of hell or *hades* never denote either the powers or punishments of hell, but the state of the dead; and the promise that the gates of *hades* shall not prevail against the church or her foundation, (for either or both may be understood,) is, in plain language, a promise of the resurrection. The permanency or security of the church in the world are not the things intended, but the certainty that death should not have the dominion over Christ or his members, and this is inferred from the character of the Rock on which the church is built, which very clearly leads us to suppose this Rock to be Christ, and not any mortal man. It is because, He is the Son of the living God, that death could not have dominion over him, and it is because the church is built on him, that she also shall be raised up: “Because he lives we shall live also; in Christ shall all be made alive.” There is something exceedingly unreasonable as well as profane in predicating the resurrection of believers on their being built upon a mere man who cannot secure himself from the gates of death, nor deliver his own soul from the grave; who cannot secure himself from being defeated, driven from his throne, imprisoned and cut off by worms of the dust. How vain to trust, that such an one can save us from the hand of death, that he can in any sense, which may be put upon the words, keep the gates of hell from prevailing against us!^{*} Peter had confessed Christ to be the Son of the living God, but in a little time his

* Since writing the above, the following anecdote has been related to me by an aged emigrant from Ireland. As it has some reference to one well known and much esteemed in our country, and illustrates the absurdity of men with no more than ordinary power over things seen, claiming such extravagant powers over the things not seen, I could not resist the temptation to repeat it.

An Irish Papist being apparently near death, among other dispositions of his property, left five guineas in the hands of his sister for the priest, as a remuneration for praying his soul out of purgatory. The sister, who appears to have had some portion of the native shrewdness of her country, informed the priest of what her brother had done, and promised to give him double the sum if he would keep her brother from dying. This however he told her was not in his power. “What!” says she, “can you pray the soul out of purgatory, and yet not keep it in the body? If you cannot keep it where it is, how can you deliver it from the place where it is going?” She kept the money in her hands and returned to her brother. The venerable Doctor Clark, well known for his eccentricity and piety, being at that time in Ireland, and in the neighborhood of the sick man, subsequently called to see him; and with the divine blessing was the means of preserving his life from the grave, and of delivering the souls of both brother and sister from the horrible popish superstitions under which they had labored.

faith would meet with a severe trial. He would see this Son of the living God expiring upon the cross, and the expectation of the church expiring with him. Christ therefore arms him beforehand for this trial, by assuring him that he would not be conquered by death, but would destroy him; that he would burst asunder the gates of *hades*, and thus make a way for his people, and give them a pledge of their own victory over this enemy.

It still remains to be considered what Christ intends by the keys which he promises to Peter. The Church of Rome considers these as implying the supreme power of Peter and his successors; a power not limited to the present world, but extending to the glorious habitation of Jehovah. As if it had been a very small thing to usurp the dominion belonging to Christ upon the earth, the Pope has unblushingly claimed the key of the Kingdom of Glory; so that he can hardly be said to allow God to exercise authority over any part of his dominion. The very habitation of the Most High must be shut up, and none must enter there, but by the Pope's permission. The throne of the Eternal must be besieged, and none have access to His presence, but as the Pope is pleased to use his key. He must stand at the gate of heaven to open, and none can shut; to shut, and none can open. He must have the sole power to bind and to loose whomsoever he will. Such are the arrogant pretensions of this feeble mortal. But let us look a little into these words to ascertain the validity of his claims, before we surrender our lives and liberty, our faith, hope and eternal inheritance into his hands.

Some interpreters have supposed the keys to be emblems of authority, being led to this by a mistaken view of Isa. xxii. 22, where we are told that the key of the house of David was to be laid on the shoulder of Eliakim. In the preceding verse we are told that the government would be committed into his hand, but there is no more reason to consider the key as an emblem of this government, than the robe and girdle of which mention is also made. The truth is, that keys might be emblems of certain privileges or appendages of royalty, but neither their nature or use would render them suitable emblems of royalty itself; and nothing is known of their being such in fact in any age or nation of the world. The use of them in the passage referred to is mentioned, and it is one which would be as competent to the steward or servant as the king:—"So he shall open, and none shall shut; and he shall shut, and none shall open."

In order to understand the true import of these words, it will be necessary to go back and review a little the history of the church. Before the calling of Abraham, no distinction was made between nations as to the privileges of God's covenant, and so none as to religious rites. But when God began to set apart one nation to be his peculiar people, he began to set up marks of distinction between them and others; and the chief of those rites by which they were distinguished, were circumcision and the use of meats.* They had many other ordinances peculiar to them as a nation, but by these they could most readily be known, and kept separate in their intercourse with the world. The great sources of intercourse, and those by which national distinctions are most readily lost, are trade and marriage. By those two rules, corresponding to these means of intercourse, God therefore guarded against the mingling of the Israelites with the rest of men, and the consequent loss of their distinction as the seed of Jacob. And though this distinction began in circumcision, the use of meats was that which was most constant, public and peculiar. Circumcision being given to Abraham, Ishmael and all the other branches

* Lightfoot

of his family retained this rite as well as the children of Israel. But when Jacob received the name of Israel, as the father of a spiritual seed, the distinction as to meats began, in their not using thenceforward the hollow of the thigh. And this distinguished them not only from all who were uncircumcised, but from all the other branches of Abraham's family. There had been, before this time, a difference made between beasts which were clean and unclean, with a reference to sacrifice, but no restriction from the use of any meat, which was wholesome for food. Now however a distinction of a different kind began, and was greatly enlarged at the giving of the law. And these rites formed a wall between Israel and all other nations, which they themselves expected to be removed when Messias should come. Thus the kingdom of God was shut up among them, and the door firmly closed against the admission of any one, unless by his becoming outwardly as well as inwardly a Jew. Let us next compare with these things what is recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, especially in the second, tenth and fifteenth chapters, and it may help us to understand what is meant by the giving of the keys to Peter. There was not a single key, but keys given to him; and whether we understand these as referring to the keys of knowledge,* and of admission into the church, or to the different classes of men, the Jews and Gentiles, to whom the door of admission was opened, we will find the history in the Acts illustrating as a comment these words of our Lord. The Scribes and Pharisees had taken away the key of knowledge by their subversion of the true Gospel, and Peter was honored to open this door, which they had closed, by directing men to the righteousness and grace of Jesus Christ, and preaching the promise as free to all the hearers of the word. He stood forth first of all to proclaim the Saviour risen, and to preach forgiveness of sins to all men in his name. He also proclaimed these things first to the Jews, and opened the door for their admission by baptism into the church of the Redeemer, under the new and better dispensation. Though the other apostles stood forth with him, and all spake to the people, he had the precedence in this work. He spake to the men of Judea and those who dwelt at Jerusalem, and he proposed their admission into the church. Then again, he was honored to open the door to the Gentiles, of which we have an account in the calling of Cornelius. Gentiles who were proselytes to the Jews' religion had been admitted before this time. But Cornelius, though a convert, was not a proselyte; so that he was the first Gentile admitted as such into the church—that is, without circumcision and restriction as to meats. The like of this had not happened from the days of Jacob to this time. It was with great difficulty, and only by an extraordinary vision that Peter could be prevailed on by the admission of this man to put his hand to that venerable fabric of rites, which had stood for so many ages, but was soon to be demolished. This act also caused great offence to those of the circumcision, and the substance of their complaint against Peter was this, "Thou wentest in to men uncircumcised, and didst eat with them." Acts xi. 3. They join these two distinctions of circumcision and of meats together, and complain that he had disregarded both. The authority which Peter received for opening the door to the Gentiles, was by a vision of meats of all kinds, which he was commanded not to call common or unclean; God thus signifying that he had abolished the distinction of meats, and so of Jews and Gentiles. This apostle also intimates his particular designation to this work in his address to the other apostles and elders at Jerusalem. Acts xv. 7. And it is evident that he refers to his designation by Christ, at the time when he promised him the keys,

* The admission of men to be teachers among the Jews was signified by giving them a key. Camero in loco.

rather than to the authority conferred by the vision, which was a recent event. "Brethren," says he, "ye know that a good while ago (*ἀπὸ ἡμερῶν ἀρχαίων*, a long time ago, or from ancient days,) God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the gospel, and believe." Now this privilege was given to Peter only. He only had the keys to open the door. The others, however, followed his example by admitting the Gentiles through the door which he had opened; and they had, in common with him, the power of binding and loosing—that is, of declaring *things* lawful or unlawful. These words have no respect to persons. It is not *whomsoever*, but *whatsoever* ye bind, &c. Lightfoot,* whose views are partly followed in the preceding remarks, quotes a vast number of sayings of the Jews, to show how commonly they expressed the declaring of things lawful or unlawful by binding and loosing; and he very properly adds, that we are not to suppose that our Saviour would use so common an expression with a meaning entirely different from that, in which it would be universally understood by the people. The history of what was actually done by the apostles may also serve as a comment on these words. For they did actually declare what things contained in the former dispensation were lawful, and what were unlawful. They bound the churches from circumcision, the passover, sacrifices, purifications, observing days, and all those things which have been abolished by the coming of Christ, and they loosed them from the restrictions of the law as to meats, association with the Gentiles, the place of worship, and all those things wherein our liberty has been enlarged.

Something remarkable has also been noticed respecting the time when the door of the kingdom was opened to the Gentiles. At this very time the Gentile idolatry had reached its height, and shown the most horrible of its fruits in the first of the nations. Caius Caligula was emperor of Rome, than whom a greater monster of wickedness never appeared in human shape, unless perhaps we should except some who have sat upon the same throne, "giving a thousand times more evidence of being the successors of Caius than of Peter." The cruelty of this tyrant may be sufficiently understood from his well known wish, that Rome had but one neck so, that by a single blow he might sever it from the body. His feasts, his amusements were all tasteless, unless mingled with the blood of his subjects. Such was his senseless and daring impiety, that like his modern successor, he affected to be a god, and would have his image set up and worshipped in all parts of his dominions. It was at such a time when the wisdom of man was showing the utmost that could be expected from it, in that nation which has been the favorite boast of infidelity, that it pleased God by Peter to open the door of his kingdom to the Gentiles, and by the foolishness of preaching to save those who believed.

If the preceding views of our Saviour's words be correct, no one can be at a loss to see how slight ground the church of Rome has for her lofty pretensions. If any thing further were necessary, we might appeal to the history of Peter, in which we will find nothing corresponding to the authority supposed to be conferred upon him. What was the treatment which this apostle received after Christ had called him the Rock, and promised him the keys? Did the other apostles fall down before him? Did they kiss his feet, or hold his stirrup, while there lacked kings to do this service? Did they salute him as their father, or call him "their Lord God, the Pope?" Did they henceforth refer to him all matters for his infallible decision? It seems very unfortunate to these pretensions, that the next name which Peter receives after being called a Rock,

* *Horæ Hebraicæ.*

was that of Satan; and it was for a strange specimen of his infallibility, nothing less than rebuking Christ, opposing his will, and taking offence at his cross. (See verses 21—23.) And where was the infallibility of this first supreme pontiff, when he was in the hall of judgment, saying of Christ, I know him not, and when he cursed and swore? Where was his infallibility when he dissembled and walked not uprightly, according to the truth of the Gospel? Where his supreme power when Paul withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed? And where the safety of walking according to him as an unerring rule, when the Jews and even Barnabas were carried away with his dissimulation? (Gal. ii. 11—13.) What had become of him as the foundation of the church, when the church was blamed equally for saying "We are of Paul, we are of Apollos, and we are of Cephas or Peter," instead of all saying, we are of Christ? (1 Cor. i. 12.) How comes it to pass that the other apostles took upon them to choose and set apart a successor to Judas, instead of referring the choice and ordination to their supposed Pope? And how is it that they debated questions, decided them, wrote epistles, travelled, planted churches, and did all things without a single reference to the authority of Peter, and without the slightest hint of his employing the least authority over them? This indeed Christ had strictly forbidden. His disciples were to call no man master upon earth, and they were not to be as the kings of the earth.

And even if we were to admit all that is urged in favor of the primacy of Peter, how shall we account for the total silence of the Scriptures in relation to his successor, and the place where he is to be found? It is never so much as said that Peter was the bishop of Rome; that he fixed his chair in that city, or that he visited it. If we are to be ruled by the successor of Peter at Rome, under the pain of eternal damnation, this must indeed be a vital point in our religion; and it is no more necessary that we should be told that Christ came into our world, and died for our sins, than that Peter came to Rome and fixed there his seat, as supreme head of the church. And yet no diligence has ever detected the least hint of these things in the Bible. Even the story founded on the statement of Eusebius, that Peter came to Rome in the second year of Claudius, and was bishop there twenty-five years, is attended with such insuperable difficulties, that the Catholics can make nothing of it but by denying one half as a manifest falsehood, and making a history according to their own taste out of the remainder. And surely where they deny so much of the evidence, it would be hard to require others to believe the truth of other parts at the peril of their eternal salvation. Paul was the minister of the uncircumcision, as Peter was of the circumcision. Was it probable then that Peter would leave his own and enter into the field assigned to Paul? Was it probable that he would become the bishop of the uncircumcised Romans, rather than of the Jews at Jerusalem, Babylon, Egypt, or some other place where they abounded? If Peter were so long at Rome, and while Paul must have been there also, how is it that in the many epistles written from that city by Paul, he never once mentions Peter as uniting with him either in sentiments or salutations? And how is it that in his epistle to the Romans we find the same singular omission? It has been properly asked, was Peter asleep, or was he sullen, or what is the reason that his name never appears? In a word, there is the clearest evidence that the church built on this pretended power of Peter, and the perpetuation of it in the Pope, is founded on the sand, and when the rain shall descend, the floods come, and the wind blow, and beat upon this house, it shall fall, and great shall be the fall of it. Babylon shall sink as a mill-stone into the sea, and shall be found no more at all.

DIORTHOTES.

ART. V. *Plenary Indulgence in the Form of a Jubilee proclaimed to the Roman Catholic Clergy and Faithful of the Diocese of Philadelphia, May 1, 1833.*

We publish this curious document to satisfy uninformed and incredulous Protestants that one of the principal abominations which caused our fathers to separate from the Roman church still exists in that community; and lest it might be supposed that we had injured the performance by suppressing parts we publish it *entire*.

That our readers may understand the nature of this proclamation, they must bear in mind that Romanists maintain that even after the guilt of sin which subjects to eternal punishment is removed, there often remains a debt of temporal punishment to be suffered; that "if this debt be not paid by penitential sufferings, or *graciously remitted by indulgences* in this life, it will, after death, retard the entrance of the soul into heaven until the last farthing be paid in the prison of purgatory."

They also maintain, that there is a "sacred treasure composed of the merits, sufferings, and virtues of Christ our Lord, and of the Virgin Mother, and of all the saints:" that the Pope has "authority from heaven to unlock that sacred treasure," and to dispense to the faithful. From this treasure, thus opened, indulgences are issued, which, in the days of Luther, and according to the account given in his writings, were declared by Roman priests to have an efficacy so great, that the most heinous sins would be remitted and expiated by them, and the person be freed both from punishment and guilt." It is now pretended that they only remit the canonical penance imposed by the church, liberate from the debt of temporal punishment which may remain due after the guilt has been remitted by the sacrament of penance, and open the doors of purgatory to those suffering spirits who departed without having made full satisfaction for their iniquities by fruits worthy of penance.

Of indulgences, some are called *plenary*, because when obtained, they remit the whole debt of temporal punishment which remained due; others are for a certain number of days or years, and only remit so much of the debt as would have been discharged by the performance of so many years or days of canonical penance. Without further preliminary remarks, we insert the Philadelphia proclamation.

FRANCIS PATRICK, by the grace of God, and appointment of the Holy Apostolic See, Bishop of Arath, and Coadjutor of the Bishop of Philadelphia—To the Clergy and Faithful of the Diocese of Philadelphia: Grace, mercy and peace from God the Father, and from Christ Jesus our Lord.

Venerable Brethren and beloved Children in Christ:—It becomes our duty to communicate to you the plenary Indulgence, in the form of a Jubilee, which his present Holiness, Gregory XVI. has graciously proclaimed to the Christian world. The objects which he has in view in dispensing the treasures of the church with such great liberality on the present occasion, will best be understood from his own words.

"After we had taken solemn possession of the Pontificate in the Basilic of Lateran, we fully communicated to our venerable brethren the Patriarchs, Archbishops and Bishops, our sentiments on the evils which afflict the church; in order to excite their faith and piety, and to conjure them to "*place themselves as walls for the house of Israel,*" by directing all their efforts, prayers and counsels, to defeat the machinations, which, with sorrow, we behold formed against it. For that purpose we admonished them to raise their eyes and hands to the mountains, whence we feel confident that help will come, as we well know that tranquility will ensue, when He is appeased, "*who commands the wind and the sea,*" and that divine mercy will descend upon us after humble prayer has ascended to God.

"But since the tempest still rages, and the conspiracy of the wicked every where prevails, we have determined on directing general supplications to be made throughout the whole church; and we therefore unlock the treasures of heavenly gifts, that the souls of the faithful may be excited to piety, and being thoroughly cleansed from the defilement of sin, their prayers may become more grateful to God, and ascend before Him as an odour of sweetness. It was indeed customary with our predecessors in accordance with the ancient practice of the Roman Church, to seek aid from the united prayers of the faithful, not only at the commencement of their Pontificate, but also whenever the Lord was pleased to afflict his people. To invite all to penance the sacred treasure of Indulgences was brought forth, that sinners sincerely detesting and humbly confessing their iniquities, might approach with confidence to the throne of grace, to God who

is prone to forgive, and who does not in wrath withhold his mercies. With this view, after having recommended our design in earnest and fervent prayer to the Father of mercies, we likewise proclaim to the whole Catholic world, an indulgence in the form of a general Jubilee; and we cherish the devout hope, that the author of all consolation will shorten the days of our tribulation, calm the present agitation, give lasting peace to the church, and every where restore security to public order."

Such, beloved brethren, are the holy ends which the Vicegerent of our Lord Jesus Christ proposes to himself and to all the church in this solemn act of authority. The pious works which he prescribes are those which the holy Scriptures in so many places point out as highly acceptable before God, namely, prayer, fasting, and alms-deeds, besides the reception of the sacraments of penance, and the eucharist. Having regard to many of the impediments under which many of the faithful labor, his Holiness has, by a special rescript, empowered the respective prelates to dispense in the performance of some of the works so prescribed, and to prolong the time for gaining the Indulgence. We, therefore, availing ourselves of the faculties thus delegated to us by the Apostolic See, declare, that the faithful of this Diocese may, at any time within six months from the date hereof, gain the spiritual favors thus proffered by the chief pastor of the church, on complying with the terms and conditions subjoined to this our pastoral letter.

Though no one is obliged under pain of sin to perform the works of piety prescribed for gaining the indulgence, (as it is a spiritual favor granted to us, and not an obligation imposed on us,) yet none, we trust, will prove so indifferent to their eternal interests, as wantonly to forego this opportunity of enriching themselves with the heavenly treasure. The debts to divine justice wherewith we stand charged for our many offences, but so imperfectly deplored and expiated, may now be cancelled by the plentiful redemption of Christ, which the Indulgence applies to penitent sinners—the obstacles which would retard our entrance into the kingdom of heaven, may be removed by virtue of the power of the keys, specially given to the prince of the Apostles. Whilst we can thus experience the tenderness of the mercy of God, shall we choose rather to await the rigors of his justice, and expose ourselves to be cast into that prison whence we shall not be liberated, until, by penal endurance, we have paid the last farthing? Shall even one among us, by continuing in sin, provoke his everlasting vengeance? Thinkest thou this, O man! that thou shalt escape the judgment of God? or despisest thou the riches of his goodness, and patience, and long suffering? Knowest thou not that the benignity of God leadeth thee to penance? Be converted, then, brethren, and do penance for all your iniquities, and iniquity shall not be your ruin. God, appeased by your humiliation, "will send his fury in no more, because he delighteth in mercy. He will turn again and have mercy on us: he will put away our iniquities: and he will cast all our sins into the bottom of the sea."

Given at Philadelphia this first day of May, in the year of our Lord MDCCCXXXIII.

FRANCIS PATRICK.
Bp. Arath, and Coadj. Phila.

JOHN HUGHES, Sec'y.

Conditions for gaining the Jubilee Indulgence.

1st. Persons desirous of gaining the Jubilee, are to visit three churches, or twice one church, within the space of three weeks, and there devoutly pray for the general interests of the church.

Persons unable to make these visits should pray in private at least twice for the same ends.

2dly They are to fast on Wednesday, Friday and Saturday, in one of the three weeks, or (by dispensation,) upon one of these days in each week.

Persons unable to fast should, in lieu thereof, recite the litany of the saints, or a third part of the rosary, or other pious work, at the discretion of the Pastor or Confessor.

3dly. They are to confess their sins within the same weeks, and to receive reverently the most holy sacrament of the eucharist.

Children not yet admitted to their first communion, may gain the Indulgence by making their confession, and performing any pious work which their Confessor or Pastor may prescribe, without complying with any other condition.

4th. They are to give some alms to the poor, as the devotion of each one shall suggest. The objects of these alms are entirely left to their own choice.

JUBILEE EXERCISES.—The exercises of the Jubilee in the city will commence on Sunday the 6th October. Each Pastor out of the city will appoint a time for his own congregation within the six months. During the time so selected the Litanies will be recited after Mass each morning; and such instructions given as the Pastor shall deem suitable.

REMARKS ON THE ABOVE.—Our readers will notice the ends to be gained by these indulgences. The treasure is unlocked, that the souls of the faithful may be excited to piety; and that they, being "thoroughly cleansed from the defilement of sin," might present prayers more grateful to God. That the faithful may "enrich themselves with heavenly treasures." That their debts to divine justice, imperfectly deplored and expiated, may be cancelled. That "obstacles which would retard our entrance into the kingdom of heaven may be removed." That there may be an "experience of the tenderness of the mercy of God," and an escape from "the rigor of his justice." That we may avoid continuing in sin, by which we provoke God's everlasting vengeance, and "expose

ourselves to that prison, whence we shall not be liberated until, by penal endurance, we have paid the last farthing."

Let the reader next notice the author of such favors, and the source from which they come. They are not from the God of mercies, nor from the fountain of his love and grace; but from the present Pope, and from his *grace* and *great liberality!*—"which his present Holiness, Gregory XVI. has *graciously* proclaimed"—"dispensing the treasures of the church with such *great liberality!*" If this is not ascribing the glory of grace and liberality, in dispensing spiritual favors, to a vile worm of the earth, and giving encouragement to the grossest idolatry, we altogether mistake the meaning of the terms.

There is indeed something said about "sinners sincerely detesting and humbly confessing their iniquities." But we are not informed whether the repentance here intended is contrition or attrition. If the latter only, then, according to the distinction made by Romanists, the faithful are only called to that sorrow which arises from the fear of punishment; and if indulgences only remit temporal punishment, no higher kind of sorrow is herein requisite. Every Protestant knows what value to put upon such a repentance.

We would call attention to the conditions upon which indulgences can be obtained. Even the hardest terms are very easy. But easy as they are, they can be rendered easier still by dispensation. What an invention to lead souls away from the only fountain which God has opened for sin and uncleanness! What encouragement to the poor Roman devotee to continue during intervals indulging in sin, trusting that at Lent, or Christmas, or the Assumption of the Virgin, or a Jubilee, he can obtain a plenary indulgence!

We, at present, invite attention only to one thing more in this proclamation. It is asserted that no one is obliged under pain of sin to perform the works of piety prescribed for gaining the indulgence, (as it is a spiritual favor granted to us, and not an obligation imposed upon us.) Joining this assertion to the words in this proclamation which specify the ends to be obtained by obtaining indulgence, we have declarations which will sound strange in Protestants' ears. "No one is obliged under pain of sin" to embrace an opportunity "to become thoroughly cleansed from the defilement of sin." "No one is obliged under pain of sin"—"to enrich himself with heavenly treasures." "No one is obliged under penalty of sin"—to have his "debts to divine justice cancelled"—"obstacles which retard our entrance into the kingdom of heaven removed"—to embrace an opportunity "to experience the tenderness of the mercy of God"—"to escape the rigors of his justice." "No one is obliged under pain of sin"—to avoid "continuing in sin." "No one is obliged under pain of sin"—to cease "to provoke God's everlasting vengeance!" Can those who maintain such dreadful doctrines be ministers of Jesus Christ? Can any one who has ever read the Bible submit his soul to the direction of such blind guides? Well may every Christian, with a soul-abhorrance at such infidel sentiments exclaim, O my soul! come not thou unto their secrets; mine honor be not united with their assembly!

Our prayer unto God is, that the thousands of our fellow-beings who are involved in such deep and fatal darkness of popery as to submit to such impositions, may be enlightened by the Spirit of truth, and saved from eternal destruction.—*Reformation Advocate.*

ART. VI. General Assembly.

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America met, agreeably to appointment, in the Seventh Presbyterian Church, in the city of Philadelphia, Thursday, May 16th, 1833, at 11 o'clock A. M., and was opened with a sermon by the Rev. James Hodge, D. D., the Moderator of the last Assembly, from Eph. v. 25—27. "Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it; that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word; that he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish."

The Rev. Dr. William A. M'Dowell was *unanimously* elected Moderator, and the Rev. Sylvester Eaton was elected Temporary Clerk. Adjourned to meet to-morrow morning at 9 o'clock. Concluded with prayer.

Friday Morning, May 17th, 9 o'clock. The Assembly met and was opened with prayer. Resolved, That as a standing rule of the General Assembly, a committee of five be appointed to consider all applications for leave of absence, with power to decide on the same, &c. Dr. M'Cartee, Mr. Lyons, Mr. Plumer, Mr. Gray, and Mr. Squier, were therefore appointed.

Committee of Overtures.—Dr. Hodge, Dr. Chapman, Mr. E. W. Crane, Mr. Nevins, Mr. Kant, Mr. William Brown, Mr. Haines, Mr. Steele and Mr. Andrews.

Judicial Committee.—Dr. Beman, Mr. Joseph Campbell, Mr. Latta, Mr. Jessup, Mr. Boyd, and Dr. H. Campbell.

Dr. Miller then moved that a committee of three be appointed to prepare a draught of a letter to the General Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland, with a view of commencing a correspondence with that body.

Dr. Green, Dr. Beman, Dr. Lawrie and Mr. Boyd, were appointed a committee to correspond with the United Secession Churches of Scotland.

The Permanent Clerk reported that there had been put into his hands the following items of judicial business, viz: "A complaint of the 2d Presbytery of Philadelphia against the Synod of Philadelphia." "A complaint of the Rev. E. W. Gilbert against the Synod of Philadelphia." "A remonstrance of the Synod of Philadelphia." "Complaint of the Rev. Messrs. R. Catchcart, G. Duffield, and E. W. Gilbert against the Synod of Philadelphia." "Complaint of John Cochran against the 8th Presbyterian church in Philadelphia." "An appeal by the Rev. Dr. James Snodgrass from a decision of the Synod of Pittsburg." "Resolutions and complaint of West Lexington Presbytery, and also an answer to the dissent and complaint of Messrs. Campbell, Taylor and others." "Complaint of Samuel Lowrie, against the Synod of Cincinnati." And "A memorial from the Presbytery of Indianapolis." The above papers were put into the hands of the judicial committee.

Overture No. 3, viz: A question from the Presbytery of Bethel, respecting holding communion with the followers of William C. Davis, a deposed minister, and calling themselves Independent Presbyterians, was taken up. Dr. Hodge proposed that the question should be answered in the negative, and gave some account of the deposition of Davis. Took the ground that a deposed minister clearly had no power to ordain. Dr. Ely proposed to amend, so that it should be left to the discretion of the pastor and session. Dr. Hodge offered some objections to this plan. Dr. Ely moved to commit. Dr. Miller opposed this; thought the course adapted to do harm. If you commit this, you do in fact commit the question, "Shall our people be encouraged to go and receive sealing ordinances from mere laymen?" Dr. Hodge hoped that, if it were desirable to avoid a decision, indefinite postponement would be adopted. Earnestly hoped, however, that General Assembly would decide in the negative.

Saturday, May 18, 9 o'clock A. M. Opened with prayer.

The following persons were declared to be duly elected as delegates to corresponding bodies, viz: Rev. B. H. Rice, D. D., Rev. H. G. Ludlow, and Rev. Dr. M'Cartee to the General Association of Connecticut. Rev. Dr. Rice and Mr. Ludlow to Massachusetts. Rev. Dr. Rice to Rhode-Island. Rev. Dr. M'Cartee to Maine. Rev. Mr. Patterson to New-Hampshire and Vermont, and Rev. R. Smith his alternate. Rev. Dr. Spring and Mr. Boyd to Reformed Dutch Church. Rev. B. F. Stanton the alternate of Dr. Spring, and Mr. Ananias Platt the alternate of Mr. Boyd. Messrs. Foote and Junkin to the German Reformed Church, and Mr. Riddle the alternate of either.

The discussion interrupted last evening was resumed. Dr. Chapman opposed the reference. Dr. M'Cartee opposed the reference, because, as a general rule, we ought to decide the questions which are proposed to us.

Mr. White of New-York read a paper purporting that no one not baptised by a regular minister of the gospel should be considered as thus entitled.

Mr. Plumer read from Digest page 94, &c.

The substance of Mr. Plumer's argument was, that by answering in the negative we should exclude many dear people of God; stated cases, and declared that he had in these matters a higher responsibility than to the decisions of the General Assembly.

Mr. Ludlow opposed the reference. Believed that few in the house agreed with the last speaker. This was the case of a wicked man *out of commission*, and even if he were as holy as Paul, his acts would have no validity without restoration to office. There must be order in the church of God. Instanced the case of persons of piety inveigled into Unitarian churches. Persons not baptised must not be admitted to communion.

Dr. Ely withdrew the motion for commitment. The debate then proceeded on the original motion to answer in the negative.

Dr. Ely referred to the opinion of Robert Hall, that baptism is not a necessary pre-requisite. Apostles were perhaps not baptised. Dr. John M. Mason's opinion was cited. What is to be done with those who, after having been regularly admitted to the Presbyterian church, go over to the followers of Davis, and yet apply to us for occasional communion?

Dr. Green said he was opposed to what he could not name otherwise than by calling it the omnipotence of the session. Took a case of an avowed Unitarian admitted by a session. Feared it might not always be an imaginary case. Would the Presbytery have no right to control the session. Could not the Synod, or the General Assembly take it up? The opposite doctrine is monstrous.

Mr. Ludlow offered some highly impressive remarks against the license pleaded for.

Dr. Spring offered resolutions, first answering in the negative, but then leaving sessions to determine how far discipline should extend.

Mr. Lathrop, in favor of committing, opposed Dr. Spring's resolutions. Was delighted that there were no shades of party visible since the commencement of our sessions. The whole subject was committed.

The Synod of the Western Reserve, agreeably to the directions of the last Assembly, made a report concerning the charge against them, that they had no ruling elders in some churches, and also that they had received ministers without the necessary engagements. The substance was, that they acknowledged no prevalence of the abuses charged. In the case of elders, we understood the report to declare that the Synod did not believe the Constitution to make them essential to the existence of a church. The report was committed to Dr. M'Cartee, Mr. Judd, and Richard D. Haynes.

Committee of Overtures reported No's. 6 and 7.

Monday, May 20th, 9 o'clock A. M.

The 21st Annual Report of the Directors of the Theological Seminary at Princeton was received, and committed to Messrs. Winchester, D. Axtell, Jehiel Talmadge and Mr. Squier.

We learn that there have been received during the year 66 students; the highest number at any one time in attendance on lectures, was 138; the number at present, 127; certificates of having finished the whole course have been given to 8 young men.

Dr. Spring as chairman of the Committee on Overtures, read the document No. 1, and proposed its indefinite postponement. Carried, *nem. con.*

Overture No. 10, being a memorial and petition for the erection of a new Synod, to be called the Synod of the Chesapeake, was taken up, and after a highly animated debate was finally granted.

Tuesday, May 21st, 9 o'clock, A. M.

The papers relative to the difficulties in the Synods of Philadelphia and Cincinnati were referred to a committee consisting of Messrs. Spring, Hodge, Ludlow, Jessup and Wilkison, to endeavor, if practicable, to effect a reconciliation between the parties concerned.

(To be continued.)

ART. VII. Anniversaries.

New-York Southern Sunday School Union.—The number of pupils in the various schools under the direction of the Society is 29,553, of which number 1,500 have been enrolled during the past year. The number of teachers and pupils who have embraced religion during the past year is 691. The receipts of the Society, from the same period, were \$1,043, and its expenditures \$1,625.

New-York Sunday School Union.—The number of schools connected with the Union is 63, all having a male and female department except two. Teachers 2,014; of whom 1,039 are females. Scholars 13,494; of whom 242 are professors of religion. The number of libraries is 36, containing an aggregate of 16,490 volumes. There has been an increase, during the year of 185 teachers, and 1,749 scholars. Three thousand Bibles, being a donation from the American Bible Society, have been distributed among the schools within the same period.

Exhibition of the Deaf and Dumb.—This exhibition attracted as great a crowd at the Chatham street Chapel last evening, as was ever brought together there, on any occasion. The whole number of deaf and dumb in the State at the present time, is about 900; and even on the supposition that it will remain stationary, there will always be 150 of suitable age for instruction. The whole number now under tuition is 96. During the intervals of the usual course of instruction, lectures by signs on various subjects are to be given to the pupils by the professors. The young men are also taught various trades, and the girls are instructed in plain and ornamental needle work, household affairs, &c.

American Bible Society.—The receipts amount to \$84,935.48; of which sum \$37,494.37 were in payment for books; \$1,190.57 from legacies; \$3,572.53 as donations towards the general supply; \$1,327.60 towards the foreign distributions, and \$20,070.96 ordinary donations; the remainder from other sources. The expenditures during the year are \$86,362.76, being \$1,427.28 more than the amount received.

It was mentioned in the last report that the managers were about to prepare plates for a new quarto, royal octavo, and duodecimo Reference Bible. Those for the two former are now completed; the others will soon be ready, and copies from them will be prepared as early as possible—probably by September next.

Plates for a Modern Greek New-Testament are cast, and are in the hands of a Modern Greek scholar for correction. Books from them will soon be prepared and despatched to Greece.

American Tract Society.—The total amount of receipts during the year is \$62,443.50; expenditures during the same period \$62,339.18. Balance in the treasury, \$104.32.

The American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions.—The Board had 12 missions, embracing 65 stations. Of these stations seven are in India, two in South Eastern Asia, four in the Mediterranean, seven in the Sandwich Islands, twenty-seven among our Southwestern Indians, and four among the Indians of the State of New-York. The number of ordained missionaries was 76; of physicians, 4; of printers, 4; teachers, 18; farmers and mechanics, 20; females, married and single, 131—making a total of 252 laborers sent out from this country. In addition to these there were four native preachers, thirty native assistants, catechists, &c., and 1,275 schools, embracing 59,824 scholars.

THE
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,

AND

EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

JULY, 1833.

ART. I. *Church and State, No. 3.*

“PROP. 3. God has committed the administration and execution of his law on this subject to church and state, in all ordinary cases.” It is a truth, that God has committed to church and state, and *heads of families, authority* to administer and execute his law, *on all subjects and in all cases.* Neither the prevalence of crime, as in the old world and the cities of the plain, nor the secrecy of crime, ought to have been named as exceptions. These may render authority inefficient, but cannot annul it. But to what end is this proposition? Or what the use of its exceptions? It has been affirmed in my first Number—that the church may ordain censures, and of course execute them, for the enforcing of every precept of the divine law—not excepting those which are to regulate the civil ruler in the exercise of the civil function. Does the author of the REASONS mean to deny this? and to confine the church’s power to cases arising out of the seventh commandment? and still further, to confine it to “all ordinary cases?” If the violation of “any of God’s statutes and judgments in regard to marriage were to become general, there could be no church *at all.*” This with him appears to be sufficient reason, why marriage should be peculiarly subject to *canon law*—the dogmas of the church. But could the violation, I would ask, of any of the ten commandments become general and there be a church? Which commandment is it, the “supervision” of which is not given the church, in order “to preserve her own existence?” The proposition then is defective or erroneous:

1. In the exceptions made to the just authority of church and state, both of subjects and cases:

2. In the omission and implied exclusion of heads of families. We may soon find reason to fear that this was not done by accident.

3. In point of distinctness. No boundaries are assigned to either of the powers named. No division line between their respective jurisdictions is drawn. No example of the proper or improper exercise of power by either is attempted to be offered. What does he think of the examples to this effect in “CHURCH AND STATE?” Would it be convenient for him to recollect them? and to accept or reject each of them pointedly? for reasons explicitly stated?

4. The want of an avowed object. To what purpose is it asserted in

Vol. X.

this formal manner, that authority is committed to church and state, unless some one is known to dispute it?

5. The pravity of the real object apparent. It is to assert a special guardianship, or "supervision of the church over the relations and duties implied in the seventh precept, more than over any other of the second table. This proceeds from the error of making marriage a religious covenant, and is calculated to prove the precedency of the church's power in this matter to that of the state. Both the *first* and *third* propositions would virtually, in the spirit of them, transfer the seventh precept from the *second* to the *first* table of the moral law. Where it stands, it defines certain duties between man and man. Where his principles would place it, it would define duties of which God is the immediate object, and of which the church has a special "supervision."

"PROP. 4. These two parties, both church and state, have a right to know every purpose of marriage, a sufficient time before its execution, to prevent it if it should be illegal. If the preceding proposition is admitted, this one cannot be refused." Yet it is easy to show reason why the preceding proposition, loaded as it is with errors, may be admitted, and this one refused. The civil and ecclesiastical powers have, it is true, *authority* to judge of every purpose of marriage, whether it be legal or not. But this judgment they have a *right* to give, on all purposes of marriage previous to the act, as on all purposes of any other action, *specifically*, not *individually*. They give their judgment specifically, by pointing out what kinds of marriage, with respect to age, consanguinity, affinity, and the like—are lawful, and what are unlawful. They give their judgment on cases, including the purpose of them individually, by declaring the marriage of a certain couple—A and B—to be unlawful. This latter mode of judging they have a right to use only after the action, or some voluntary and overt act, indicating the design of a bad action. For the higher powers to extort from men, by inquisition, a confession of their *designs*, in order to judge of them, implies either an impeachment of their designs, as being bad, or of their moral faculties as being incapable of discerning between good and evil. All men have a right to be reputed innocent till guilt be proven; and to be exempt from arrest, libel and inquisition, till probable evidence or suspicious conduct appear to inculpate them. This is the only legitimate mode of administering justice. It is dictated by the light of nature, and sanctioned by the Spirit of God. Ex. xviii. 20. *Thou shalt teach them ordinances and laws, and shalt shew them the way wherein they must walk, and the work that they must do.* Executive officers are then appointed to take cognizance of the violation of these laws. But were our author's system of prevention to prevail,—and he gives a number of examples to shew its general application, as he thinks, to all cases, including that of marriage; then all laws but one—that of publication—would be superceded. Every purpose of the human heart must be arraigned at the bar of the public tribunals, to be judged of there, before it be executed. Human accountability for every act but one—the neglect of publication—will in a great measure be done away. The burden, at least, of human responsibility, will lie upon the officers. But then Jethro's prudent advice, which God has sanctioned, will lose at least one half of its advantage—which was to diminish the number of causes, by laws prescriptive of moral and civil duty. Then Moses and his officers may sit day and night to try *purposes*, till they *will surely wear away both themselves and all this people that is with them.*

But for the satisfaction of all candid persons, and such I know there are on both sides of the controversy, let the question be fairly stated.

1. It is not the *expediency* of the *state's* making a rule of publication in certain cases; as for example, when one or both the parties are unknown: nor is it the expediency in times of general confusion and danger, of extending this rule to all cases, that is now questioned. Legislatures often lay such restrictions on the use of men's natural rights, for the good of the whole; but without pretending any antecedent and universal moral obligation. Thus the natural right to remove from place to place, may be restricted in case of an invasion or seige, and by the watchmen of cities in untimely hours of the night. Josh. vi. 1. Song. v. 7.

2. It is not the *expediency* of the *church's* making, upon similar grounds, a rule of this kind for her own members, not excepting magistrates, in the act of being married, which is here questioned. Nor is the duty here questioned, of people's submitting in practice to a rule thus limited—although they do not see it to be expedient—provided they are not required to acknowledge in it any divine appointment, that is, in the language of the *SYNOD OF DORT*, provided it be not imposed in such a manner, as to restrict and tie down the conscience. The expediency of the church's interfering so far, in a matter of natural right, and of a civil nature, is, I think very questionable. Yet it may be admitted with perfect safety to my argument. If the author of the Reasons then only meant by "the right to know the purpose," a right to institute a law to this effect—this might have been admitted. But he speaks of "a moral obligation," and one "that lies on church and state to require this previous knowledge."

3. The question is not, whether marriage, in its own nature, be public, and whether marriage, formed without the knowledge of either of those powers—church and state—ought to be prohibited. For we also assert, that in an organized state of society, every marriage ought of *divine right*, to be celebrated before a competent number of witnesses, of whom it is expedient, and when by law required, *necessary*, that some officer appointed by the state, if not also by the church, be one; and that it ought of *divine right*, immediately upon celebration, to be confessed before the church and state, which is sufficiently done by the report of such officer.

It is this one principle then, labored after painfully in the three first propositions of the Reasons, drawn into view awkwardly in the three next, and abandoned, we shall soon see, in the seventh, as untenable—it is the doctrine of the antecedent moral obligation—the doctrine of the *divine right*, of the rule of publication,, which I do here *impugn*. The question is, whether publication, as opposed to the license required in any of these states, be of moral obligation, in all ordinary cases, suppose no rule for it were by man enacted?

The main argument with the author of the Reasons, for the moral obligation of the practice prior to any human enactment of a rule for it, is, the right of the public authorities to require previous information. In order to make the argument bear on the question, he must mean the right to require publication. This right, therefore, it is plainly his duty to prove, and then to show that this right implies a moral obligation to exercise it in all ordinary cases. He has not taken the trouble to do either of these. This right, to a certain extent, has been admitted in our statement of the question. But he claims it, without proof, to every extent necessary to his argument. Then, instead of showing that the moral obligation is implied in the right, or that it necessarily flows from it, he assumes this, and so confounds right with duty. The right to make and enforce a rule in some cases, he confounds with the duty of making and enforcing it in all cases. Congress have a right to declare war. Therefore it is their duty to be always declaring war. For the same reasons, it is the duty of parents to be always correcting their chil-

dren. But, "They have a right to do it, because they owe it to God in duty, who has entrusted them with the administration of his laws, and this obligation is the very foundation of the right." But the same language holds equally good for the perpetual declaration of war, and for the incessant plying of the rod. The question however is, whether this obligation to God is an obligation to be perpetually engaged in these actions, or only an obligation to exercise discretion, and to act when there is a providential call? The author assumes the former without proof. I might do the same in behalf of Congress, or of parents, in the cases above stated. The argument from the right to do a thing, to the duty of doing it, is an insequent—a *non-sequitur*. The conclusion does not flow from the premises. But the author helps this argument mightily, by begging the question manfully. He takes for granted, that there is a moral obligation to require publication *in all cases*. And upon this moral obligation to require it, he *founds* the right to require it. And from the right to require it, he *infers* the moral obligation. He not only begs the question, but likewise reasons in a circle, as if to repay what he had borrowed. The reader will please to look at the proposition itself, with its illustrations. "They have a right to know—." Then in the next paragraph but one, "Another inference is—a moral obligation." And a few lines below, "This obligation is the very foundation of the right." The argument in full would run thus:—Church and state are under moral obligation to require publication in every case. This obligation creates a right. Wherefore they have a right to require it. But how do we know that they are under such a moral obligation? Ans. It has just been proved that they have a right to require it. This right can only be founded on a moral obligation to require it. Wherefore "an inference is—a moral obligation" to require it. Nor is this argument a light one with our author, or one which the Reasons can very well spare. It is the life and soul of the *fourth proposition*, as that is the soul and centre of the *perfect seven*. But to support the fact of a moral obligation, which in the proposition itself he had begged or assumed, as if evident, and not possibly to be "refused"—he adduces one other argument. It is adduced indirectly, as being only an auxiliary, and is implied in a multitude of examples, all supposed to bear on the same point. The unnamed, and undefined argument, which no doubt is familiar to the minds of many readers, is in substance this: *Publication, as practised in the Associate and some other churches, is a necessary means of preventing illegal marriages.* But the *necessity* of any thing as a means, implies its *sufficiency*, either by itself, or in connection with other means. If this practice be made to appear either insufficient or unnecessary, the argument—drawn from the supposed necessity of it—falls. Or if it be unnecessary in ordinary cases, and insufficient in those which are not, the argument falls. Now it is plain that publication in ordinary cases, is not necessary to prevent illegal marriages. In such cases, the persons to be married are known, and their parents' consent, if they be under age, or (non sui juris,) not at their own just disposal, is likewise known—without publication. These are the only particulars requisite to be known in order to prevent illegal marriages: the character of the parties and the consent of parents. Are they single persons? and not too nearly conjoined already, by affinity or consanguinity? Marriage, I maintain, to be a public fact. Birth to be the same. Both these facts are, in all ordinary cases, to be known by certificate, verbal or written. So is the consent of parents. And no wise and conscientious officer will depend on less than this—will depend on mere publication for his knowledge of the parties' right, or of the parent's consent. Now as all the impediments which can render a marriage *illegal*, which can authorise either church or state to prohibit it,

must arise from one of these three—birth, producing consanguinity, some previous marriage, or the want of parents' consent; and all these particulars being, in ordinary cases, determined with more ease, *accuracy* and despatch by certificate than by publication, it clearly, follows—publication is not in ordinary cases a necessary means of preventing illegal marriages. A previous promise of one person to marry another, will not authorise either church or state to compel the marriage, or to prohibit the delinquent party from marrying to another person than the one promised. The church may censure for making a rash promise, or for breaking a good one; it is not for them to decide which of these two is in this instance the sin committed. The state may award pecuniary compensation to the injured person, and by this, or other means, inflict a merited penalty on the injurious. Further than this, neither the duty of the public authority, nor the interest of the injured, require or permit them to proceed.

But again, in cases which are not ordinary, and where the requisite information cannot be obtained by certificates, it is less satisfactorily obtained by publication. It were possible for a man of general acquaintance in these states to be published in one of our largest congregations, according to rule, and *married* nominally, having other wives in different parts of the Union. And what if the congregation were small? What if he were an obscure person? or had come from a foreign country? The efficiency of the measure would in that case be less. The resort which some have in this part of the discussion is, to beg the question. "We should observe the appointment, and leave the event to God." This is an excellent course, I agree, when we *have* a divine appointment. But in this case they take it for granted that it has a divine appointment, and so no matter about its sufficiency. And yet they prove the divine appointment from its supposed sufficiency. The argument of the author, which we are now considering, is, that this rule is necessary. This implies that it is sufficient. When it is shown to be unnecessary in common cases, and insufficient in others, the whole argument for this divine appointment falls. Another resort is *to mistake* the question. "If it do good in some cases, it should be observed for the sake of those." This may prove that it is expedient to make such a rule, or, if made, to retain it in use as a human expedient. But this "*may do good sometimes*," affords but lame evidence of a divine appointment. Such proof will not be admitted for,—"*Thus saith the Lord*,"—in other matters, by persons of sound principles. Temperance societies may do good sometimes,—therefore they are of divine appointment. Synods should pass an act to censure every person who will not join them. And then every magistrate should be censured who "countenances" any person in not joining them, and who will not be "*a terror*" to such as "*evil doers*."

The whole fabric of the divine right of publication is based upon this fallacy:—That for a minister, or his precentor, to tell a couple's purpose to his hearers, or even to his elders, however few, provided it be done on the meeting ground, makes the fact of marriage a legal fact, both to church and state—although such fact may never take place—and if it do, may take place in private: but that, upon the other hand, the failure to tell the purpose on the meeting ground, makes the fact of marriage clandestine both to church and state, although it be publicly and officially solemnized. I may take occasion hereafter to show that this, besides being an abuse of the word clandestine, is a departure from the customs and language, both of the Ancients and of the Reformers. In order to obviate the exposure of such a fallacy as above stated, the author runs himself into a greater difficulty, and thus exposes it the more. "To tell a public officer, either in church or state, is not to tell either church or

state." But we have been accustomed to believe, that to tell a thing to the church, is to lodge information of it with the officers of the church. Matth. xviii. 17. Yet my views accord with the author's, that such a mode of *telling* will not prevent illegal marriages. He was aware, that to make his argument valid—to make publication a sufficient means of preventing one man from marrying another's wife—to make it as good a means as personal knowledge or certificate—it ought to be to all and every one in the nation. Therefore, instead of the *authorities* plainly referred to in the language of the proposition, who *have a right to prevent*, he now substitutes "the community." But whether it be the "community," in their "primary and conjunct capacity," and so met in general *convention*, or only the populace in town and country, we are not so explicitly informed. I must at all events contend in my turn, that neither his congregation nor mine, is in any sense the community; and that to tell a purpose to them, is not to tell the community. This purpose, if either party be a foreigner, ought likewise to be known to all and every person in the "community" from which such party may have come. This is the author's first *inference* from his proposition; and I feel happy in acknowledging, for once, the clearness and fairness of his induction. "An inference from this is, that this previous knowledge of the purpose of marriage ought to be given to all to whom it may concern, because for them chiefly it is necessary." It ought to be given to all—to every body—in the community of which either party is or has been a member, before it can be, with any probability, known "whom it does concern, and for whom chiefly it is necessary." This inference is fairly inducted from the proposition. If the one be true, so is the other. If the latter be false, so is the former. But the latter is an impossibility. At least it might employ a single precentor more than three sabbaths. It would employ him more in all cases which are not ordinary—in all cases where satisfactory evidence by word or writing cannot be had—in all cases which seem to require publication. And this destroys the last refuge of this moral obligation and divine right. The rule must be content with the honor of being called a human expedient.

The author thinks it "were ridiculous and absurd to assert, that the magistrate had authority to punish the incendiary for burning my house to the ground, but none to hinder him from kindling it." But it would be more ridiculous and absurd for him to call upon *the powers that be*, to compel me, and all his neighbors, to proclaim our purpose, before we kindle any fire, lest the kindling be illegal, and may burn his house—to *the ground*. "The punishment of the man who entices my wife to marry him, is a small matter to me, after my peace and comfort is ruined forever." But besides what is shown above, that the fact of another marriage remaining undissolved, being a public fact, needs better means than publication to decide it; no woman of common understanding can, by the idea of a pretended marriage, be enticed to commit adultery, who is not enticed already. The preventive, I should apprehend, in this case, comes too late for the true husband's peace and comfort. The pretended marriage is not the principal crime, and is punishable rather as an imposition on the public confidence. But in this and similar examples, sometimes adduced, the idea cherished is, that persons bent upon the basest crimes, will be stupid enough, if required by law, to proclaim it beforehand. His other examples are still more foreign to the point. The instalment of a pastor is effected by a religious covenant, in which the congregation is a party, and therefore have a right to know, in time to make up their mind. In a decree of divorce, a former covenant is to be rescinded, and the absent party being known to be a party, has a right to object upon good reason shown. Goods imported or exported, have not

to be published, but the invoice reported to the proper officer only—and that only because a special law has made it requisite. The question is, whether the higher powers are under moral obligation to lay a *perpetual* law of revenue, non-intercourse, or embargo, upon marriages? The insolvent debtor is *reasonably* supposed to have more creditors than one. The deceased man is *reasonably* supposed to have creditors, debtors and heirs. Besides, the property cannot be sold without buyers, and an advertisement is the best means of inviting them. In every sale or conveyance of land, absent persons, who are interested, have their rights secured by proclamation. They know to have recourse from any part of the earth, by their agent or otherwise, to the newspaper of the county where their lands, which never migrate, are “being and situate.” If these matters had not been in the RELIGIOUS MONITOR, I had not troubled the religious reader with an answer of them. The requiring of a license to be taken, is the requiring of a certificate, if the parties be under age, of their parents’ consent; and the implied right to any thing more, unless it be, in singular cases, another certificate of relationship, or reputed single state in the places where the party is best known—is imaginary.

PROP. 5 differs but little from the preceding. I do most cordially agree with our author, that “The word of God uniformly recognizes in parents a power to give or not to give their children in marriage.” That is, in case of giving, only with the children’s consent. For I hold further, which is the doctrine of Protestants against Papists, that marriages of minors without the consent of their parents, are in their own nature *voidable* by the will of the parents. Num. xxx. 3—5. Ex. xxii. 17. It is the uniform tenor of both Testaments, that parents, *and they only*, have authority over their children, to give or not to give in marriage. And this is direct proof against the pretended moral obligation to ask the consent of church and state. Deut. vii. 3. 1 Cor. vii. 38. Nor can there be a “secret let” to a parent’s giving in marriage that son or daughter who has always been in his power. But the author contradicts himself, and the Bible, and the law of nature, in saying that the authority of natural parents is “included in that of the civil and ecclesiastic.” If it be included in it, it may be controlled by it. And he says that “church and state have a greater authority over us, and a greater interest at stake!” Is this author a father? if he be, he would resist such an encroachment on parental right, *even unto blood*. How the right of the parties in other respects may be known has been shown already. Wherefore, to give or not to give children with their own consent, the other party having equal right to receive, is the natural and unalienable right of him who is the parent by nature or adoption—a right with which no power between heaven and earth may interfere. The claim to know and solemnize the fact of marriage is no exception. And the moment this right passes from the parent, it passes over and becomes vested in the person of the child, for whom alone the parent held it guarded, and there it rests immovable till marriage or death, uncontrollable either by church or state. One exception, of a very limited extent, was made by the judicial law, which shows the rule to be now confirmed without exception. Num. xxxvi. 6. If this *including* authority of church and state be once established, and our author shall have achieved the reformation on hands, he has still another in contemplation. He has discovered that the Bible “limits in marrying to those making the same profession of religion.” But to the honor of christianity be it spoken, no denomination of Christians of whom I have read ancient or modern, have limited their members, in marrying, to those of their own profession—except some sects of the German Anabaptists—not all those sects, not the modern Baptists. Those Anabaptists to whom I allude, BERNHARDINUS DE

MOOR calls the more rigid excommunicators. A member marrying one who was not of their sect, was excommunicated, and not received again, even upon repentance, till the person of extraneous profession, either became converted or died.*

PROP. 7th is in substance, that magistrates should be censured for celebrating a marriage without previous publication. It professes to be built upon the foregoing propositions, particularly this principle:—"That persons thus marrying neglect God's mind and will, violate his ordinance on this head." It professes to be built upon the divine "ordinance" of publication. If so, the proposition has been shown to be without foundation, and I might here close the disputation. But the author appears himself to have distrusted this foundation, and so resorts to another. And not only so, he abandons the *divine right*, as if untenable, and betakes himself *exclusively* to the fifth commandment, and under it to the supposed authority of the church to make a law of publication. "Again the respect of the conduct of which she takes cognizance, in this case, is not the civil or magistratical, but the moral respect of it only, viz: his countenancing the parties whom he marries in a breach of the fifth commandment." Now what is meant *by taking cognizance of the respect of a thing abstractly*, I question if any man can tell. But the "magistratical countenancing" of the breach of the *fifth*, or of any other commandment, I should think censurable. He, it would appear, does not. Be this as it may, the fifth commandment is the only one for the violation of which censure is in this case to be inflicted. And this violation on the magistrate's part, is not *direct*, but *by implication*. He "only countenances the parties" in a violation. The parties are under a *direct* obligation from the fifth commandment, to be published. But the magistrate is under no such direct obligation from this, or any other commandment. His language must mean this, or nothing. But the fifth commandment always interposes a medium between itself and its subject. This medium in the present instance cannot be the state. No command from that source has been given. And even to ask *advice* concerning one's *match* of those who have already declined to give advice on such matters further than what is contained in the statute book, is not to honor but to insult them. It is to the church that we must turn our eye to descry the source whence this mandate or obligation for the proclamation of purposes emanates. The author aids us *a little* in exploring the church's archives for a copy of this mandate, by naming "discipline worship and doctrine." In the worship it cannot be. He has not yet asserted that publication is an ordinance of worship. In the doctrine it cannot be: for if it were a sin against sound doctrine, it would be strange to describe it as "a breach of the fifth commandment *only*." It must be in the *Discipline* of the church, that he holds the magistrate of our communion pledged to observe this rule. And moreover he agrees with me, and every reader of common sense, that the rule in the Directory was made for ministers and the parties to be married; that the rule in the new Book of Discipline was made for the parties, but includes ministers by referring to the Directory. He agrees with me that the magistrate, if he violate this rule by marrying a couple on licence, violates it "only by countenancing the parties." Now, if the parties do not belong to our church, and the rule be, as we have shown, and as this author undesignedly here admits, but a little after *designedly*, for arguments sake—"matter and form," a thing indifferent in its nature—then these parties not being under the rule, cannot break it—consequently the magistrate cannot be countenancing them in breaking it.

But in the case of the parties, one or both belonging to the Associate

* Hombeck, Summa Controv. Lib. v. p. 387.

church, and marrying upon license, and thus, under present circumstances, *violating sinfully* the rules of their own church—is the Seceder magistrate who marries them guilty of countenancing this breach of the fifth commandment? The author of the Reasons affirms, “Although the previous publication of the purpose of marriage were ‘matter and form’ of it, a thing indifferent, I do not see that the church is under any obligation to surrender it to the state.” He does not see that the church should refrain from censuring the magistrate for not enforcing the rule. This is all that he has been asked to see. And he had said under PROP. 6, “In his magisterial capacity he is bound, as being a ‘terror to evil doers,’ to require that it be done.” What *terror*, besides debarring men and women their natural right to marriage, must, by the magistrate, be impended over their head, for neglect of church rule, in a thing indifferent, is a secret yet to be developed. But this is one terror too much for our testimony to bear. The simple reply to the charge of countenancing is this: The magistrate, in the distribution and protection of men’s natural rights, is not justly chargeable with the countenancing of any deed which he has no just authority to suppress. He is not justly chargeable with the countenancing of false worship, by protecting the persons, liberties and rights of the worshippers, in the very act of false worship. Because, he has no right nor authority to punish them, nor to withhold his protection. Much less has he any just authority to withhold from persons their natural rights, because they reach for them, *schismatically*, over the enacted rule or ceremony of some church. He has no authority, in his distribution of men’s natural rights, to distinguish between those who are breaking church rules, and those who observe them. “The magistrate, as such, has nothing to do with religion. His whole duty as a magistrate respects men, not as Christians, but as members of civil society. He ought not to punish any *as heretics or schismatics*.” The neglect of publication, were it even a divine appointment, yet not being of the essence of marriage, is at worst a heresy. The neglect of a church rule, the matter and form of which are indifferent, is a sin of schism only. And whether the *terror* inflicted be positive, or negative, there is nothing in this sin to punish but schism only: unless she “take cognizance of the respect of the conduct *abstractly*,” the “*terror*” of which, I suppose, would not be very alarming.

“And moreover,” say *Answers to various Reasons of Dissent*, “as the whole institution and end of their office are cut out by, and lie within the compass of, natural principles, it were absurd to suppose that there could, or ought to be, any exercise thereof toward its end, in the foresaid circumstances, but what can be argued for and defended from natural principles; as indeed there is nothing especially allotted and allowed unto magistrates by the word of God, and the Confessions of the Reformed churches, but what can be so.” Can the refusal of marriage to any, whose natural right to it is otherwise good and sure, merely for their neglect of a church rule, in a thing indifferent, “be argued for and defended from natural principles?” If it can, let us have the argument distinctly written. And further, let the duty, the universal moral obligation, of being published be argued for, and defended from, natural principles, *without begging the question, without arguing in a circle*, independent of ecclesiastic canons, and we will all agree that it is the duty of magistrates to enforce it. We will admit that it is the duty of state legislatures in all cases, to make laws to enforce it. We *may*, too, admit that our members, belonging to any of those legislatures, are censurable, for not using their endeavours to obtain laws to this effect. It would still be unjust to censure an executive officer for not enforcing a moral precept, which the Legislature gave him no power to enforce. It would be un-

just to debar him from office, because the laws did not authorise him to enforce all the duties of the two tables. He is not debarred, by secession principles and practice, for want of power to enforce the observance of the Sabbath, or to guard the sanctity of the divine name. He says, under PROP. 4, "It would be a fallacious mode of reasoning to say, that because the state did not expressly require it, therefore it forbids the magistrate (viz. the executive.) to require this previous knowledge,"—publication, as opposed to license. But it would be extremely "fallacious" and contrary to the principles of just government, to say any thing different or contrary. The power and duty of the executive is, and in natural justice ought to be, *defined and limited*, by the constitution and laws. Beyond these he has no right nor authority to act, let the thing to be acted be, in itself, right or wrong. If these enjoin anything sinful in its nature, it is duty not to accept of office, or if he have accepted to resign. But the marrying of a couple, whose right is known, is not rendered sinful in its nature by the neglect of publication, were it even of divine appointment. For the sin would in that case lie, not in the act of being married, but in the previous act, the neglect of the divine appointment. Upon any other principle, every moral defect in our constitution and laws would exclude every christian man from office, and from acting as juror. And *be it so*, I expect to hear this author say, as our brethren the Reformed have long ago said, with more consistency. But *no verily*, is the voice of our testimony—the voice of every genuine Seceder. A man may swear to support the constitution and laws, notwithstanding their moral defects, but with nothing immoral. And if he execute these to their full extent according to the power vested in him by the same, the sins of omission are not his, but the body-politic's, or the Legislature's. For an executive officer to proceed further, and to assume power not vested in him by the constitution and laws, is to assume power not vested in him by "We the People"—and therefore not vested in him by God. This great moral person, "We the People," is the only medium of divine appointment, through which political power flows from God the Most High to any individual man. If they withhold any portion of that power which they ought to transmit, the sin lies at their door.

Conclusion.—"Because if it is indifferent, it has, at least, nothing contrary to the moral law, and therefore it cannot stand in the way of any moral duty of the state functionary." Answer. It is a moral duty, we have repeatedly shown, of the state functionary, to dispense to men all their natural rights, even to heretics and schismatics. The observance of the rule indifferent to them, but the enforcement of it is not so to him. The sin lies here in the usurpation of power not conferred by the God of government.

1. The magistrate usurps a power not conferred on him through the only medium of divine appointment, the constitution and laws.

2. He usurps the power of punishing men as heretics and schismatics, and of having, as a magistrate, to do with religion, by enforcing church rules, the duty of observing or enforcing which is not cut out by and lying within the compass of natural principles.

3. The church usurps the power of ruling an act of administration purely civil, and of making the magistrate her rod, to enforce her enactments in things, the matter and form of which are indifferent.

4. She at the same time usurps the power of censuring and casting out of the church those who cannot, for the fear of the Almighty, be the instruments of inflicting on others her unscriptural censures.

The author's modesty in this affair is remarkable. He would not have the church to strike any man with a weapon which is not in her hand—an armed man with a weapon which might provoke resentment. "She inflicts

no pains or penalties, no civil disabilities, nothing—nothing but a spiritual censure, suspending him from sealing ordinances.” Then the prayer—the body of which can only be construed as an *anathema*—the conclusion of it literally is *maranatha*. But of such thunderbolts I had rather be the object than the instrument. The magistrate has no right, according to our testimony, to compel men to worship God in the way of his own appointments. He must dispense to them all their natural rights in the very act of violating those appointments. And yet it seems he *must* and *shall* compel them to follow church rules in a thing indifferent, and withhold one of the most unalienable rights of man till they comply. And the church shall compel her subordinates to compel him to compel them to follow these church rules, by “grasping firmly” the sword which has lost much of its edge by the Reformation—an unscriptural anathema. “And *second*, because the state is not the church’s father and mother, that she should owe this deference to the state.” The church, he thinks, may compel every person except her “father and mother,” to do what she pleases, provided it be not intrinsically evil. Is this a good rule in other cases? If the author of the Reasons be not my “father and mother,” have I a right to compel him to do what I please, provided it be not intrinsically evil? The fifth commandment recognizes the relation of equals.

J. A.

ART. II. On Divine Love.

(Continued from Vol. IX.)

CONTEMPLATION III. PART I.

7. He vanquished our enemies. These are numerous, powerful, and combined to prevent us from the enjoyment of God and all happiness. It is delightful to contemplate how he began and proceeded against them in *order*, conquering and to conquer.

He rescued human nature from the guilt, defilement and dominion of sin, by his incarnation. As he was not represented in the covenant of works, he had no imputed guilt. His human nature was formed and sanctified by the Holy Ghost. Hence called “that holy thing.” In opposition to all the wickedness of the age in which he lived, he maintained his purity through life. “He was holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners,” though he lived among and conversed with them. They could not convince him of sin; and lastly, He put away sin *radically* and *meritoriously*, by the sacrifice of himself. “He finished transgression, and made an end of sin.” This was beyond the capacity of all mankind. “What the law could not do in that it was weak through the flesh,” (the impossibility of the law) God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, condemned sin in the flesh; that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us,” (first in him as our surety, and then in us, by a mystical union to him as “the Lord our righteousness,”) and we ought to *evidence* this, by walking, not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.” “He overcame the world,” as he told the disciples. He maintained the truth and purity of the doctrine, from the holy scriptures, as to the divinity of his person and his mission, as the promised Messiah. “Saith he, “If ye believed Moses, ye would believe me, for he spoke of me.” Gen. iii. 15. Deut. xvii. 18. He explained the moral law, in all its spirituality, purity, extent, and perfection, and thus rescued it from the false and gross interpretations put upon it by the Scribes and Pharisees, as was observed in a preceding particular. And when he was repeatedly attacked through life, he made full

proof of his ministry. When "the Pharisees and Herodians took counsel how they might entangle him in his talk, they asked him, Is it lawful to give tribute to Cæsar, or not? He saith, show me the tribute money: and they brought unto him a penny. He saith unto them, whose is this image and superscription? They say unto him, Cæsar's. Then saith he unto them, Render, therefore, unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and unto God the things which are God's. When they heard these words, they marvelled and left him, and went their way." When the Sadducees asked him whose wife the woman should be at the resurrection, whom the seven brethren successively had married, "Jesus answered, ye do err, not knowing the scriptures, nor the power of God. For in the resurrection, they neither marry nor are given in marriage; but are as the angels of God in heaven. But as touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. God is not the God of the dead, but of the living;" i. e. their bodies must be raised, and soul and body united, that he might be the God of the *whole person*. "And when the multitude heard this, they were astonished at his doctrine."

"In us, the *soul* is not now a *person*, as having never had any separate or distinct subsistence, but the soul in union with the body makes a person; at death the *soul* becomes a *person*, as a separate or distinct rational agent; at the resurrection the soul will be no longer a person by itself, but only the soul and body reunited, to continue so forever."*

To proceed: "When Jesus asked the Pharisees, What think ye of Christ? Whose son is he? They say unto him, the son of David. He saith unto them, If David call him Lord, how is he his Son? And no man was able to answer him a word, neither durst any man from that day forth ask him any more questions." In fine, it appears from his whole history, that he never failed to *defeat* the adversaries to the truth. He was always ready to give an *answer*, or a *πολογιᾶ*, an apology. It signifies a courage, not only to tell the truth, but to tell the grounds we go upon. In this Christ is our example, and he was always victorious. And then, none could blame his carriage: *that* was the law repeated in life, and practice. Never had God's *authority* more deference, or his *holiness* a better revival. "The prince of this world could find nothing in him." Nay, he confessed, "Thou art the *Holy One* of God."

Lastly—As to the riches, honors and grandeur of this world, our dearest Lord chose a lot much different from that which is most admired. For "he made himself of no reputation, and he took upon him the form of a servant." He *emptied* himself of that which we endeavor to *fill* with. Indeed, *his person* was always great, being the son of God; *his errand* was no way mean, the recovery of a lost race; the life that he *came from* was that of eternal blessedness; the end of his undertaking, was to fetch up the sons of men *thither*. His *heavenly attendance* declared a majesty. Nothing looked contemptible about him, but the meanness of his appearance, and the miseries that he underwent. The angel proclaimed both his *dignity* and *lowness*, with the same breath, to the shepherds. "To you is born a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord. And this shall be a *sign* unto you." A very unlikely *sign* indeed. "Ye shall find the *babe* wrapped in swaddling clothes, [rags agreeably to the original] lying in a *manger*." His poverty through life and his death upon the cross, occasioned the unbelief and slight of the world. "He was a root out of a dry ground. He had no form or comeliness in him;

* Gib's Sacred Contemplations, p. 80.

and when we saw him, there was no beauty that we should desire him. He was despised of men, a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief. They hid their faces from him; he was despised and they esteemed him not."

But he dignified a state of poverty, and made it glorious. "Had the riches of this world been as necessary as our corrupted reason imagines, can we suppose the great God would have sent forth his son a beggar? If Christ's heart had been set upon them, he might easily have commanded the keys of nature's treasure. But he neglected the abundance and swill of riches. He dishonored that which we call reputation, by laying it aside." "He hid not his face from shame and spitting." "This consideration should give us a coolness in the pursuit of worldly riches. They were none of Christ's entertainments. They were always beneath him. He lived and died without them. Nay, they are not the servants of his glory in heaven. They are quite discarded things. 'He has received power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing.' But there is nothing sensual about him. There is no earth in his throne and grandeur that is both impure and dying. 'Silver and gold' are called 'corruptible things,' they must wear and tarnish. But whatever belongs to a Mediator's court is nothing akin to death; eternally removed from all decay and pollution.' 'Nothing enters thither that defileth.'"*

He vanquished Satan. This he promised in paradise. "The seed of the woman shall bruise the head of the serpent." That is, in the style of the gospel, "The prince of this world shall be judged." Accordingly, when he was baptized, "Then he was led up of the Spirit into the wilderness, to be tempted of the devil." And there he defeated him, by "the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God," as is recorded by the Evangelist, Matth. v. 1—11. He also repeatedly overcame him afterwards, by casting him out of the persons he possessed. The devils were struck with terror at his appearance, "Saying, let us alone; what have we to do with thee, thou Jesus of Nazareth? art thou come to destroy us? I know thee who thou art, the Holy one of God." But the complete victory was accomplished on the cross. Whilst he was hurried to his trial, and insulted there, he tells the priests, "this is your hour and power of darkness;" and one would think that their victory continued to the last of his pains upon the cross, when they derided him in these words, "He saved others, himself he cannot save." But it was quite otherwise. He was then a conqueror; "having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a show of them openly, triumphing over them on his cross." The majesty of his torments was admired in heaven, and felt in hell; for "through death he subdued him that had the power of death, that is the devil." Of that hour he says, "Now is the prince of this world cast out." In that day he began to save his people; as he "bare their iniquities," so he crushed their enemy. His death was a *satisfaction* and a *victory*. "He delivered them who through fear of death were all their life time subject to bandage."

He unstinged death in dying and triumphed over the grave in his resurrection. "Death was swallowed up in victory." He rose as the representative of his people. "Christ is risen as the first fruits of them that sleep, every man in his own order, Christ the first fruits, and they that are Christ's at his coming." As there is a twofold death, so there is a twofold resurrection. There is a resurrection, (i. e. regeneration,) that precedes the first death, which secures against the second death, that fol-

* Bradbury.

lows the second resurrection. "Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection; on such the second death hath no power."

Here it is proper to observe, how the other persons *concurred* with the Son, in his obtaining all this victory. Saith the Father, "With him my hand shall be established, mine arm shall also strengthen him." And saith the Son himself, "The Lord God will help me; therefore I shall not be confounded." Again, "Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, [i. e. my body in the grave,] nor suffer thine Holy One to see corruption." Accordingly, "God raised him from the dead and gave him glory." Lastly: He "through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God." Nay, his body was preserved from corruption, and "quicken'd by the Spirit."

8. The ascension of Christ into heaven, in the *nature* and *name* of his people, is another *evidence* of his love. Thus he said to Mary, "I ascend unto my Father and your Father, and to my God and your God." To deny the truth of his resurrection and ascension, is to reject the most *certain history*, and blaspheme against the *greatest goodness*. To the disciples "he showed himself alive after his passion, by many infallible proofs, being seen of them forty days, and speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God." And he said unto them, "Ye shall receive power after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you; and ye shall be *witnesses* unto me, both in Jerusalem and in all Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth. And when he had spoken these things, while they beheld, he was taken up; and a cloud received him out of their sight." This completed his acceptance, as it showed what he had done and suffered was equal to the design upon which he submitted to it. Thus he had a *title* to the reward. "After he had offered one sacrifice for sin, he forever sat down at the right hand of God." This also secured the salvation of his people. His making the atonement is the grand foundation of the covenant, and this appeared when he was received up into glory. "As concerning that he raised him from the dead, no more to see corruption, he saith in this wise, I will give you the sure mercies of David." Thus the covenant comes to be ratified with believers. "By his own blood he entered *once* [for all] into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us." And of this he gave plentiful evidence, by sending down the Holy Ghost; which showed his great interest above, and his constant care about the church which he left behind him. "He being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received the promise of the Father, hath shed forth *that* which ye see and hear." They saw the cloven tongues of fire, and heard the disciples speak all languages. The apostle would not have them to consider it barely as a wonder or sign from heaven, but as the consequence of an agreement there. Christ went thither with a demand: he used to tell them, "Till I go away the comforter cannot come, but if I go, I will send him to you." As if the apostle had said, "We cannot tell what became of him after the cloud received him out of sight, but he hath taken a sure way to show us that his entrance above was not in vain; he hath sent down the promise of the Father he used to talk of, and it is from that *grant* that he supplies this dispensation." They might think that his going away would leave them desolate. But they rather received a divine presence than lost one; for when he sent down the Holy Ghost, it was "that God the Lord might dwell among them." Lastly: The ascension of Christ was an evidence of love to his people, because he went into heaven as a *forerunner*, and to make all things ready for their reception. "If [seeing] I go, and prepare a place for you, I will come again and receive you to myself; that where I am ye may be also." "It is heaven to be where Christ is. His presence below makes heaven on earth; his

presence above makes heaven in perfection,"—as a great divine observed.* He will fulfil his promise. "The Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the arch-angel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise *before*. Then we, which are alive and remain, shall be caught up together with *them* in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air; and so we shall be ever with the Lord." Here again observe the *concurrence* of the Father in the ascension of Christ. It was, "the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, who raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenlies." And as after his resurrection, "through the Holy Ghost, he gave commandment unto the apostles," so it was from that fullness with which he ascended, that the Spirit was sent down to supply the want of his personal presence.

9. The intercession of Christ in heaven is another *evidence* of love to his people. The love that he expressed by his blood on the cross, went up to the kingdom with him. Isaiah describes the manner of his procedure. "He bare the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors."

The privilege of having an advocate is what the Christian cannot do without. You may as well rob him of his *heaven* as of his *Jesus*. He has nothing but what he receives from a throne of grace; no way of going there but by prayer; no access but by a mediator. Nay, "he cannot order his speech by reason of darkness." But "we have an advocate with the Father." He possesseth his existence in a perpetual activity. "He ever liveth to make intercession." And "as the memorial of his death are within view, he cannot fail in any petition. Every wound is an argument that carries success along with it. He is no common pleader. His interest is well grounded. His Father denies him nothing. His throne is a place of requests. There is a mixture of petition and authority in his language. It is petition as it is directed to a superior; and authority, as he claims no more than his due." "Father, I will that they whom thou hast given be with me." And what a great number is contained in this happy roll! "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word." Therefore, let us trust our cause with him, and make room for "hope and peace in believing."

Thus, we have contemplated these acts of Christ's love to his people, displayed in what he *did* and yet *doth* for them. We should now proceed, secondly, to contemplate *other acts* of his love manifested in what *he gives to them*. And this is no less than all the blessings of salvation, as he himself saith, "He that overcometh shall inherit all things." As he purchased them at the expense of his blood and agony upon the cross, and pleads them within the vail, so he has the honor of dispensing them from his throne. "Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel and forgiveness of sins."

Here again we might wander at large in *another field of love*. We might contemplate Christ quickening his people when they "are dead in trespasses and sin." He give them spiritual light. And, "there is none teacheth like him." He is exalted to give forgiveness. "He washeth his people from their sins in his own blood." He giveth strength for all the duties and trials of life. He is the consolation of Israel. They are "the preserved in Christ Jesus, and called." They "are more than conquerors through him that loved them." And, lastly, he saith, "I will give unto them eternal life."

* Prof. William Moncrief, Alos, Scotland.

These observations we shall not illustrate any farther at present, because, first, we have limited this contemplation *principally* to those acts of Christ's love which are *personal*, and in which the Father and the Spirit only *concur*, as has been proved. Whereas, secondly, these blessings which we have mentioned are represented in scripture as conferred by *each* person in the Godhead. Sometimes by one, sometimes by another, which proves that each person is God.* And, lastly, we shall have occasion to illustrate the preceding evidences of Christ's love, when we come to contemplate the love of the Spirit displayed in applying our salvation. We shall therefore conclude this branch of the subject, by subjoining three evidences of Christ's love, which are *peculiar to himself*, but not to the *exclusion* of the other persons.

1. He will judge the world. "The Father judgeth no man, [i. e. personally,] but hath committed all judgment to the Son," Nay, "he hath appointed a day in which he will judge the world by *that man*," viz. Christ Jesus. Here it is necessary to observe, in opposition to the *Socinians* and *Unitarians*, that the order and process of that day supposes those capacities that a *creature* cannot have. There must be *omniscience* to "search the hearts and try the reins of the children of men:" an infinite *purity*, there is "none holy as the Lord, there is none beside him, he is a God of judgment, and by him actions are weighed." Infinite *power* to execute the sentence. "The wicked shall go into everlasting punishment; the righteous into life eternal." There must also be an *eternity* in the person who tries the world, for when "the judgment is set, and the books opened, the Ancient of days will be seen, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom." These perfections are inseparable from him who judges the world in righteousness, and therefore "God is Judge himself: the heavens will declare his righteousness, and all men shall see his glory." And yet all this our Saviour has declared to be his own. "HE will *then* be glorified in his saints, and admired in them that believe." So that this shall be a time of love, and a day of complete salvation to Christ's redeemed people.

2. Though Christ said to the disciples, "It is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom: and the Psalmist saith, "the good Spirit shall lead us to the land of uprightness," yet the Son himself will give the kind invitation." Then shall the *King* say unto them on his right hand, "Come ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world."

3. In heaven, the Son *alone* will be visible, and display his love to his people, by *personally* conferring upon them all the pleasures of paradise. "The Lamb which is in the midst of the throne, shall feed them, and shall lead them unto living fountains of waters." But this is not to the *exclusion* of the other persons, for "God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes." And as expressive of the consolations of the Holy Ghost—"There is a pure river of water of life, clear as crystal, proceeding out of the throne of God, and of the Lamb." Then these delightful words of the Psalmist will receive a complete accomplishment—"They shall be abundantly satisfied with the fatness of thy house; and thou shalt make them drink of the river of thy pleasures. For with thee is the fountain of life; in thy light shall we see light." We might now mention some of the distinguished properties, and excellencies of Christ's love. But as it is proposed to make these the subject of the next Contemplation, we conclude by observing in general—How *extensive* and *delightful* a subject is the love of Christ! Saith one, "The proofs of Christ's

* The reader will find this *proposition* illustrated and confirmed in the Religious Monitor, Sept. No. 1830, pp. 201, 202. Also more fully, Sept. No. 1831, pp. 201—212.

love reach back to the first Adam, and forward to the last of his sons. It extends to all the redeemed from among men in every period of the world: nor is it confined to time, but reaches to eternity itself. He showed it in one eternity, proved it particularly in time, and it will be displayed and admired forever. We cannot in any respect comprehend this love. It is without beginning and without end. Some evidences of it we can contemplate and enjoy. But when we begin to trace it to eternity past, or forward to eternity to come, and proceed on in our views, as far as we can, it is like a great and pleasant river, which hides its head in unknown regions!"

(To be Continued.)

ART. III. *Extract from a work soon to be published, which is to be entitled "Helps to Christian Devotion, consisting of Dissertations on the Psalms."*

PSALM II. *Translation.*

1. Why do the heathen rage, and the people meditate vain things?
2. The kings of the earth seat themselves in council, and the rulers deliberate together,—against Jehovah,—and against his anointed?
3. "Let us break asunder their bands, and cast away from us their cords."
4. He that sits in the Heavens shall laugh; and the Lord shall have them in derision.
5. Then shall he speak to them in anger; and in his wrath he shall terrify them.
6. But I have anointed my king upon Zion, the hill of my holiness.
7. I will declare the decree. Jehovah hath said to me; thou art my son; I, this day, have begotten thee.
8. Ask of me, and I will give thee the heathen for thine inheritance; and the ends of the earth for thy possession.
9. Thou shalt rule them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them to pieces as the vessel of the potter.
10. And now, ye kings, be wise; be instructed, ye judges of the earth.
11. Serve this Jehovah in fear; and rejoice in trembling.
12. Kiss the son, lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little. Blessed are all who wait for him.

DISSERTATION.—The apostles, Peter and John, having healed a man who was lame from his birth; and the miracle having come to the knowledge of the Jewish rulers; while the apostles were speaking to the people, the priests, the captain of the temple, and the Sadducees came upon them. They were grieved that they taught the people, and preached, through Jesus, the resurrection from the dead. But, not daring to bring any accusation against them, for fear of the people, they called them and commanded them not to speak at all, nor teach, in the name of Jesus. But when they had permitted them to depart they came to the place where their own company had assembled, and they informed them how they had been treated by the chief priests and elders. It is said, "when they heard that, they lifted their voice to God with one accord, and said, Lord, thou art God, who hast made heaven and earth, and the sea, and all that in them is; who by the mouth of thy servant David hast said: Why did the heathen rage, and the people imagine vain things; the kings of the earth stood up, and the rulers were gathered together—against the Lord, and against his Christ." By a proper degree of attention to this interesting fact, we may have some knowledge of the meaning of this exclamation: Why do the heathen rage? &c.

The word which is rendered heathen, represents that part of mankind, who are either ignorant of the gospel, or continue in opposition to it, after they have heard it preached. In a large and comprehensive sense, it means the inhabitants of those countries, which have never been enlightened by the gospel; and in a more particular and limited sense, it means those who show by their lives and conversation, that they have not received the principles of Christianity into their hearts; and that they do not yield obedience to God, according to his gospel. So the Psalmist, in the lix. Psalm, prays for deliverance from his persecutors, and calls them heathen; although he evidently means Saul and his agents, who were endeavoring to destroy him. It is mentioned in the title, that this Psalm was composed at that time, when they watched the house to kill him. He declares "they lie in wait for my soul. They run and prepare themselves without my fault. Thou, therefore, O Lord God of Hosts, the God of Israel, awake to visit all the heathen: be not merciful to any wicked transgressors. But thou, O Lord, shalt laugh at them; thou shalt have all the heathen in derision." We are, therefore, to understand by the word heathen, or Gentiles, or nations, as it is here used by the Psalmist, all those who, in heathen or Christian lands, are ignorant or regardless of the gospel; or who still continue in opposition to the principles, or the practice of true Christianity. When we see the various efforts, which are made in the present time, to prevent the operation and advancement of the pure principles of the gospel, and the pure worship which God has ap-

pointed, from being practised by those to whom God has sent it: when false worship is introduced, and a false gospel preached, instead of the true gospel of Christ; and when we compare the facts before us, with the facts which are stated in the Acts of the Apostles; we may see clearly what we are to understand by this exclamation of the Psalmist. The heathen still rage, and the people still meditate vain things; whenever the leading truths of the gospel are presented to their minds, in such a way as to command their attention.

As in this particular example we are to understand by the heathen, or nations and people, with the kings and rulers of the earth, Herod and Pontius Pilate, the gentiles and the people of Israel; so in all other cases where opposition is made to the true gospel, we shall find that the opposition is made by the very same sort of characters; although they have the name of Christians. Herod was the king of the Jews, and professed to be a worshipper of the true God; the Jews made the same profession, and attended to his worship with the most scrupulous formality: even Pontius Pilate professed to have a great regard for truth and righteousness. All that diligently observe the course of life, which is pursued by men who are called Christians, and men called infidels, will find that there is a striking similarity, between their conduct, and that of the Jews and Romans, in the days of the apostles. They rage, and they imagine vain things; for while they sat themselves in council, and deliberate against Jehovah, and against his Messiah, they are gathered together, to do whatsoever his hand and council determined before to be done. They are fulfilling the designs of God, while it is their great object to oppose them, and prevent them from being fulfilled.

The Psalmist here presents to us the language of the hearts of such characters. They say in their hearts, let us break asunder their bands, &c. All that receive the Lord Jesus Christ in truth, must receive him not only as their prophet and priest; but they must receive him as their king. They must put themselves under his government, that he may rule in them as well as over them. The bands and yokes of the Redeemer, are the bands and yokes of the Father. He draws his people to his Son; and he puts his yoke upon them. It is true that his commandments are not grievous. His yoke is easy, and his burden light. But it is grievous and heavy to the man whose affections are set on the present life. He commands us not to love the world, nor the things that are in the world, not to be solicitous concerning what we shall eat, what we shall drink, and wherewithal we shall be clothed; but to seek first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and to rely on his promise, that all temporal things, which are suitable and necessary, shall be given to us in the proper time. But the worldly minded man cannot bear this constraint. The great object of his solicitude is the things of this world; and so great is his eagerness to obtain them, that to be commanded to set his affections on other objects, not only gives him pain; but excites a kind of rebellious disposition in his heart. Then he takes some means to free himself from these bonds and yokes, which are attempted to be put upon him, contrary to his inclinations. Hence men that have the same feelings and dispositions on this subject, will unite in the same work, and use the same language of encouragement the one to the other. Various and numerous are the means and efforts and contrivances, which men have adopted for this purpose; and they are chiefly directed against him, whom the Father has commanded angels and men to worship. Herod and Pontius Pilate, the Jews and the Gentiles, at the time when Christ rose from the dead, assumed his authority, and was about to send his gospel over the world, exerted themselves with all their power, aided and directed by the power of Satan, to break asunder the bands, and cast away the yokes of the Redeemer. But they succeeded no better than the builders of Babel in ancient times. They thought to exalt their own power above the power of the Almighty. They attempted to build a city and a tower, whose top might reach to heaven, that they might have a centre of union, where they should gather together against the Lord, and against his anointed. In that period they were less guilty than they are at this time, because the true character of the Lord Jesus Christ was not clearly revealed. But such is the enmity of the human heart, against Jehovah and against his Messiah, that carnal men always become the more hostile, as the truth is more clearly revealed. In the days of Herod and Pontius Pilate, the power of the Messiah appeared to be so small, that the feelings of enmity in the hearts of many, were mingled with contempt; and for years and ages after those days, the gospel was suffered to grow, because men did not generally see, that the reigning religion would be endangered by its influence: but as soon as this truth began to appear, then the sword of persecution was unsheathed, and the venom of the dragon appeared, in all the efforts of the heathen to destroy the Christian name. But so soon as Christianity obtained power, and the name of Christian became a title of respect and honor, then anti-christ arose, under the outward resemblance of Christianity; the dragon gave his power unto the beast; Satan put on the robes of an angel of light; the man of sin seated himself in the temple of God, and set his throne close by the throne of the Most High. This is the spiritual condition of the world at the present time. Hypocrisy prevails under the outward appearance of Christianity, and the great mass of the Christian world, have a name that they live while they are dead. Thus men still say in their hearts, concerning the Redeemer, we will not have this man to reign over us: and they say, one to another, let us break his bands asunder; and cast away from us his yokes.

This kind of feeling and disposition is in all mankind by nature; for the carnal mind is enmity against God; and this carnal mind is never utterly destroyed in us, so long as we remain in this world. But it is by submitting to Christ, believing in Christ, and trusting in Christ continually, that we receive power to conquer our own evil dispositions, and to gain the victory over the world, the flesh and the devil. The power of evil is so strong, both in our hearts, and in the world around us, that nothing less than the constant operation of the power of Christ, can deliver us from the dominion of sin, even after we are made willing in the day of his power. "The flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh, and these are contrary the one to the other, so that we cannot do the things which we would." When we delight in the law of God after the inward man, we still find a law in our members, warring

against the law of our minds. This evil principle will operate to prevent us from submitting entirely to the law of Christ. It operates in the Christian by means of darkness and deception, and he can find it only by the application of the light of truth. Hence he frequently exclaims with the Psalmist, "who can understand his errors?" All Christians, therefore, have reason to examine themselves constantly and carefully, lest they should act like the rest of mankind, in breaking and casting away the bands and yokes of the Redeemer.

Still it must appear evident to every one, on mature deliberation, that all the efforts of man against his Maker, are like the efforts of a venomous reptile, to injure those who have power to destroy it, or to inflict upon it, whatever pain they may think proper. We are here told, that there is some such feeling in the mind of the Almighty, when he beholds the evil dispositions, and the malignant efforts of sinful men, against the authority and government of his only begotten Son. He that sits in the heavens shall laugh, &c. When we speak of the laughter and derision, or of the anger and rage of the Almighty; we should keep in mind his high and holy nature and character. There can be nothing in his laughter that is degrading, and nothing in his anger, which would give us any reason to think, that his mind could be ruffled by the same passions which agitate the human bosom. When Herod and Pilate, with the Jewish and Gentile populace, exerted themselves to destroy the Redeemer; and made him suffer death on the cross; or when the rulers of mankind at the present time, and those whom they have under their authority, exert themselves in various ways, against the Redeemer and his cause; he beholds their works, and is able at any time by an exertion of his power, to confound their counsels, and cover them with confusion. Therefore the laughter, which is here ascribed to Jehovah, is the perfect tranquility of his mind, when he considers that all the efforts of his enemies, are as harmless as the efforts of a worm against the foot that treads upon it.

But as men have in them the malignity and the poison of the serpent, and by this evil disposition, their actions are directed and regulated; so God looks with displeasure on their evil works: and as these evil works are directed against his authority and government; so he determines in his justice, to punish them for their iniquities, and to put them under his feet. As God is known by the judgments which he executes; so we may have some knowledge of his feelings of anger against transgressors, by the sufferings which follow many transgressions. The wrath of God is the steady determination, which he keeps in his heart, to punish every sin to the uttermost. It is no pleasure to him to bring misery upon any one, for he does not willingly afflict, nor grieve the children of men; but he has determined to execute judgment righteously; and the sin of rebellion against the government of his only begotten Son, is the most presumptuously wicked of all the wicked actions of men. Those, therefore, who are guilty of this sin, shall be reprov'd in his anger, and terrified in his indignation.

The dreadful vengeance which he inflicted on the Jews, after they had condemned and crucified the Redeemer, may give us some knowledge of the terrible nature of his wrath. The object which the Jews had in view, in the perpetration of this wicked work, was to free themselves from his yoke. But instead of gaining their object, they were cast down into the chains of darkness and despair. They suffered horrible punishments in this world, and too many of them in death, gave mournful evidence that their names were not written with the righteous. As it is one of the chief subjects proposed to us by the Redeemer, for our rejoicing, that our names are written in heaven; so it is, and ought to be, the cause of most horrible pain and terror to men, when they have reason to fear, that they shall die in their sins, and be the objects of God's displeasure for ever.

It appears, from the history of creation and providence, as it is presented to us in the word of God, that the principal object, which God the Father had in view in all his works, in this world, and in all his works among the angels, was to honor his only begotten Son. Hence, the Apostle declares, concerning the salvation of those whom he had chosen to everlasting life, "whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the first born among many brethren." Man was created in the image of God, but having lost that image by his fall and apostacy; so all those who shall be saved, are predestinated to be conformed to the image of the Son of God. As the children were partakers of flesh and blood, he also took part of the same. He took flesh and blood, and thus united the human with the divine nature. Being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself and became obedient to death, even the death of the cross; and, therefore, God the Father has exalted him, and given him a name, which is above every name. We see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor. This is therefore the great cause, why God honors and blesses a part of the human family. His great object is to render most blessed and glorious, him who was with him through eternity, as one who was brought up by him, and whose delights were with the sons of men.

The Father is here represented, as making this proclamation to heaven and earth, to angels and men, that he had honored his only begotten Son, by committing into his hand the government of earth and heaven, until that period, when all things should be subdued unto him, and his enemies should be made his footstool. The commencement of this kingdom was publicly made on Mount Zion, where the temple was built. From this place the gospel began to be proclaimed, the knowledge of Christ to be extended, and his kingdom to be established. The Father, therefore, proclaims: I have anointed my king upon Zion, &c. As David and Solomon, and the kings of Israel, were anointed on Mount Zion; so Jesus Christ, the spiritual or true David, was anointed king over the universe, but especially over the Israel of God. As Zion was consecrated to God for a holy place, among the hills or eminences, which were in, and round about Jerusalem; and was the particular place where his holy people assembled to worship him; so the assemblages of Christian worshippers are his house, his temple and his holy place. There is now no place upon the earth more holy than another. Therefore the Redeemer said to the woman of Samaria, the hour cometh when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the Father. But the hour cometh, and is, when the true

worshippers, shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth: for the Father seeketh such to worship him. Jesus Christ is anointed the sovereign or king, over all the assemblages of Christian worshippers, and is the head of his church, which is his body, the fullness of him who filleth all in all.

The Psalmist in the next place represents this King of Zion, who is King of kings, and Lord of lords, as making his proclamation to the kings of the earth and to mankind. It might be proper for us in this place, to look back for a moment, over the arrangements of this sublime, and wonderful piece of divine composition. In the first place, the nations and people of the earth, appear to be assembled together in rage and tumult. Then ten thousand vain imaginations enter into their minds, like those who framed the project of the building of Babel. The kings and rulers and judges sit together in deliberation; and the chief subject appears to be, how they shall be able to free themselves and the world from the government of him, whom God the Father has exalted in human nature, to be the Prince and the Saviour.

Again, the great God of heaven, the Father and Lord of the universe, is represented as looking down upon mankind, and viewing their evil imaginations and works of wickedness, with contempt and indignation. Then he confounds their language, and throws them all into confusion; and while they look forward fearfully to the judgment, and fiery indignation, by which they are threatened, and by which their hearts are filled with terror, they call to the rocks to fall upon them, and to the hills to cover them, from the vengeance of the Most High: For he speaks to them in anger and terrifies them in his wrath.

But there is hope for the human family, by the reception of the gospel, and the acknowledgment of willing subjection, to the King of kings. Therefore, that confusion might cease, and all things be settled in proper order, the Father proclaims to the universe, that he had anointed his King, and placed him on Zion, his holy hill. Then this King comes forward, and reveals to mankind the substance of his Father's annunciation. He proclaims the eternal decree of God, or the covenant into which he had entered with his Father, before time began, and in which all nations were promised to him for his inheritance; and he concludes with an address, in his Father's name, to the kings and judges of the earth, and to all mankind, to submit to his authority, receive his instruction, and enjoy his protection, and the blessings of his kingdom.

The persons of the Godhead are eternal. There are three distinct subsistences in the one Jehovah, and each of these subsistences is Jehovah. They are not called Father, Son and Holy Spirit, from the relation which they bear to mankind in the gospel; but from the relation in which they stand to each other. If the universe had never been brought into existence, Jehovah, the Father, Son and Spirit, would have been as he is, the same Jehovah. We may also observe, that the Godhead in each of the persons is invisible. No man hath seen God at any time. It is true that God can render himself visible to man, by putting on any appearance he pleases, and he appeared to Moses as a flame of fire in a bush. But the Son of God has taken human nature as his permanent residence or dwelling place. He dwells in human flesh. His human body and his human soul, are thus united with the Godhead. His human nature is not only the dwelling place for his divine nature; but the Father dwells in him, and he manifests the Godhead to his people. We come to him that we may come to the Father; because the Father is in him, and he in the Father; and it is he who makes known the Father to us.

When the Father makes this declaration to him, "thou art my Son, this day I have begotten thee;" he simply declares a fact which exists at this moment, which has existed from eternity, and will exist forever. No new relation is here established among the persons of the Godhead. Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, to-day and forever; and there can be no change in the other persons of the Godhead. There is only this difference with respect to the human nature of Christ, which was declared to Mary by the angel; "that holy thing which shall be born of thee, shall be called the Son of God."

We may here know something of the force of the epithet, wonderful, which is so often applied to the Son of God in the scripture. Thus, when Manoah enquired of the angel, who appeared to him and told him, that he should have a son, he asked: what is thy name, that when thy saying cometh to pass, we may do thee honor: he said, why dost thou ask after my name, seeing it is secret; or as it ought to have been rendered; seeing it is wonderful. Thus also said Isaiah; unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given, and his name shall be called wonderful. And thus says the Apostle, great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh!

Hence as this personage, who on account of his eminence is called wonderful, is the mighty God,—God manifested in the flesh, so it is plain, that he has the very nature of Jehovah. In this nature there can be no degrees. It is one and the same in each of the three persons. Jehovah is the self-existent God; he who is, and was, and is to come, the Almighty. But there is the distinction of authority. The Father has authority over the Son, and the Spirit, for he sends them both into the world, as he sends the angels. He gives his command, and they obey; and the Holy Spirit obeys both the Father and the Son. But the great difference which exists between God and all other beings, is that of the Creator and the creatures. The Creator is eternal, and possesses all the divine attributes; while the creature was brought into existence by his power, and is limited in all his faculties. But the Son of God is the Creator of all worlds, and the heir of all things. He is not only the Creator of all things, but they are his property; for the Father has given them into his hands, and constituted him the Governor of all worlds; and especially the Governor of all the nations of the earth. All things were made by him and for him, and he is before all things, and by him all things consist. He is head over all things, or governs all things for the good of the church. It is plain that this Sonship and procession from the Father, is not and cannot be the same in every thing, with the Sonship and procession, which exists among mankind. God is infinitely above us. It is impossible for

us to understand how the Son can be always begotten, and always proceeding from the Father; and how all this can come to pass by an eternal decree. The word which is rendered decree, signifies something which is marked out, or portrayed or delineated, in a conspicuous manner. The Son is the brightness of the Father's glory, and the express image or character, or engraving, of his person. The Father, therefore, decreed from eternity, that the Son should always proceed from him, and be his representative; and the Sonship of Christ, in his divine nature was eternal as the decree was eternal. As the sun and the stars began to shine, or the rays of light were emitted from them, when they began to exist; so Christ was the brightness of his Father's glory from eternity. This is, therefore, the declaration, or rather the revelation of a fact, which is true at the present moment, which has existed forever, and will forever be the same. The Father has said to the Redeemer from eternity, thou art my son, this day I have begotten thee, and he now says to the world; this is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased, hear ye him. He is always begotten, because he is always in the bosom of the Father, and always proceeds from him.

Jesus Christ is therefore very properly called Wonderful, as to his divine nature; and he is no less wonderful, as to his human nature, in union with the divine. It is very true, that in the fullest and most exalted sense of the terms, his human nature never can be called the Son of God, because the human is essentially below the divine nature, and can never rise so high in the scale of excellence as to be altogether equal to it: yet the Holy Ghost declared, that the holy thing which was to be born of the virgin, should be called the Son of God. Adam was called the son of God, because he was created in the image of God; but the human nature of Jesus Christ, is the Son of God in a much higher sense; because the eternal and only begotten Son of God, has chosen to make this human nature his eternal residence. Therefore as the body of Christ will be glorious beyond all our comprehension; so his soul will transcend in its faculties, of feeling and understanding, all the souls of the children of Adam. "He is fairer than the sons of men; grace is poured into his lips; and God has blessed him forever." In this sense he is the chief among ten thousand; yea, he is altogether lovely. The Apostle also declares, in the Epistle to the Romans, that Jesus Christ was made of the seed of David, according to the flesh, and declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead. Since, therefore, Jesus Christ, as to his human nature, is declared to be the Son of God with power; and as this human nature is, by the excellence of its faculties, the beauty of its form, and by every other created excellence, constantly partaking of the communicable attributes of God; so in this sense also, God the Father says to him, thou art my Son; this day I have begotten thee.

In this sense every Christian may sing this sentiment in application to himself. "The children of God are born, not of blood, not of the will of the flesh, not of the will of man, but of God." They are born of water, and of the Spirit; or by the outward means, and by the inward operation of the divine power in their hearts. They are born, not of corruptible, but of incorruptible seed, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever. But regeneration is the commencement of the work of holiness. When God begins this good work in the heart, then every virtue and every grace, is communicated in the proper time. "His divine power bestows on his people, all things that pertain unto life and godliness, through the knowledge of him, who has called them to glory and virtue." By faith in the exceeding great and precious promises of the gospel, they become partakers of the divine nature, having escaped the corruption that is in the world through lust. Therefore in this sense God says to all his people, as well as to his only begotten Son, ye are my sons, this day I have begotten you. He has begotten them to a lively hope, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead; to an inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven, for those who are kept by the power of God, through faith unto salvation. This is the way in which we ought to apply such sentiments, to the Captain of our salvation, and to ourselves, as far as they are applicable.

This Psalm was written by David, and is therefore in a certain sense, applicable to David. God said to him, as he said to every one that is regenerated: "thou art my son, this day I have begotten thee." But David was, in his person, in many of his works, and in his kingdom, a remarkable type, or figure, or symbol of the Son of God. No figure taken from man, can fully represent the whole person of Christ, for as his divine nature cannot be represented to the eye of man, so it cannot by any symbol be fully represented to the human mind. But as David was raised from an humble condition in the world, and was anointed by the command of God, to be the king of a great and powerful nation; and the temple and the city of David stood on Mount Zion; so God said to David, in a certain sense, I have anointed thee my king, upon Zion, the hill of my holiness. Ask of me, &c. The kingdom of Israel was, after years of trial and dangers and painful exertions, finally given into his hand; and he reigned over the whole nation. He acquired authority during his life, over many of the heathen nations around the kingdom of Israel, and the reign of Solomon, his son, extended from the river Euphrates to the Mediterranean Sea. So the promise was in a certain sense fulfilled in Solomon; "he shall have dominion from sea to sea, and from the river to the ends of the earth."

But in the person and works of the Redeemer, in the propagation of his gospel, and in the establishment of his kingdom, we may see and realise the truth of all these typical representations. As it is declared by the Apostle John, the law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ; so we may say, the promise was fulfilled outwardly to David, but inwardly and spiritually it was fulfilled, and is still in the course of being fulfilled, to the Redeemer. It is necessary for us to keep the truth always in our minds, that all things belong to the Father. He has authority over all, and he has authority over his only begotten Son. In this sense, as well as with respect to his human nature, the Redeemer declares the Father is greater than I. Jesus Christ is Jehovah, and has the same nature with his Father; but he was always under the Father's authority. He obeys his commands, and he receives blessings from his hand. He asks, and receives; he seeks and finds; he knocks and it is opened to him. But when we take into

view the human nature of Christ, the kindness and condescension of the Father appears more clearly to our minds. When he recognizes the Redeemer as his son, both in the divine and human nature, and knowing that his delights were always with the sons of men, he anticipates his wishes, and promises to give him on his asking, all nations for his inheritance, the ends of the earth for his possession.

As the Father intends to support his authority over all, so he shows this determination in the very honors which he bestows upon his son. It is necessary, even for the Son of God, to ask and to receive from his Father, whatever blessings or honors he wishes and hopes to enjoy. This asking is not merely a particular request, but a continued prayer. God says to all his children, as Christ said to his disciples, ask and ye shall receive, seek and ye shall find, knock and it shall be opened. It is only he that asks, who has any right to hope for any blessing from the hand of God. Prayer is an exercise of so much importance, in the eyes of the Father, that his only begotten Son is still in the habit of prayer. There is something always which he desires and asks from his Father. He stands at the right hand of God, and makes intercession for all that come to God through him. But one of the chief and most important requests, which the Redeemer makes to his Father, is that all the nations of the earth should be brought into subjection to him; that all Kings should fall down before him; and all nations should serve him; that he should not only be virtually, but by universal acknowledgment, the King of kings, and Lord of lords.

He has had his request always in some degree granted to him. A part of the human family has been given into his hand, from generation to generation. The Lord's portion is his people: Jacob is the lot of his inheritance. He found him in a desert land, and in the waste howling wilderness: he led him about, he in-trusted him, he kept him as the apple of his eye. This is in fact the condition in a spiritual point of view, in which the Redeemer finds all his people, who are given into his hand to be redeemed. In the ancient ages, they were only to be found in one nation; and the rest of the world were suffered to walk in their own ways, and to choose their own delusions. But he led his own people like a flock of sheep, by the hand of Moses and Aaron, and other leaders whom he provided for them. It was the Lord Jesus Christ, the Saviour, who led them, and there was no strange God with him. It is necessary that the Redeemer should lead his people through trouble, and that he should humble them and try them: but when they are sufficiently humbled, so as to be able to bear prosperity with a righteous and humble disposition, then he raises them to honor and comforts, and gives them reason to praise him. He has promised, that they shall delight themselves in the Lord, and he will cause them to ride upon the high places of the earth, and feed them with the heritage of Jacob their father. He causes their light to rise from obscurity, and their darkness to be as the noon day. He guides them continually, and satisfies their soul in drought, and makes them like a watered garden, and like a spring of water, whose waters fail not. This is the way in which the Captain of our Salvation leads all who are given into his hand by the Father. He whose delights are with the sons of men, finds increasing delight in filling the hearts of his people with spiritual food and gladness, as soon as they are prepared and fitted to receive it. This is his portion and his inheritance among mankind, and he thus prepares a people among whom he shall dwell forever.

But the Father has promised, that the people whom the Redeemer forms for himself, and who shall shew forth his praise, shall not only be collected from other nations, besides the Jews; but in the latter ages, all nations shall serve him, and his churches shall be purified, so that his worshippers shall generally be righteous characters. Professing Christians, who live in any sinful practices, shall be cast out of the church, and finally destroyed from the earth. Therefore says the prophet: "awake, awake, put on thy strength, O Zion; put on thy beautiful garments, O Jerusalem, the holy city: for henceforth there shall no more come into thee the uncircumcised and the unclean." The true gospel shall have free course and be glorified, and all those who will not submit to the Redeemer, shall finally be cut off. For God says, "the nation and kingdom which will not serve thee shall perish; yea, those nations shall be utterly wasted." "Thy people also shall be all righteous; they shall inherit the land forever; the branch of my planting, the work of my hands, that I may be glorified."

The Apostle declares, that the rulers of the church watch for the souls of those under their care, as they that must give account. If therefore they should have reason to believe, that the people under their care were generally righteous characters; they would then be able in their prayers, to give their account in with joy. It would indeed be equal cause of thanksgiving to God, by faithful rulers and overseers of any church or congregation, if they had reason to believe, in the judgment of charity, that those of whom they had the oversight were generally righteous. But this appears plainly to be the meaning of the Father's gracious promise to his son, to give him the earth for his inheritance. Every congregation of worshippers, shall generally be composed of righteous characters; and the inhabited world shall be divided into different congregations. It is said in the book of Deuteronomy; "when the Most High divided to the nations their inheritance; when he separated the sons of Adam, he set the bounds of the people according to the number of the children of Israel." The meaning of this declaration, which now seems obscure, will be fully developed in that time, when the Most High shall divide to the nations their spiritual inheritance in the gospel, and when the sons of Adam shall be separated merely into different congregations of worshippers. Then it shall come to pass, according to the words of the prophet, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the tops of the mountain, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it.

The Father has commanded his only begotten Son to ask him continually for this invaluable blessing; or to make it the subject of his prayers. He asks only for such things as he believes and knows to be agreeable to the will of his Father. But the Father has taught him to pray that the nations may all be given to him for his inheritance; and the Redeemer has taught us

to make our request for the same blessing. It is all comprehended in the petitions, thy kingdom come; and thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven. We know that it is the will of his Father, to give the kingdom into his hand. "The riches of the Gentiles shall be brought into it. And they shall bring the glory and honor of the nations into it. The daughter of Tyre shall be there with a gift, even the rich among the people, shall entreat his favor. Yea, he shall live, and to him shall be given of the gold of Sheba, prayer also shall be made for him continually, and daily shall he be praised."

This grant of the Father is accompanied with a command, which renders it proper and necessary for the Redeemer to bring the world into subjection, by a course of severe and terrible discipline. A rod of iron can never be supposed to be used by a father for the correction of his children, unless they have become exceedingly refractory,—and even rebellious. This is plainly an emblem of such severe and terrible measures, as a sovereign would use when his subjects had rebelled against him. But the nations of the earth have always showed this rebellious disposition. It has plainly appeared, in all ages and countries, where the government of Christ has been attempted to be established, that mankind would rather be under any other sovereign, than the Son of God. This is the reason why the heathen rage, and why the rulers of the earth sit in council. Their object is to break the yoke of the Redeemer. They do not desire to be under such a government. Indeed there is too much evidence of this lamentable truth, in every country and neighborhood, where the gospel is preached, and the ordinances administered according to the commandments of Christ. The spirit of Antichrist began to work in the minds of men, even in the days of the apostles; and it has continued to increase in power, notwithstanding all the efforts and exertions, which have been made to extend the influence of the gospel. It was the purpose of God, that mankind should be permitted to give full proof of the wickedness of that spirit, which dwells and operates in the human heart. But he declares, by the Apostle Paul, that when that wicked spirit shall be fully developed, and exhibited for the condemnation of the world that lies in wickedness, then the Lord shall consume him, with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy him with the brightness of his coming. Then a terrible series of judgments shall be executed over the face of the earth. These judgments are called the seven last plagues, or the vials of the wrath of God. In these scenes the Redeemer shall rule the nations with a rod of iron, and shall dash them in pieces, as the vessel of the potter.

But although all the chastisements, which shall be inflicted on the children of God, shall have the effect to teach them his laws, and render them more humble and obedient; yet we may learn from many places in scripture, that in these latter days, the judgments of God on his own people, will be more severe than any which they have experienced in former times. In these latter ages the prophecy is to be remarkably fulfilled; "awake, O sword, against my shepherd, and against the man that is my fellow, saith the Lord of hosts: smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered; and I will turn mine hand upon the little ones. And it shall come to pass, that in all the land, saith the Lord, two parts therein shall be cut off and die, but the third shall be left therein. And I will bring the third part through the fire, and will refine them as silver is refined, and will try them as gold is tried: they shall call on my name, and I will hear them; I will say it is my people; and they shall say, thy Lord is my God." From these declarations of the truth of God, we may learn that there shall be in these latter days, a long series of dreadful judgments, by which the wicked shall be cut off and destroyed in large numbers, and the righteous shall pass through a fiery trial, by which they shall not be destroyed, but their hearts shall be purified. Hence it is said, concerning "the great multitude, who stood before the throne and before the Lamb, clothed with white robes, and palms in their hands: These are they who came out of great tribulation; and have washed their robes, and made them white, in the blood of the Lamb."

But in the end of all these tribulations, when they shall have passed through these fiery trials, and have come forth like gold, they shall be raised to honor and power among mankind. So it is said concerning the witnesses, whom the Son of God had appointed to prophecy in sackcloth, and afterwards to suffer death, and that their dead bodies should be cast into the streets, for the gratification and triumph of their enemies; they afterwards rose from the dead, and ascended to heaven; and then great fear fell upon them who saw them. So also, it is promised by the Lord Jesus Christ, to the church of Thyatira and to all churches that are placed in similar circumstances, and that walk in the course which he has commanded; contending earnestly for the faith which was once delivered to the saints, "to him that overcometh and keepeth my works to the end, I will give him power over the nations; and he shall rule them with a rod of iron; as the vessels of the potter shall they be broken to shivers; even as I received of my Father." Individual Christians, who are placed in these circumstances, may be obliged to endure great tribulation, to lose all the comforts of this world, and even their lives for the sake of the truth: but those who are faithful unto the death, shall receive the crown of life, which the Lord hath promised to them that love him. When churches or Christian communities continue faithful, and suffer every kind of pain and indignity, which the enemy can inflict; when they never give up the truth, nor submit with their hearts, to the power of iniquity, they always overcome in the end, and rise into power. The honorable condition, to which the Christian church has arrived in the world, at this present time, shows conclusively the faithfulness of God to his promise. The power to which the protestant churches have arrived, who have contended earnestly and faithfully against the errors and corruptions of the Roman church; this and many examples of particular churches, who have suffered for a time in bearing testimony to the truth, but have afterwards gained the victory and risen to honor, might be adduced, to show that the Redeemer has been abundantly faithful to his promise in times past. But in these latter days, we may hope with confidence, to see the same promise fulfilled, in a striking and remarkable manner, to all the churches who have continued firm in the support of the truth. They shall have power over the nations; their enemies shall melt away

before them, and by the power of their King, who stills the noise of the seas, the noise of their waves, and the tumults of the populace, they shall be enabled to dissolve and disperse all the combinations of the enemies of the truth, and of the pure worship of God. Like the potter's vessel, they shall break them to shivers.

The foregoing part of this Psalm, is a short but powerful exhibition of truth, showing the sovereign authority of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the manner in which that authority shall be exercised and supported. The Psalmist therefore concludes with a no less powerful application of the subject, to the leaders and governors of mankind, and through them to the whole world, to induce them to bow in willing subjection, to him who is placed over them by the Father Almighty. By kings and judges that class of mankind is evidently meant, who hold the reins of government, and direct the affairs of nations, cities, villages, and communities, from the largest to the smallest. Even the father of a family, who has children and domestics under his government, is in this sense one of the kings and judges of the earth. All these characters stand in a state of responsibility to the great King and Judge of all. The Father has committed all judgment to the Son, and we must all, even in this world, stand at the judgment seat of Christ, to give an account of the things committed to our charge. Our judgment, or condemnation, will be the more terrible in proportion, to the importance of our official station. Every man, in every station of life, must pass under the inspection of this Sovereign Judge; and therefore it is highly important, that every one should exercise wisdom and receive instruction.

This King, whom they are required to serve, is no other than Jehovah, the Sovereign of the heavens and the earth, and the Creator of all things. "By him," says the apostle, "were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers, all things were created by him and for him, and he is before all things, and by him all things consist." This is Jesus Christ, the King, whom the Father has set upon Zion, and who claims the government of the universe. The Father has anointed him for this high office, that he might wage war with the powers of darkness, and bruise the head of the serpent. When Eve brought forth her first born son, she exclaimed I have gotten a man from the Lord, or rather, as it ought to be rendered, I have gotten a man, *THE JEHOVAH*. It is the same personage who is here brought into our view. Serve this Jehovah in fear; for he is your Maker, and the great and dreadful God. The fear of him is the beginning of wisdom. We should fear him as we fear the Father, and our religious joy should be mingled with fear. We are commanded to rejoice always in the Lord, but in our rejoicing we should keep in mind his dreadful judgments; and tremble in view of the vengeance, which he will execute on the workers of iniquity.

But this subject is addressed chiefly to those kings and rulers, who sit in council and deliberate together against Jehovah, and against his Messiah. These are all the kings of the earth, and the judges who bear rule over the tribes of the earth. These characters, if they continue to keep their minds fixed on the earth, and regard not the words of this King, shall mourn, when they see and understand his coming to bring terrible judgments upon the earth;—when the fire shall devour before him, and it shall be very tempestuous round about him. They are commanded to tremble in the midst of their profane and earthly joy, and instead of serving themselves and the idols of their own hearts, to serve this Jehovah who is the Son of God.

There is a token of subjection and of willing obedience to the Lord Jesus Christ, which in its outward form and correspondent feelings, is in some degree different from the kind of subjection and willing service, which we render to the Father. The kings and judges of the earth are exhorted, to kiss the son, lest he be angry, &c. The meaning of this expression can scarcely be understood, without recurring to the manners and customs of times and countries different from our own. In the ancient ages, all the heathen countries, as well as the Jews believed in saviours, who were in some respects different from the great God. Almost all the household gods, and the gods of particular countries, were of this description. They all believed that the God who made the heavens and the earth, was a higher and more powerful being, than any of the particular and local saviours. This is the subject, which is brought particularly before us, in the xiv. of Isaiah; a part of which we shall translate literally, from the original Hebrew. "Assemble yourselves, and draw near together, ye that are escaped of the nations; they have no knowledge, who carry the wood of the graven image, and pray to a god who cannot save. Proclaim, and bring near; yea let them take counsel together; who hath shewed this from ancient times? from this time who hath proclaimed it? am not I Jehovah? and there is yet no God without me; the just God and the Saviour; none except me. Look to me and be saved all the ends of the earth, for I am God and none else. By myself I have sworn, the word has gone out of my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return, that to me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear." The meaning of this declaration is explained by the Apostle in Romans xiv. "We shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ. For it is written, as I live saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God. So then every one of us shall give account of himself to God." If we do not bow to him at the present time, we shall be obliged to bow to him as our judge, at the day when all nations shall be assembled before him, and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats." They who do not look to him as the Saviour, and tremble before him, lest he should be angry, and they should perish from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little, shall be obliged to look to him and tremble before him, as their Judge, when he shall pronounce the sentence of eternal condemnation on the wicked.

It was customary, among many of the idolaters of ancient times, to kiss the images of their gods. So we are told by Cicero, that the mouth and chin of one of the gods were worn by the kisses of his worshippers. So also it is said, by the prophet Hosea: they say of their idols; "Let the men that sacrifice, kiss the calves." Thus we may learn how the act of kissing began to be considered as an act of worship, which they rendered to their gods and saviours, and also as an act of reverence, to those whom they esteemed and honored as their superiors,

who had a rightful authority over them. When Pharaoh, the king of Egypt, placed Joseph in authority over his kingdom, he said to him thou shalt be over my house, and according to thy word shall all my people be ruled. It is literally rendered, at thy mouth shall all my people kiss. The custom of kissing the idols, or of kissing the hand when they bowed to the idols, as a token of subjection and reverence, had become so common, that it was used in their common language, to signify willing subjection to those who were in power. But Joseph was a type of the son of God. He was called by Pharaoh, Zaphnath Paaneah, that is, one to whom God revealed secret things. The Lord Jesus Christ was sent into the world, to reveal the secret of redeeming grace; and thus the secret of the Lord is with them that fear him, and he will show them his covenant. Thus also God the Father said to his son, thou shalt be over my house, and at thy mouth shall all my people kiss; or, they shall all be ruled by thy word.

The love of God which is manifested in the gospel, and the various attributes of God, which ought to excite love in the hearts of men, are exhibited so clearly, that those who do not receive the Redeemer and submit to him, give an evidence no less clear, that they are actuated by some kind of dislike or hatred to that Saviour, whom the Father has placed on the throne, and to whom he commands them to be subject. Hence as this Saviour is the acting governor, and judge of the earth; so this kind of wicked feeling always excites his resentment and indignation. God the Father offers him, and he offers himself to be their Lord, and Saviour; and they reject him, and say we will not have this man to rule over us.

No wonder that the anger of the Redeemer is excited, since he has made such a sacrifice for man, and offers him such invaluable blessings. This kind of conduct proceeds not entirely from ignorance, but hatred; and such characters are really the enemies of Jehovah, and of his Messiah. Hence he looks upon them with anger and withdraws his presence. He says this people errs in their heart, and they have not known my ways. They perish from the way, like the Israelites who fell and died in the wilderness, in which they wandered, and never found the way to the land of Canaan.

There is danger of everlasting ruin in the indulgence of such a disposition. If we do not give ourselves up to him, to be ruled and directed according to his will, his wrath will be kindled against us. We have reason to fear that he will hide his face from us, and then we shall go on frowardly in the way of our own hearts. If there is danger of perishing when his wrath is kindled but a little, it must be a dreadful consideration, to see his wrath burning against us, like the devouring fire on Mount Sinai, when even Moses said, I exceedingly fear and quake. If such was the declaration of Moses, when he saw the emblem of the wrath of the Son of God, no wonder the wicked are represented as calling to the rocks to fall upon them, and to the hills to cover them from his vengeance.

Men perish from the way by little and little, as his wrath is kindled. They first begin to neglect their duty occasionally and then give it up entirely. Sorrow is always the consequence of sin. There is a short lived comfort which is placed before them, by way of temptation, and they are led into sin; but sin will always be followed by pain. Sin entered, and death by sin, and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned. But this sin of refusing submission to the Son of God, if it continues so long as to harden the heart, and provoke his anger, so that he swears in his wrath they shall not enter into my rest, is certain and irremediable and eternal destruction, from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power.

The son of God is always presented to us as a Saviour, or deliverer. Pain and sorrow, and woe, are denounced against mankind in the curse of the law of God. But the son offers to be our Saviour; and there is no other name given under heaven among men, by which they can be saved. Without him the curse must come upon all, and by rejecting his offers of salvation, the condemnation is increased beyond all hope. Those therefore who receive him, and trust in him for salvation, are the only characters, who have any right to expect blessings from God. The act, or exercising mind, by which we receive his salvation, is called waiting for him; because his salvation is not sensibly perceived at any particular moment. He is always presented to our mind, as a refuge or protection, and therefore waiting for him, and flying to him for protection, are only different degrees of the same exercise of the believer's heart. His salvation consists in deliverance from all sin, and all sorrow. We wait upon him for this blessing, and we exercise patience, in waiting for his coming to deliver us from evil, and to bestow upon us every other blessing. All those whose hearts are continually acting under the influence of this principle, are in a state of blessedness, which is perfect in its nature, and will always be growing in its degrees, until it reaches the perfect blessedness of the heavens.

ART. IV. *Influence of Arminianism.*

When the doctrine of free-will began to be broached by some who called themselves Protestants, in England, the friends of the Reformation were filled with the greatest alarm. They feared this single doctrine more than all the fires and faggots of Rome. Thence, that holy martyr, Bradford, and others, in their letter on this subject to Cranmer, Ridley and Latimer, express themselves thus:—"The effects of salvation they, (the free-willers, as they were called,) so mingle and confound with the cause, that if it be not seen to, more hurt will come by them than ever

came by the Papists. In free-will they are plain Papists; yea, Pelagians, and ye know that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump." Were the Pelagian doctrines so signally instrumental in the erection and support of the Anti-christian kingdom? Its earthly superior has discovered the wisdom of the serpent in attempting to 'heal this deadly wound' by the very same means. Even that learned Jesuit, Petavius, acknowledges that the famous Council of Trent was called together to oppose the errors of Calvin, as much as those of Luther. The virulence, and the variety of their decrees, in opposition to the doctrine of grace, plainly shew their full conviction, that this doctrine made the throne of Anti-Christ tremble at its base. Soon after the dawn of the Reformation, appeared Ignatius Loyola, the father of the Jesuits, who exerted himself to the utmost of human power to support this tottering throne. Two great lines appear in the formation of this extraordinary society; blind devotion for the Pope, and unparalleled zeal for free-will and its kindred articles. In consequence of the latter trait in their character, they have not only been the warmest antagonists of all without the pale of their church, but the most bitter enemies of all within it, who have held the opposite doctrine. Thence their unrelenting persecution of the Jansenists in France, who were considered as traitors to the interests of Rome, because of their adherence to the doctrine of grace; although they scornfully disclaimed the name of Calvinists, and were in other respects zealous Catholics. Thence their adversaries could not rest till they got their doctrines condemned as heretical, the leaders of the party deprived, imprisoned or banished, and a decree passed that all, whether clergy or laity, should formally abjure sentiments which threatened the very existence of holy mother church.

As this has been the interior policy of Rome, it may not be improper to attend to her mode of management without her pale. There is every reason to believe, that the publication of Arminian doctrine in the church of England was the result of Jesuitical craft. When Archbishop Laud's papers were examined, a letter was found among them thus endorsed with his own hand: "March, 1625. A Jesuit's letter, sent to the rector of Brudells, about the ensuing Parliament." The design of the letter was to comfort the heart of his superior, who might be apt to fear that the unexpected calling of a Parliament would blast all the schemes formed in England for the restoration of Popery. To shew that there was no reason for despondency, he says:—"We have now many strings to our bow—we have planted that sovereign drug *Arminianism*, which, we hope, will purge the Protestants from their heresy; and it flourisheth and beareth fruit in due season. I am, at this time, transported with joy to see how happily all instruments and means, as well great as lesser, co-operates unto our purposes. But to return unto the *main fabric*, OUR FOUNDATION IS ARMINIANISM."*

Even Heylin, blindly as he was devoted to the ruling party, acknowledges the justness of the statement given by another Jesuit of that age, who expressed himself in the following terms:—"Protestantism waxeth weary of itself. The doctrine is altered in many things for which their progenitors forsook the church (of Rome); as, Limbus patrum; prayer for the dead; the possibility of keeping the commandments of God; and the accounting of CALVINISM to be HERESY at least, if not TREASON."† The learned and judicious Halyburton observes on this subject, that the jealousies of many discerning people were considerably increased, when it was seen with what violence the abettors of this new divinity appeared against the more moderate part of the church of England, as well as the

* Bushworth's Collect. Part 1. Toplady's Calvinism, vol. 1. Introd. p. 38. † Life of Laud.

Dissenters, upon the account of some ceremonies, owned by themselves as indifferent in their own nature; while, at the same time, they expressed a great deal of tenderness, if not respect, to the church of Rome, and made proposals of union with her.*

Here I shall only subjoin the words of an historian. "The churches were adorned with paintings, images, altar-pieces, &c., and, instead of communion tables, altars were set up, and bowings to them, and the sacramental elements enjoined. The predestinarian doctrines were forbidden, not only to be preached, but to be printed; and the Arminian sense of the articles was encouraged and propagated."† Thus Arminianism was introduced as the body of Popery, and a new fleece of superstitious ceremonies as her proper garb.

It is well known to those who are acquainted with the history of the church of Scotland, that the learned and eminently pious Rutherford was, A. D. 1636, banished by the high commission court from his parish; discharged from exercising any part of his ministry in Scotland, under pain of rebellion; and ordered to confine himself within the city of Aberdeen during the king's pleasure, where he continued for more than a year and a half. The principal reason of this tyrannical sentence was, his publishing "*Exercitationes Apologeticæ pro Divina Gratia.*" We have his own testimony on this head. "The cause that ripened their hatred was my book against the Arminians, whereof they accused me those three days I appeared before them."‡ He had been summoned to answer for the publication so early as 1630. But as the Archbishop of St. Andrews was prevented by tempestous weather, from being present at the court, and as Mr. Rutherford was befriended by one of the judges, the diet was deserted. This work was supposed to cut the very sinews of Arminianism, which the Jesuits acknowledge to be their *main fabric*; and the court party considered as indispensably necessary for consolidating their system of tyranny both in church and state.

But while the Arminian system ultimately encourages Deism, by its connection with Socinianism and Popery, it at the same time operates more immediately. Arminians inform us, that they do not see how "it can be proved that the belief of any other articles is necessary to salvation, than of those few which are admitted by all who are called Christians."§ They grant that these are few; and according to their limitation, they must be few indeed. The trinity, the incarnation, the atonement, regeneration, justification by faith alone, and all the other great doctrines of revelation are denied. Thus those articles only which respect the perfections of God, will be accounted fundamental. But even these are not left entire. Socinians deny his essential omnipresence, his omniscience, his immutability, his punitive justice. Some of these have been acknowledged by Heathens, and are acknowledged by Deists. But here is a plan of Christianity which releases from the necessity of believing such articles.

The doctrine of Arminians concerning the *Heathen*, has the same tendency. Some of them hold that the Heathen may be saved, if they live according to the light of nature. This is merely a revival of the old Pelagian tenet, that "every one who was sincere in his own religion would be saved." Others do not go so far, but assert, that those who make a right use of the light of nature, entitle themselves to a communication of the light of grace.|| They suppose that God communicates this in a way similar to that in which he deals with children within the pale of the

* Nat. Rel. Insufficient.

† Letters, Ep. 1 p. 1.

|| Turret. Theol. Loc. 1, Qu. 4.

† Tindal's Continuation of Rapin's Hist. vol. 3.

§ Remonstr. Apolog. ap. Haliburton, p. 23.

church. But as we are not to be "wise above what is written," the language of inspiration must equally limit our charity. We are expressly assured that "where no vision is, there the people perish;" that God will pour his fury upon the Heathen, and on the families or kindreds "that call not on his name." The Ephesians, it may be supposed, were in general no worse than other Heathens. Yet the Apostle affirms, that while without the gospel they had not hope, and were "without God," literally "atheists in the world." For the Spirit of truth, so far from admitting that Heathens may serve the true God, expressly asserts that they know not God, but do service to them that are no gods. He declares, without any limitation, that the "things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils, and not to God." When human wisdom, aided only by the light of nature, and some faint glimmerings of tradition, had gone to its utmost stretch in the famous schools of Greece and Rome, what estimate did the Spirit of God form of it? That it had brought men nearer to God? The very reverse. "The world by wisdom knew not God." What God may or may not do, in an extraordinary way, we dare not pretend to say, where God himself hath not said it. But we are certain that, as "there is not another name under heaven given among men, by which we can be saved, but the name of Christ;" so the scripture gives us no idea of the salvation of adults, but by the outward means of grace. And with respect to the Heathen, it is expressly said, "How shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher? So, then, faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God."

Besides, this doctrine proceeds upon a false ground. It supposes that heathens may be found, who live according to the law of nature. But scripture asserts the very contrary; that they are "without excuse," that "they are all under sin."

Those who hold this doctrine, which imposes upon many, under the notion of an amiable charity, unwittingly controvert the great evidences, which the Spirit of God hath given of the necessity of a revelation. The Apostle of the Gentiles illustrates the necessity of "the revelation of the righteousness of God, to faith," from the consideration of his "wrath being revealed against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men." This, he applies immediately to the heathen, and primarily, because of their idolatry. Rom. i. 17, 23. It is because there can be no faith without hearing, and no hearing without the word of God, that he introduces that prophetic language with respect to the Ministers of Christ,—“How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace, and bring good tidings of good things.” There is not one word in scripture, which exhibits the wisdom of God as procured by that of man, or the grace of Christ as superinduced upon heathen virtue. The one must be renounced as ignorance, and the other as unrighteousness, before God. The revelation of grace is represented, not as giving perfection to human wisdom, but as the remedy provided, in sovereign mercy, for those whom this wisdom hath blinded. "For it is written, I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and will bring to naught the understanding of the prudent. Where is the wise? Where is the scribe? Where is the disputer of this world? For after that, in the wisdom of God, the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God, by the foolishness of preaching, to save them that believe." Did Jesus send the apostles to perfect what heathenism had begun? The commission of Paul runs in a very different strain. He was sent to the Gentiles "to open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the kingdom of Satan unto God."

This doctrine, how far soever it may be from the design of those who

publish it, has certainly a great tendency to confirm professed Christians in their indifference to the gospel. To declare that sinners may be saved without this revelation of grace, cannot be a cogent motive to the obedience of faith. This is not the way to recommend the great blessing of "knowing the joyful sound." To ascribe as happy an effect to the darkness of heathenism, as to this "marvellous light," may well lull sinners in their eternal security, but will never be the means of awakening them to a due consideration of "the things that belong to their peace." It may make them wish that they had been born pagans, as thus they might have been saved on easier terms. But it will never excite them to bless God that their lot is cast in "the valley of vision." For certainly it is one of the first steps of the gracious operation of the Spirit, deeply to affect the hearts of men with a sense of the "love and kindness of God our Saviour," in favoring them with precious light, without which they must have "sat in darkness, and in the region and shadow of death." Therefore, this charity for the heathen, however specious, bears not one mark of true charity to those who enjoy the gospel. On the contrary, it obscures the wisdom of God in the work of salvation. If men may be saved by faith in a Mahomet, a Confucius, or a Zoroaster, why should not God have spared his own son? Why did he give him up to the death, if men could as certainly obtain eternal life any other way? Under pretence of ascribing the greatest benevolence to God, it denies the peculiar glory of this benevolence. It denies the freedom of its operation. All must indiscriminately partake of it, whether believers in the Son of God, or in the false prophet; whether they have worshipped the true God, or whorshipped devils. According to this doctrine, the grace of the gospel deserves not the name of grace, unless it run in every devious or polluted channel formed by the vanity of the human mind, as certainly and copiously as in that of the blood of the Lamb.

It is easily conceivable that the mind, under this delusive system of charity, may make the most rapid progress to infidelity. We have seen that it necessarily disparages the gospel revelation, and directly tends to strengthen our natural disregard for it, by denying it to be a distinguishing mercy. It also pours contempt upon the great doctrines of faith, and prepares the mind for the rejection of all mysteries in revealed religion. It becomes necessary to explain away the meaning of many passages of scripture, that express the contrary, some of which have been already mentioned. Thus a man is led to "handle the word of God deceitfully." If he find it difficult to avert the force of these, he perhaps entertains a secret disgust at revelation, because it does not so easily bend to his system, as he could wish. He may adhere to it for a while, struggling between its natural meaning, and the contrary dictates of his own mind; conscience secretly whispering the truth, and his perverse will opposing it. But let a temptation enter from another quarter; he will find it an easy matter to quit a religion which seems irreconcilable with his feelings, and at once to embrace a system more perfectly in unison with his boasted liberality.

It has been formerly observed, that writers of the Arminian persuasion have been serviceable to the Church, in illustrating various arguments in defence of revelation. But from the nature of their system, they have necessarily failed as to the principal one.

Arguments of a rational kind, in support of Christianity, may produce a rational faith. But a divine faith can only flow from a view of the divine perfection and authority impressed on the word, and manifesting itself to the soul, by the operation of the Holy Spirit, who indited it. This alone can support the Christian, during the rage of corruption or temptation, when he loses sight of every other argument. Many Armin-

ian writers speak as if the proper ground of faith, in the apostolic age had been the evidence of miracles; and seem to suppose that the great evidence, which we in these later ages, have of the authenticity of scripture, is the testimony of the inspired writers, viewed as men of unexceptionable character. But this faith, whether we consider its immediate object, or its origin, is merely of a human kind; and is essentially different from that which is "of the operation of God."

Undoubtedly, one of the most forcible arguments for the necessity of a revelation, is the depravity of human nature. There are two characters of the christian revelation, which powerfully recommend it as divine; its efficacy in giving the sinner such a display of his spiritual necessities as experience exactly verifies, and its exhibition of a salvation perfectly commensurate to these necessities. Men may be at first shocked at the strong language of scripture in regard to themselves, and endeavour to explain it away as much to the honour of human nature as possible. But if they give due attention to the word, they will find that it not only declares the truth as to what in their situation is too plain to be denied; but that it shows them a spiritual deformity in their hearts and practice, of which they formerly had not the least conception; and discovers this so clearly, that they can no more deny it, than those facts which they learned from the dictates of a natural conscience. They at the same time, perceive that the word of God exhibits a salvation of the very same extent with their greatly varied necessities; that this salvation wants nothing which they need, and that it has nothing superfluous. If, at any time they discover a spiritual disease which was formerly hid, they may be at first, in danger of supposing that their case is unexampled. But eventually, the discovery of this new disease proves only the occasion of their being more fully confirmed in the all-healing efficacy of the divine word.

But according to the Arminian scheme, the force of such reasoning is lost. While those who fairly follow the footsteps of Pelagius, absolutely deny original sin; the substance of his heresy is adopted by Arminians. If, as many of them affirm, man had no occasion for the gracious illumination of the Spirit, in order to a right understanding of the scriptures.* If his will retains an inclination to what is truly and spiritually good, and a power of determining itself to the choice of this; if he can do something to merit justification; the fall has done him no great injury. This view of human depravity will never convince men of the necessity of revelation. It cannot be supposed that Arminians should successfully recommend the word of God, to infidels, as what can alone acquaint them with their spiritual wants; while it costs them such labour and ingenuity to explain away a great variety of passages on this subject, which flatly contradict their system.

Their denial of the sovereignty of God in election, affords a great handle to Deists. The plan can never make revelation in general, more palatable to the carnal mind. For to be consistent, it ought to go a great way farther. By the strong language used against the doctrine of particular election, Arminians only open the way for others, to attack the divine sovereignty, with respect to angels. Is not this perfection of Deity, as much displayed in passing by all "the angels who kept not their first estate," as in the preterition of some of the lost family of Adam? Can it be said, that the one is irreconcilable with infinite justice, without arraigning the same attribute in respect to the other? Arminians admit the election of particular nations to the enjoyment of the means of grace, while they deny that of particular persons to the enjoyment of

* *Exam. Armin.* p. 53.

grace itself. To countenance this absurdity, they suppose another; a possibility of salvation without these means, that is, a possibility of receiving the grace of God in another way than that to which he hath expressly restricted its operation. But the vanity of this idea has been already considered.

By impartial judges, this denial of particular election can be viewed in no other light than as a tacit crimination of the justice of God, in his conduct towards nations. If the Great Potter hath not a right to make his vessels as he pleases, what right had he to choose the Jews, to the means of salvation, and to leave all other nations to walk in their own ways, without hope, and without God in the world. If we sincerely receive the scriptures ourselves, or wish to recommend them to others, as a divine revelation, we must receive them as they really are, and not reject any doctrine, while we assent to others equally obnoxious to reason as depraved. The sovereignty of God, in commanding the extermination of the nations of Canaan, and in afterwards bearing with the Jews, though they did worse than they, has been still as exceptionable to Deists, as the doctrine of particular election. To admit the one, and deny the other, is to set revelation at variance with itself.

The doctrine of free-will can be of as little service in recommending Christianity to its adversaries. If they judge of the whole system from this pretended specimen, their prejudices must be increased. Many, who acknowledge no revelation, are convinced that the Arminian doctrine on this head, is irreconcilable with philosophy. Reason undoubtedly teaches that, if God give a revelation, it must not only be recommended by the clearest evidence, but be accompanied with such power as to have all that effect which he designed. But while Arminians represent the effect of the outward means, nay, the efficacy of the divine operation, as entirely suspended on the uncertain will of the creature, notwithstanding God's will to save all; instead of exalting revelation, they virtually represent it as a revelation unworthy of God. For its effect must thus be uncertain as to any, and its end must be certainly defeated as to a great part of those whose salvation God meant by it. If there be merely a possibility of salvation to all, there must be at the same time a possibility that not one should be saved. Does not this system supply the enemies of Christianity with an argument against the very duties of religion? For why should I pray to God, for what does not depend on *his* will, but on *my own*? The system called Calvinistic, how much soever it may be objected to in other respects, must be acknowledged to be consistent in this. For as it supposes that God, by the revelation of grace, meant to save some only, it asserts the immutability, of his purpose, and the efficacy of his operation, as to every individual whom he meant to save. While it does not pretend fully to explain the mysterious operation of God, any more than the mystery of his being; it asserts according to scripture, that the natural and essential liberty of the will is nowise impaired in the change accomplished by grace, although this grace is certainly efficacious.—*Dr. Jameison.*

ART. V. *Intelligence from Scotland.*

We understand that the late decision of our Synod, recognizing the Original Seceders in Scotland as one Church with ourselves, has been received by them with the greatest pleasure and satisfaction. It has tended greatly to strengthen their hands and encourage their hearts in the midst of their troubles and misrepresentations, in contending for the principles of the Reformed Church of Scotland, as maintained by the Fathers of the Secession. They consist of thirty ordained ministers, divided into four Presbyteries, viz: Edinburgh, Ayr, Perth, and

Aberdeen. They have five preachers, also a considerable number of students attending the Divinity Hall, under the inspection of the venerable Professor Paxton, whose name must be dear to those who know him, either personally or from his writings; and particularly to such Ministers as received the benefit of his instruction, in their early years; but are now widely scattered, in Scotland, Ireland, and America.

From a Letter lately received, we find one of our brethren saying, "Remember me to any of the staunch friends of Reformation principles, and assure them that though unknown in the face, I feel as present with them in the spirit, and rejoice in their strivings for the faith." Our correspondent, says that he had written to a distinguished individual who is one of the Ministers of the Original Seceders, respecting their sentiments on common benefits being the purchase of Christ, as reports had been industriously circulated to their injury; nothing having been mentioned in their Testimony particularly on that subject. The following answer has been given.

"April 1, 1833.

"You have not mentioned the time at which your Synod meets, and I am afraid a letter sent from our Synod (which is to meet on May 14,) may be too late. As you are anxious to hear from us on a certain point, and I think your anxiety is not without reason, I judge it better to answer your letter without delay. I have no other reason for the omission of an express condemnation, in our Testimony, of the doctrine of Christ's purchasing Common Benefits, (as they are called), but that we did not think it was a prevailing error, and that we thought the Cameronians had dropped that peculiarity. Perhaps we were mistaken as to the fact. My sentiments as to common benefits are the very same with those stated in Gib's Display, and in the American Testimony; and I have every reason to believe that those of *all* my brethren are the very same. It is a point that never was called in question among us, and about which we never felt any difficulty, and never perceived the slightest jarring of sentiment or shade of difference among us. I have heard, indeed, some good honest private Christians among the Anti-Burghers, from my earliest years, occasionally on *asking a blessing*, beg 'a covenant right to these mercies.' I dare say they used it very innocently, but it is a phrase I never employed."

After giving his sentiments freely on other subjects, he concludes, by saying, "Much allowance must be made for the difficulty which brethren in America feel in obtaining correct information, and their liability to be imposed upon by false reports." This we think should satisfy any candid mind, that the report was not true "that the Original Seceders held the doctrine of common benefits being the purchase of Christ."

The same worthy Father says, "The Churches of England and Ireland are in a tottering state, and that of Scotland is not free of all danger. A considerable number of ministers and members of the latter are making attempts at reform, particularly in getting rid of patronage; but the greater part, including orthodox ministers, will content themselves with propping up the edifice and giving its walls a little white-washing. We live in uncommon times; and who can say what will be the end of these wonders?"

"I shall see that the Synod (or their Committee) write to America after their ensuing meeting. The union with the Original Burghers I do not think will take place soon. It is highly reasonable that our Transatlantic brethren should know the terms before hand; and if the Synod agree to any overture, I have little doubt it will be transmitted to you."

It appears the Rev. Thomas Goodwillie, during his stay in Scotland, has been preaching for Dr. McCrie, Professor Paxton, and others of the same connection; and has been cheerfully received and highly approved of.

We expect more information from the same quarter soon, which we shall lay before our readers. As we have, through the medium of a friend obtained an intelligent correspondent in Edinburgh, and another in Greenock, we shall by and bye be able to enliven our pages with correct Foreign Intelligence, and interesting extracts from the Edinburgh Presbyterian Review, Presbyterian Magazine, Theological Magazine, &c.

ART. VI. General Assembly.

(Continued from page 31.)

WEDNESDAY, May 22, 1833.

The Committee, consisting of Drs. Spring and Hoge, and Messrs. Ludlow, Jessup and Wilkinson, to whom had been referred the complaint of 2d Presbytery of Philadelphia, against the Synod of Philadelphia; the complaint of the Rev. Robert Cathcart, George Duffield, and E. W. Gilbert, against the Synod of Philadelphia; a remonstrance from the Synod of Philadelphia against the division of the Presbytery of Philadelphia, on the principle of elective affinity; a complaint of E. W. Gilbert against the Synod of Philadelphia; and a complaint of the Synod of Cincinnati against the principle of dividing Presbyteries by elective affinity, reported, that they had effected a compromise, and introduced the following resolution, to wit:—

Resolved, That the complainants in these cases have leave to withdraw their complaints; and that the consideration of all the other papers relating to the second Presbytery of Philadelphia be indefinitely postponed.

The report was accepted.

After a long discussion, in which most of the speakers supported the resolution and urged the necessity of restoring peace to the church, while a few urged the Assembly to settle the constitutional questions involved in the several complaints, this resolution was unanimously adopted.

The report was then adopted, the compromise completed, and the papers were all withdrawn. The moment this was announced from the chair, it was proposed that solemn thanksgiving be rendered to God. The motion was carried as by acclamation; and Dr. Miller thereupon addressed the throne of grace, and returned grateful acknowledgments to the God of Peace.

THE
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,

AND

EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

AUGUST, 1833.

ART. I. *The Parts of the Revelation that exhibit the Church in our own Time, considered.*

(Continued from page 14.)

I HAVE already considered the character of the woman—her enemy, the dragon—the nature of the opposition which he makes to her, which we have seen to be of two sorts, “deceit and violence”—the means appointed for the woman’s preservation, which are three, “wings of a great eagle, that she may fly;” “her place prepared of God,” and “the earth helps the woman.” The consideration of her flight concluded the last paper. It remains now to consider the second means of her safety, “*her place.*”

I have already hinted that her particular external location in this world, is not to be excluded from the meaning of her place. Whether the woman be considered individually, or in a collective sense, she must be a resident in some place of the earth; and that place, wheresoever it be, must be ordered and prepared in the providence of him who watches over her safety, and makes all things work together for her good. In this particular of her interest, infinite wisdom and love go before her, as the pillar of cloud did in the wilderness before Israel, and seek out, and point to the place where she is to pitch her tent, and determine how long she is to continue there. But as there is no visible society yet set up that is proof against the errors of this flood, so neither has there been any *place* found which can exclude them. It is only the Word and Providence of God, taken together, that can at any given time within the 1260 days, lead to the place where she may reside in safety, and these, like the meridian and the latitude on the map, will always lead to the very place.

The reader will observe, that her place is, through the whole period, to be in “*the wilderness.*” The wilderness, in a symbolical sense, is here contrasted with the “*earth,*” where the dragon has his seat, and on which he pours forth his flood, and which opens its mouth and swallows it. The earth is a symbol for all manner of earthly-mindedness and earthly life. When it is used to hold up to view earthly men, it may denote riches and splendor, luxury, lust, and power; or, in other words, “the lust of the eye, the lust of the flesh, and the pride of life;” 1 John ii. 16. When it symbolizes them as professors of religion, it means, in

mass, all that is human in their religion—their doctrines, and commandments of men; their pomp and ceremony; their decorated churches, splendid robes, and enchanting music; their moving oratory, and words of men's wisdom. Now, the *place of the woman*, in order to its being a safe retreat for *her*, must be in respect to all these things a "*wilderness*," a place where they do not grow, and are not to be found. If she will be safe, she must retire from all such things, and from the company that delight in them. She can at no moment venture out of her wilderness and approach the abodes of earthly life safely. The dragon, who never sleeps or tires in his vigilant search after her, waits for such a rash and daring venture in her, as his golden opportunity. Whosoever he sees a congregation or a whole ecclesiastic body lusting after his earth, and imitating the fashion of his great party, he sets his snare in their path, and when *we* see them doing so, we may safely conclude that ere long they will fall into it. What holds true with regard to the whole body of God's people, holds true with regard to individuals. If the individual Christian would pass safely to the "house of many mansions," he must pass in a manner *unknown* through the world, a stranger to its fashions, its language, and its joys. And if at any time Satan lays before his imagination a map of worldly glory and pleasure, with many fair promises, upon the old condition of worshipping him, the believer's only safety is, in taking to his great eagle-wings of faith, and fleeing into his wilderness, and his place assigned him in the providence of God. "And having food and raiment, let him therewith be content," "for he hath said, I will never leave thee nor forsake thee." If this be the only way of safety, as most certainly it is, then the present course pursued by many, very many professing christians, and not fewer, in proportion, of the Associate Church than of other Churches, must be one of extreme danger to the present and succeeding generations. Most certainly the prevailing taste in respect of education, dress, manner of life, pursuits, &c., cannot agree with the rule already quoted. The end which men set before themselves, to which all their operations and toil are to tend, is *not food and raiment; things honest in-the sight of all men, or that they may have to give to him that needeth*; but it is "to add house to house, and field to field." With as much avidity and energy of soul do they "lade themselves with thick clay," and grasp "*the earth*," as though their *heaven* and their *eternity* were here beneath the sun, while the affairs of their scriptural profession are like the "garden of the sluggard," and the "house that droppeth through;" and those children, who are soon to occupy their place, are taught to approve of "this wisdom and way," and they of themselves will naturally, in their turn, *improve* upon it.

The woman's place is "*prepared of God*." Although it is in a wilderness, yet it is a place of great security. It has infinite strength. The gates of hell cannot prevail against it. Here it is, "A man shall be an *hiding-place* from the wind (*of diverse and strange doctrine*), and a covert from the tempest; as rivers of water in a dry place; as the shadow of a great rock in a weary land;" Isa. xxxii. 2. This man, the man Christ Jesus, is the place to which the woman, by the wings of faith, flies; and him she "follows whithersoever he goes," and she is safe. So long as a church flies to Christ as he is, and not as *imagined* and *described* by ignorant men, or crafty and desinging aspirants, she is as safe from the flood of errors and delusions as if she were within the very *throne* of God. That Christ is the only place which is calculated to preserve from the flood of wicked and anti-scriptural tenets, is so easy to be seen, that it scarcely needs any remark. For if dwelling immediately in the light of the sun is a perfect security against being in darkness, so must embracing and holding the truth be against error. Christ is "the truth,"

The whole truth, and nothing but the truth; and therefore it must be, that whosoever abides in Christ is safe from error.

Although the woman's place is in the wilderness, yet it has no want of any thing that is needful to nourish and feed her. So much is expressly said concerning it; and it may be fairly inferred from the passage just quoted; for it is as "rivers of water in a dry place." What can be more needful or more refreshing in a dry place than waters? and what more abundance of it can be desired than "rivers?" In Christ, her hiding place, there is "fulness of grace and truth"—"all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge"—"all the promises, yea, and amen"—"all power in heaven and earth," to give her meat in due season—"and in him she is complete." In him is laid up the whole of God's covenant for her safety here, and glory afterwards; Isa. xlii. 6. And it is "ordered in all things, and sure." It has provided her with a revelation of God's mind and will in the Old and New Testaments, so necessary in every thing which it contains, that "nothing is to be taken from it," and so complete, that "nothing is to be added." It "is all profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished, unto all good works;" 2 Tim. iii. 16. It has provided her with all ordinances that are needful and proper to her in her wilderness situation:—the ordinance of the holy Sabbath, to commemorate the resurrection of her Lord, and therein, the ground and security of her acceptance before God: the ordinance of preaching, to set before her, in all its particulars, this covenant, and Christ crucified, her hiding place: the ordinances of baptism and the Lord's supper, to signify and seal the same to her receiving it by faith: a throne of grace, to which, at all times, and in every place, she may come boldly, and obtain mercy, and find grace to help in every time of need: a song, also, which she may sing in the house of her pilgrimage, and in the night of her affliction, which lifts up her soul out of all its down-castings and depths, unto God the eternal fountain of her joy: and it has also laid down the path in which all the steps of life and duty are to be taken; so that whatever she has to do, individually or socially, publicly or privately, *the way* of doing it is before her. Through these ordinances, her God hath appointed to nourish and feed her out of the inexhaustible fulness of her hiding place, Christ. While professors dwell in this place by faith, and draw the living water from these wells of salvation, it is impossible that all the violence of the satanic flood can reach them; and when they leave this place, and these ordinances, it is just as impossible that they can be safe. In other words, the safety of the Church, during the 1260 days, from error and corruption of every sort and degree, lies in adhering closely, by the vital principles of *faith and love*, to these ordinances of the new covenant. I say *faith and love*, because there are other principles on which a Church or an individual may externally adhere to the letter and form of them, and do it with great exactness and tenacity; but when it is done on *any* other principles at all, instead of being safe *from* the flood, they are safe *for* it; because, whatever other principle it may be, it is but one of the elementary principles of the flood itself. If professors and Churches then mean not to be surprised by "sudden destruction, while they are dreaming of peace and safety," they must show a becoming solicitude to have and to keep pure and entire all the ordinances of God's covenant, and they must not be less so to have *faith and love* as the principles by which they adhere to them. These ordinances, and that faith and love, are two which God hath joined together, which no Church or professor may put asunder, but at the hazard of ruin and death. But what is the existing state of things? Will the truth just stated allow the inference that the visible

Church is, generally speaking, in this place prepared of God? Are they very solicitous to "receive, observe, and keep pure and entire all such religious ordinances and worship as God hath appointed in his word?" Are those who "hold fast the form of sound words," doing so "in faith and love which is in Christ Jesus?" 2 Tim. i. 13. Do they appear, generally, to be apprised of the exceedingly great danger that there is in leaving this place? The contrary of all this makes up the true state of their case. The great solicitude of very many seems to be, how to cast off regard to every form of sound words, without appearing shamefully inconsistent before men, and without awakening in their own minds a just sense of the demerit of their own conduct. While the ordinances of God are treated as if they were of no value, the ordinances of man are the objects of idolatrous wonder and admiration. They cannot be satisfied with "casting down to the ground the place where God's name dwells," nor with extolling the "doctrines and commandments of men." There is no Church in safety—not even they who are "displaying a banner because of the truth."

Very many members are settled down in a state of carnal security and stupid formality. They cannot be aroused by any ordinary means. The watchmen are asleep at their posts. There is treason in the city. Judas is betraying his Master with a kiss. Sincerity in vows and professions is gone. "Take ye heed every man of his neighbor, and trust ye not in any brother, for every brother will utterly supplant, and every neighbor will walk with slanders; and they will deceive every one his neighbor, and will not speak the truth; they have taught their tongue to speak lies, and weary themselves to commit iniquity. Thine habitation is in the midst of deceit; through deceit they refuse to know me, saith the Lord. Therefore thus saith the Lord, I will melt and try them: for how shall I do for the daughter of my people? Their tongue is an arrow shot out; it speaketh deceit: one speaketh peaceably to his neighbor with his mouth, but in heart he layeth his wait. Shall I not visit them for these things? saith the Lord: shall not my soul be avenged on such a nation as this?" Jer. ix. 4—9.

This place of the woman is prepared of God in a *providential manner*. The covenant, which I have mentioned above, is ordered, not only in respect to the fulness that is in Christ, and of the ordinances through which that fulness may come, but also in respect to the *times, places, manner, and means*, in and by which she may have access to ordinances. There shall be always a place prepared for her, and, verily, she shall be fed. But it may vary much in these particulars now mentioned. For a time Elijah was to be fed in the ordinary way, but after a time that way did not comport with his safety. God had a place prepared for him at the brook Cherith, which is before Jordan, and there the ravens were commanded to feed him with bread and flesh, morning and evening. But, by and bye, the brook dries up, and this was to be his place no longer. God prepared him a place at Zarephath, where he commanded a widow woman to feed him. This widow had put a handful of meal in a barrel, and a cruse of oil; and lo, when he came to the city, she is gathering two sticks, that she might prepare it for herself and son, that they might eat it and die. Nevertheless he was fed in that place until the day that the Lord sent rain upon the earth. Thus, from place to place, God prepared a place for him, and he, *believing the word of God*, fled thither, and was fed. But, reader, how would it have fared with the prophet, had he not had the *great wings of faith* to fly? Had he, like many, resolved to *walk* on the feet of reason, these places would have afforded him no safety or support, for he would never have reached them at all. He would have said, "how absurd to leave the public markets and stores,

and go to this brook in expectation that carnivorous birds, so fond of flesh themselves, will bring their flesh to me regularly. Why may not God as easily preserve me here? This is enthusiasm. I will not go." Neither would he have gone more swiftly, in the way of reason, to the widow of Zarephath. It is somewhat similar still. The woman is, for the most part, fed in the ordinary way, by the public ordinances of the Gospel, dispensed in a fixed way. God maintains a succession of ministers and elders for this end; and he maintains them individually in their office and in their day; and "they shall feed her there." When she hath access to the ordinances, as God hath appointed them in his word, they are the place where she shall be fed and be safe, if for these two ends she *fly* thither. But *public* ordinances are not *always* her place. By some or other of those ordinances enumerated above, she shall be fed and have a place, but by which of them, it is not revealed, except by the providence of God; much less is there any ground to conclude that she will invariably enjoy, or that she *must* enjoy public ordinances. It is true, public ordinances will not fail to be dispensed somewhere. Yet the "remnant of her seed" may often be without them, and in order to be safe from the "flood," at special times, they *must* be so. Whosoever it happens that a congregation or a single individual professor is deprived of opportunity to attend public ordinances, as they are appointed in God's word, or at least, without any *known* error, their "*place*" of safety is to be *without* public ordinances. For it is impossible that they can hold fellowship in public ordinances with a *SINGLE* error, and be in safety; and much less can they do so when the error is known to them and has been denounced by them in their public testimony. For it is not conceivable that "a place prepared of God" can be a place where we must necessarily swallow at least *some drops* of this flood. Now that it often falls to the lot of the Lord's people to be so situated, requires no proof. Congregations are frequently vacant for years together. Christian families are, in the providence of God, sometimes far removed from their brethren in profession, and solitary individuals likewise are so. It may be, that the "woman," properly, is sometimes a solitary individual, who has not visible fellowship with another on earth, not even with him in whose bosom she lies. Very many, may I not say the greater part of professors, account this to be an hard case—a place to which they will not go. To have public ordinances in the neighborhood, and not to attend them, because of one or two points of error embodied in them, is to them an intolerable idea. Thus they say, "shall we sit here at home, Sabbath after Sabbath, and see our family rise up to maturity without the benefit of public ordinances! It *must be* our duty to attend ordinances. It cannot be right to stay at home on account of a few minor points of difference. Such a one preaches a good gospel sermon, &c. But, reader, all this talk is but the stumbling and falling of *reason* attempting to walk where faith must *fly*. The woman's place can, in no instance at all, be entered by reason; but that faith which mounts up by the word of Him who cannot lie, far beyond the utmost point of reason's vision, finds it at all times a place of easy access. In vain will the subtle fowler lay his snare of a *few minor points of error* in the sight of this bird. It perceives the danger. And that in comparison with it, the domestic circle, or even solitude itself, is a place of safety. In either of these situations, there is no want of nourishment for the soul. "Man lives, by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God," and in either of these places the Christian may have *all* the words of God—all his promises, and, among the rest, that very one, which measures out strength for a day, without public ordinances. He or she, as the case may be, has a great High Priest within the veil, interceding for him, and

a Throne of Grace where he may come boldly. The parent, in the midst of his rising offspring, can engage in all the exercises of family religion. He has a double opportunity and a double motive for answering to them the important question, "what mean ye by this service," *this remaining at home*, and not going with the rest of the neighborhood? These are the ordinances and duties which God himself has expressly appointed for nourishing the woman. The brook Cherith ran dry to the prophet, but these never, never will; they are *wells* that spring up from the *Infinite Fountain* itself, and that spring to eternal life. "Thus saith the Lord God of Israel, (concerning them,) the barrel of meal shall not waste, and the cruse of oil shall not fail, until the day that the Lord send rain (of gospel doctrine) upon the earth." Let no widow woman or solitary christian any more say, "Behold, I am gathering two sticks, that I may go in and dress it for me and my son, that we may eat it and die." Whoever lives at the end of these days, may boldly challenge all the solitary ones who have, by faith, occupied this place at Zarephath to say, that either their handful of meal wasted, or their cruse of oil failed. But I know that many of them can say, even now, that their adhering to this solitary place has only been the means of safety and of nourishment to themselves, but of opening springs of "water in the wilderness, and rivers in the desert," to others. "When the poor and needy seek water, and there is none, and their tongue faileth for thirst, I, the Lord, *will hear them*; I, the God of Israel, will not forsake them. I will open rivers in high places, and fountains in the midst of the vallies. I will make the wilderness a pool of water, and the dry land springs of water. I will plant in the wilderness the cedar, the shittah tree, and the myrtle, and the oil tree. I will set in the desert the pine tree and the box tree together, that they may see, and know, and consider, and understand together, that the *hand of the Lord hath done* this, and the Holy One of Israel hath created it." Isa. xli. 17—20. Have not several of my readers seen "the little one become a thousand, and the small one a strong nation?" And if there are others yet "solitary in the woods," let them wait on the Lord, for he says, in the same verse, "I, the Lord, will hasten it in his time." Isa. lx. 22.

I come to consider now, the last means ordained for the woman's safety, that is, "the earth helped the woman, and the earth opened her mouth and swallowed the flood," &c. I observe here, that the help given by the earth is not *intended* help. Some interpreters laying hold of the word "help," have inferred that it was an act of friendship to the woman; and this has led them to such a view of the prophecy, and of the events by which they supposed it to be fulfilled, that does not at all agree with the known character of the earth, nor with what is here stated concerning it. It has been interpreted to mean such friendly aid as was given to the Reformers by some of the great men in power, such as Luther received oftentimes from Frederick of Saxony. But to say nothing of the very doubtful identity of such a man as Frederick with the earth, it is altogether inconsistent with the elementary principles and the known history of the earth, (I mean the party symbolized by it,) to suppose that it can have one friendly feeling for the woman, or a single wish to prevent her destruction. In ch. viii. 13, John says, he "saw an angel flying through the midst of heaven, saying, with a loud voice, woe, woe, woe to the inhabitants of the earth." But if the inhabitants of the earth had a fellow-feeling with the woman, these woes would never have been uttered. But to proceed. The character of that party is most clearly implied in the 20th and 21st verses of chap. ix. For its worshiping of devils, and idols of gold, and silver, and brass, and stone, and wood; and murders, and sorceries, and fornications, and thefts, were the

procuring causes of the first of these woes, and that, however terrible a scourge it (the Turks) was, "*yet they repented not.*" And this impenitence is a permanent feature in their character, for we find them retaining it after the two succeeding woes were inflicted. We need not, therefore, be surprised to find, ch. x. ver. 2, that Christ sets his feet upon them as his enemies. In ch. xi. ver. 10, we are told, that the plain and faithful dealing of the witnesses was a torment to them, and that they will rejoice when these witnesses are dead. In this, ch. xii. ver. 12, we are informed, that the devil is to have his seat and influence among them. In ch. xiii. ver. 8, they are represented as the worshippers of the Beast, whose names are not written in the Lamb's book of life; and in the 11th verse, that they are the nest in which shall be hatched that brood of carnal hypocrites which shall come abroad into the greater part of the world, in the outer garb of *ministers* of the Lamb, but who, in fact, teach the doctrine of the dragon. It therefore seems to me impossible to imagine, that this help which they give to the woman is intended to be *help*. And this is confirmed by the manner which this help is given, that is, by "*opening their mouth and swallowing the flood which the dragon cast out of his mouth.*" They drink down the waters of error and delusive superstition as greedily as the thirsty ox does the water. It is congenial to their earthly, unrenewed nature, and agreeable to their taste and manner of life, the lusts in which they delight to indulge. This helps the woman *indirectly*. For it may well serve to alarm her at any opinion or tenet, and to hasten her flight from it, when she perceives it to be so palatable to such people, that they eagerly seek after it, and greedily drink it down as their native aliment. And when the teachers of errors are so busily engaged, and so remarkably successful in making proselytes of carnal, earthly men, that they have neither time nor temptation to urge their opinions upon the attention of sober, humble Christians; or when they are so dazzled with the earthly splendor of their adherents, and so inflated by flatteries, that they account the plain, unassuming, retiring Christian beneath their notice, or deserving their contempt, it helps the woman. By these means, the flood is stayed from coming after her. She is allowed to sit quiet, and is reminded of the difference between herself and the earth, and admonished to fly to her place, and to keep close to it. And in *what way soever* the earthly, carnal multitude *stay* anti-scriptural opinions from going beyond the circle of their own society, it is a help to the woman. In this manner she has been helped from the first, and she is still. May I not assume, as matter of fact, that there are many of the popular tenets of the present day totally unknown to many hundreds of private Christians in the Associate Church, owing to the disesteem in which her profession and her way is held; and that she herself is known as a Church, to a very small extent, owing to the same cause. No doubt this is meant for evil on the part of many who drink down the fashionable doctrines, but God means it for *help*, and it will be the wisdom of all her people so to reckon it instead of giving heed to the feelings of wounded pride.

Most of the practical instruction contained in the passages which I have been considering, have been anticipated. Still it may be observed,

1st. That true christian fellowship is not always visible and organized. The "*woman*" is a noun, signifying a multitude of persons, few of whom have lived in the same age or in the same country. Yet they had real fellowship together; they all lived in the same wilderness; all ate of the same spiritual meat, and drank of the same spiritual drink. Their love and hatred, their joy and sorrow were the same. Their faith and their practice were the same. They "*were so perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment, that they are here represented as*

but one person. Those who have "one faith, one Lord, one baptism," have as real and true fellowship together as the members of one family can have, although they may have lived in all the countries of the world, and in all the ages intervening the days of Abraham and the end of time. Yea, although some of them be on earth and some of them in heaven. For "they are come unto Mount Sion, unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels; to the General Assembly and Church of the first born, which are written in heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect;" Heb. xii. 22. On the contrary, all visible and organized fellowship is not true and real. When men have and avow different and inconsistent doctrines—when one holds to an indefinite atonement, another to a general one, and a third believes that Christ atoned for his elect alone—when one contends that Presbyterian government alone has the authority of Christ, and another regards every form of government as equally good—one holds to the Psalms of the Bible—another sees no harm in imitation—their assembling within the same walls and sitting at the same communion table on the same day, can never constitute true and real fellowship. And is there not a wide-spread misunderstanding on this subject? Is not the belief exceedingly common, that if a man do not attend public ordinances, or have them not within his reach, he has no christian fellowship, and is not in the church? and on the other hand, that going to church and sitting at the communion table, is another name for true fellowship? Believing this false dogma, men take the alarm at the temporary want of public ordinances and fly from their prepared place into some visible fellowship, against which they have witnessed, as being in some part erroneous, and so they are caught in the devil's snare. Their reasoning on this point is most fallacious. 'Tis as if a man should say, it is much safer for me to partake of this public entertainment, although I know very well that there is a little mortal poison mixed in the dishes, than to be obliged to eat, from day to day, in my own private family, where I am sure all the victuals are safe and nourishing. Or, I will drink only the pure waters of Shiloh, and turn aside those drops of the dragon's flood that have fallen into them, when they come to my lips. Is there not reason to fear here, that the *heart* of many is deceived as much as the *head*? That, instead of being drawn by their love to public ordinances to join some visible communion, they are DRIVEN into this measure by the *irksomeness* of a *whole day* of secret and private communion with God? If conscience durst speak out, would it not declare that this is the *very thing* which causes many to make shipwreck of their scriptural profession, and, with a wanton hand, to violate their most solemn covenant engagements?

2d. When the woman's place is a place without public ordinances, she has reason to expect that God will not let her be a loser by it. There "she shall be nourished." Although in itself considered, it is not a place to be preferred, being a straitness. Yet it is often a place of the most exquisite soul-refreshment. It is like "rivers of water in a dry place." When the soul is panting after God in his sanctuary, and saying within itself, "When shall I come and appear before God?" (Ps. xlii. 2,) God sometimes lets fall a word upon it, with such power and sweetness, as is seldom enjoyed even under ordinances themselves, or on this side of glory. Sometimes it is drawn up to heaven in prayer. At other times, it is influenced with love, by means of meditation, and cries out, "O how love I thy law; it is my study all the day." Besides, such a situation stirs up a Christian to a serious consideration of the way in which the Lord has led him, and to a close examination of his own motives and his own conduct, particularly in respect to the improvement of days that are past.

And withal, his spiritual appetite is whetted, and he is prepared to enjoy the ordinances more than before. He is humbled and chastened in his soul: he is more weaned from the world; his soul longs after the company of the saints, "the excellent ones of the earth, where his delights are all placed." Ps. xvi. 3 And in these things is the nourishment of a soul.

3d. When a professor, man or woman, is so placed, whether by the unavoidable circumstances of Providence, or by their own ill digested plans, it is still their duty to seek public ordinances. First, by prayer to Him who is the disposer of them, that He, in his own time, would either bring ordinances to them, or them to ordinances; and secondly, by petitioning ministers and presbyteries for supply of preaching. If these means were employed and persevered in, the solitary christian or family would, more frequently than they do, witness the loving-kindness of the Lord in answering his own promise. And if the Monitor comes to any so placed, I would urge upon them to use these two means forthwith. This is duty. Follow it, and leave the event to God. Let neither the improbability of such a thing as public ordinances in such a place, nor your own poverty deter you. Trust God, and He will bring it to pass. Delight thyself in God, and He will give thee the desire of thine heart. Ps. xxxvii. 4, 5.

(To be concluded.)

ART. II. *On the Controversy between the Protestants and Papists, respecting the Rule of Faith.*

You that receive the divinely inspired Scriptures as the only infallible rule of doctrine and life, and often, in your addresses to the Lord, cordially exclaim, "O, how I love thy law!" suffer me, if this brief communication meet your eyes, affectionately to lead you into some of those meditations which, to the pious mind, can scarcely fail to result from its reading of the present newspaper controversy between the Romanists and Protestants. Let us not regret, that such a public controversy exists. The Lord will overrule it. Who can tell the good that may result from it? The science of our holy religion is founded on sure principles that invite and challenge the strictest scrutiny; and the better those principles are understood, the more, in ordinary cases, we may reasonably expect, will religion, the subject of that science, be felt. Now that controversy brings those principles frequently into view; and consequently, a knowledge of them will extend, perhaps, in some degree, even among the Romanists; and meanwhile the abominations, &c. will be disclosed. And whereas opposition to your love of the scriptures, or to the beloved object itself, is much more like fuel on the "coals of fire," than like water to quench; when you witness the contempt which one side of the controversy pours upon the Bible, how sensibly your attachment to that precious book increases! How often your hearts reiterate, "O how love I thy law!" But to point out the many good effects that may be expected to flow from a discussion of questions concerning the infallible rule of your doctrine and life, your faith and practice, is not my design on the present occasion. Let me apprise you also, that I am not about to canvass the several abilities displayed on the respective sides of the controversy; nor about to advance, as if I were individually engaged in the dispute, a class of arguments formally in polemic array. No: I am going to propose for your meditation some few but vitally important matters, in an experimental and practical respect.

You have received the sacred Scriptures "not as the word of men, but as" they are "in truth, the word of God." Whence originated *your* belief that the Bible is his word? You know, from your own experience, that, in order to that belief in your minds, the Bible did certainly not derive its credibility and divine authority either from a pope, or a popish council, or the whole popish church: yet you believe, with tenfold more and with *other* assurance than the Romanists do, that "all scripture is given by inspiration of God." Nor do your firm belief and persuasion, that the Bible is God's word, rest on the authority of Luther, or Calvin, or the whole *Protestant* church. There is a pillar on which the corporation of a city have a certain law exposed to public notice; but, surely, that law does not derive its authority from the pillar. In such a respect may the church be figuratively called "the pillar and ground of the truth." Or, perhaps, the text in which the church is thus denominated, alludes to the cunningly devised fables engraved or inscribed on pillars and various other grounds in the temples of heathenism, and especially in the temple of the Ephesian great goddess Diana; and then the church is figuratively characterized as being the pillar and ground of the *truth* in contrast with those *cunningly devised fables*. No where do the sacred Scriptures tell us, that the church is the pillar and ground of believing the Bible to be the word of God. True, it was through the *instrumentality* of the church, believing, declaring, and proving all scripture to be given by inspiration of God; preserving the sacred oracles in their entireness and purity throughout every age; transmitting them from nation to nation, and from generation to generation; and every where publishing them for the conviction and conversion of sinners, and for the edification of saints, that you became convinced of the divine inspiration of the Bible; but the instrumentality of the church was not the *ground* of your believing that inspiration. The Bible cannot have derived its authority from the church: the true church derives her authority from the Bible. Many communities there are, clashing with each other, each styling itself *the church*. We cannot know, except from the Bible, which of them the *true* church is. From that inspired word of God, who "cannot lie," we know that the Romanists are not the true church. "Lo, they have rejected the word of the LORD; and what wisdom is in them?" Nay, more, horribly more; "Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he, as God, sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God!" Does not he blasphemously pretend that the authority of the Bible is grounded on his? The authority of the Bible depends on the Bible itself. The idea, that the sacred Scriptures derive their authority from the church, exhibits the *topsyturviness* of a foundation resting on its own superstructure, and the absurdity of an effect producing its own cause. The church being "built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ being the chief corner-stone;" who, but Romanists, can believe that the foundation is built upon the church? Means, instruments, and especially the gospel ministry, are used and employed, merely as means and instruments, in building on that foundation. "Now we believe," said the Samaritans to the woman of Samaria, who had been the organ of communicating to them intelligence of the Messiah's advent, "not because of thy saying; for we have heard him ourselves, and know that this is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the world." The woman's saying, then, was not the ground of their believing, but merely the means by which a way was opened for the belief, that Jesus was the Messiah. John had borne "witness unto the truth," viz: had announced Jesus to be the Christ: "but I," said Jesus, "receive not testimony from man." The belief, that Jesus was the Messiah, did not rest on the testimony of John: the testimony of John served but as means

by which people were led into that belief grounded on infinitely higher authority. "I have greater witness," said Jesus, "than the testimony of John." So the divinity of the sacred Scriptures is believed by you, not because the church believes and declares it, but because of their own divine authority.* What must you think, then, of a church that arrogates to herself the credit, and impudently maintains the blasphemous falsehood, that the belief even of the divine inspiration of the Bible is founded on her authority? A falsehood so repugnant to your own personal experience of that fundamental article of faith, and so manifestly refuted by the Bible, as well as by your own experience, that, in regard to less important articles, you can have no confidence in her. You know, from your own personal experience, that you believe the divine inspiration of the Bible; and you know likewise, that you do not acknowledge the authority of that church. What an impudent falsehood, then, that her authority is the foundation of your believing the Bible to be the word of God!

I will now barely mention certain internal and external evidences, by some or all of which you became convinced of the divine inspiration of the Bible; and then briefly remind you of some things you have experienced of the power of that inspired word. The Scripture doctrines, harmony, style, and prophecies, together with the well attested and well known truth of ordinary, extraordinary, and miraculous events recorded in that wonderful book, and the history of the origin and transmission of the sacred Scriptures, furnish those internal and external evidences; that history including the fact, that, when popery was crowding itself into the church, (for the *true* church never existed in popery,) the sacred oracles committed to her, were faithfully defended, preserved and promulgated by her, even while she hanged her "harps upon the willows," and sighed and cried in the midst of spiritual Babylon, till the time of the great Reformation, when the true worshippers of God came out from among the worshippers of the beast. Those internal and external evidences are sufficient to produce a speculative belief, that the Bible is the word of God. But you, beloved in the Lord, since you have experienced the power of that word, view those evidences in a light essentially different from that in which the merely speculative believer views them. In God's light do you "see light." "It is the Spirit that beareth witness, that (οτι) the Spirit (speaking in the word) is the truth." O how powerfully does the word, in the irresistible operations of the Holy Spirit, prove itself to be in your hearts! Your first great change, effected by the Holy Spirit with the word, was a passing "from death unto life." When you first heard Jesus call "his own sheep by name," omnipotently were you drawn "out of darkness into his marvellous light." And does he not continue to speak to you as never mere "man spake?" Your hearts "burn within" you, while Jesus, in the Bible, talks with you "by the way, and while he" opens to you "the Scriptures." He exclaims, "Mary;" and your hearts reply, "Rabboni." Behold, does he not "stand at the door, and knock?" You hear his voice. It is the voice of your Beloved, who is "God of gods, and Lord of lords; a great God, a mighty, and a terrible," at whom "the mountains quake, and the hills melt." "Hear, O heavens, and give ear, O earth! for" not a pope, nor a popish council, nor the popish church, nor a Luther, nor a Calvin, but "the LORD hath spoken." "The voice of the LORD is powerful; the voice of the LORD is full of majesty." Is it possible, that there actually exists a scarlet-colored, seven-headed, and ten-horned "beast," so "full of names of blasphemy," as to pretend to clothe God's own word with authority?

* *Desine, cur vidcat nemo sine numine numen, Mirari, solem quis sine sole videt?*—i. e. Cease to wonder why no one sees God without God: who sees the sun without the sun?

The sacred Scriptures, as the rule of your doctrine and life, your faith and practice, must be a perfect, a complete, and an infallible rule: for otherwise they would not be God's word. "As many as walk according to this rule, peace be on them, and mercy, and upon the Israel of God;" for "the law of the LORD is perfect, converting the soul: the testimony of the LORD is sure, making wise the simple: the statutes of the LORD are right, rejoicing the heart: the commandment of the LORD is pure, enlightening the eyes: the fear of the LORD is clean, enduring forever: the judgments of the LORD are true and righteous altogether." "These are written, THAT ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and THAT believing ye might have life through his name." "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable," (ὠφέλιμος, *utilis*, useful,) "for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; THAT the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." Were the rule imperfect, incomplete, or fallible, it would not answer those ends. And besides, the same reason why there is an awful denunciation against him who adds aught to, or takes aught from what was revealed to Moses and to John, (Deut. vi. 2; Rev. xxii. 18, 19,) holds in regard to every other portion of the Bible. What have you to do, then, with any tradition of the Romanists? Your Lord says, "In vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." The text, (2 Thes. ii. 15.) "Hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word, or our epistle," refers not to a difference of substantial matters propounded in respectively different ways, but to the different ways of propounding the *same* substantial matters; for the apostle Paul, though declaring "all the counsel of God," yet said "none other things than those which the prophets and Moses" had said "should come." Acts xx. 27; xxvi. 22.

Here we may remark, that, if Paul, while declaring "all the counsel of God," still said "none other things than those which the prophets and Moses" had said "should come," then the Old Testament must be a perfect, a complete, and an infallible rule, as well as the Old and New Testaments together are. For instance, does not the Old Testament, where we read, "The LORD thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken," comprise all that the New Testament prescribes for the rule of your faith and conduct? The text, (Heb. xi. 40.) "That they," viz. Old Testament saints, "without us should not be made perfect," implies no imperfection in the Old Testament, but refers to the state of the church and of individual believers. The Old Testament was the gospel of promise: the New Testament is the gospel of fulfilment. Now the dispensation of the gospel of fulfilment is better than the dispensation of the gospel of promise. And the church under the Old Testament dispensation was treated as a child, to whom the mysteries of faith were propounded in shadows and similitudes, called *σκιαι*, rudiments, elements; a name signifying such a mode of instruction as is adapted to children. "The heir," i. e. the church, "as long as he" was "a child," as the church was under the Old Testament dispensation, differed "nothing from a servant, though he" was "lord of all, but was under tutors and governors until the time appointed of the Father." But now, under the New Testament dispensation, we are treated as adults, put into possession of that "better thing which God hath provided for us." Now we must have and manifest a manliness correspondent to the sublime prophecies concerning the latter day. "In that day," according to one of those prophecies, "shall the LORD defend the inhabitants of Jerusalem: and he that is feeble among them at that day shall be as David; and the house of David shall be as God, as the angel of the LORD before them." But, however different the two dispen-

sations, both prescribe the same perfect, complete and infallible rule, i. e. God's word. Whether the rule was committed to any writings before the books of Moses, I need not inquire. That the light in which it was exhibited through successive ages gradually increased, from the mother-promise of the seed of the woman, till the close of the Apocalypse, does not affect the perfection, the completeness, or the infallibility of the rule itself. We are not to suppose, that the rule was not perfect, complete, and infallible, in what is called the unwritten word, before the time of Moses; or that the Old Testament contains but a part of the rule, and that the New Testament supplies the remainder. Therefore when I say that the canon of the sacred Scripture is now complete, I mean that the books of the Old and the New Testaments contain all the divine revelations of that same one perfect, complete, and infallible rule. Nothing is lost, nothing is lacking, of what pertained to the canon. He who has given us the Bible, does also graciously preserve it pure and entire for us. The books referred to by certain titles in the Bible, but not found extant under those titles, either were introduced, under other titles, into the canon of the Scriptures, or were never a part of the canon. And enough is revealed: more may not be expected: nothing may be added. Persevere, then, in rejecting all human traditions and commandments taught for doctrines: for you have in the Old, and now also in the New Testament, a very "sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day-star arise in your hearts."

But you are told, that the rule does not work well, inasmuch as it is the cause of numberless contradictory and violently clashing tenets even among Protestants themselves; and also inasmuch as the characters of Calvin and other eminent reformers, adopting that rule, labor under some very grievous imputations. Even Socinianism is ascribed to that rule. What a blasphemy! True, some profess to mean only *the common use* of the rule, and not the rule itself; and so the blasphemy may not seem quite so direct and gross. But can you believe, or do Romanists themselves believe, that Socinians follow that rule? or that God's own word, or its use, tends to any false doctrines or practices? Rather say, "Yea, let God be true, but every man a liar." "Wherewithal," O Lord, "shall a young man cleanse his way? By taking heed thereto according to thy word." Whatever the neglect, rejection, misuse, abuse, or perversion of the word may do, the use of the word never tends to errors either doctrinal or practical. The errors are not in the word, but in the depraved understanding. "The statutes of the LORD are RIGHT—are a STRAIGHT" rule; though the race of man is "a perverse and crooked generation." But the crookedness of man does not crook the rule: the rule remains always the same. Man must conform to the rule: the rule will not conform to perverse man. Christianity is not to be rejected, because papists, professing it, worship images and other idols; and so that rule is not to be rejected, because many, though professing it, do actually not follow it. As well may the Jews class you with the gross idolaters of popery, because you profess to be christians, and the papists do so too; as the papists class you with Socinians, because you follow that rule, and professedly the Socinians do so too. But why multiply? In a word, why has God commanded and highly commended the common use of his word? "Search the Scriptures." The Bereans "were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the Scriptures daily." And with respect to the grievous charges, whether true or slanderous, preferred against certain eminent reformers, if you should suppose, for the sake of argument, that those charges were not only tenfold more grievous, but also completely sub-

stantiated, your position would appear the firmer, that no man's word is to be substituted in the room of God's, for the rule of your doctrine and life: for, if even those eminent worthies were such deplorably fallible men, what confidence can you have in the *ipse, ipsa, or ipsum dicit* or word of a horribly depraved pope, popish church, or popish council? If those reformers were the rule of your doctrine and life, then, indeed, your rule would be accountable for all the doctrinal and practical errors of those reformers: if popery were the rule of your doctrine and life, then your rule would be accountable for all the blasphemies and horrible-ness of popery: but if God's word is the rule of your doctrine and life, then—*what?* Enough, that God "cannot lie."

Continue to "prove all things," then, doctrinal, experimental, and practical, by God's word, as the only perfect, complete, and infallible standard of your faith; and "hold fast that which is good." Alas! how much of a popish spirit is pervading Protestant churches! "Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God." Remember, that the great maxim of your faith is, "To the law and the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." See how many means of man's own device there are, such as unseemly meetings and whisperings, fictitious narratives, overawing associations, proud boastings, unprincipled excitements, &c. used for the conversion of sinners, and eulogized as if superior to the means of God's appointment. Try those artful human means by the standard of your faith; and then say whether God can bless them, and still honor, as he certainly will, his own institutions. Read the pompous narratives and reports of *enormous* conversions and revivals produced by such "sleight and cunning craftiness of men"—men eulogizing, without a blush, their own work as *God-like*; and judge, from the standard of your faith, whether Papists may not boast, with propriety, that Protestants are fast returning to the principles of "holy mother." For yourselves, have your understandings, wills, propensities, conduct, words, religion, your very nature, conformed to the word of God. Far worse than useless is that faith, which flows from ignorance, error, and falsehood. O how many a one, bloated with an imagination of his extraordinary piety, produced by the sleight and cunning craftiness of men, flatters himself, that he is wonderfully religious and spiritual, soaring far above that *dead* old fashioned letter, the Bible! whereas all his experience, and spirituality, and wonderful piety, are nothing but a fantastic image of a deceiving and self-deceived carnal mind. Beloved in the Lord, suffer me to repeat the great maxim, "To the law and to the testimony." The various other uses, the perspicuity, &c. of sacred Scripture, and the question, who is the judge of religious disputes, open a wide field, in which, peradventure, I may, in some future communication for the Religious Monitor, take a short walk with you.

V. D. M.

ART. III. Public, Social Covenanting.

RELIGIOUS ordinances owe their efficacy to a divine appointment. Being in themselves wholly inadequate to produce those effects which God accomplishes through their instrumentality, many have been, by this circumstance, led into fatal delusions. Some have regarded ordinances as *effectual* means of grace; and in this way have ascribed to external observances that work, which it is the peculiar province of the Holy Spirit to effect internally in the soul of man. Others, taking the opposite

extreme, have looked more to the *intention* of those engaging in the observance of ordinances, and to the manner of observing them, than to their nature. Hence the intention of the observer having been taken in the room of a divine appointment, they have, in some cases, varied the ordinances, and, in almost all, the manner of their observance; so that it is no uncommon thing to hear from the lips of a backsliding church, respecting this and the other ordinances, that it is not suited to our times. Having lost sight of the divine appointment, they have added to, taken from, and varied divine ordinances, according to human views of expediency and the supposed fitness of things. This is believed to be one of the secret springs of that flood of modern inventions, or new measures, which have deluged the Christian church, and almost blinded the eyes of men to a discovery of divine truth. But all such observances are vain and abominable in the sight of God. He will loathe them as he did the offerings of his ancient covenant people in the times of their apostacy. "He that killeth an ox is as if he slew a man; he that sacrificeth a lamb, as if he cut off a dog's neck; he that offereth an oblation, as if he offered swine's blood; he that burneth incense, as if he blessed an idol: yea, they have chosen **THEIR OWN WAY**, and their soul delighteth in their abominations." Isa. lxvi. 3.

Among divine ordinances **PUBLIC, SOCIAL COVENANTING** has always held a conspicuous place in reforming times, and has always been virulently opposed by apostatising professors. In its nature, it enters more or less into all religious duties, all scriptural ordinances, and all acceptable approaches to the Divine Majesty. But we speak now of formal, explicit, and direct covenanting, in which the covenanter, after due examination of his conscience in matters of true and false religion, and a humble confession of his sins and weakness, takes hold of God's covenant by faith; avouches the Lord to be his God, in opposition to all false Gods, and all idolatrous esteem of the creatures; and in the strength of promised grace, **PROMISES** and **SWEARS** with uplifted hand, that he will hold fast his name and his cause, unfeignedly endeavoring to walk in his ways, to keep his commandments, and to hearken to his voice, in opposition to all divisive courses, to all latitudinarian schemes, and to all prevailing errors. This kind of covenanting has the divine warrant,* and has, in a peculiar manner, distinguished the true Israel of God, in reforming times, both under the Old and the New Testament dispensations. We find the Israelites neglecting and despising this duty till God afflicted them with severe judgments; but when they were led to a discovery of their sinfulness and apostacy from God, we find them renewing their solemn covenant obligations. Neh. xi. 38; 2 Chron. xxxiv. 31. Then they **SWARE**, "the Lord liveth in truth, in judgment, and in righteousness." "And they shall be mine, saith the Lord of hosts, in that day when I make up my jewels," was the gracious reply. Then they had peace in all their borders. In like manner, in New Testament times, when the first dawns of the Reformation began to break in upon the long night of popery, we find this duty revived in a wonderful manner. It was repeatedly engaged in by all ranks of men in England, Ireland, and Scotland, from the year 1580, down to near the time of the Secession. And it is now *one hundred years* since the Secession church took its rise, in consequence of various abuses and corruptions in the church of Scotland, and *ninety* years since she engaged in this so-

* It is not the design of this paper to prove the divine warrant for covenanting; this has been done satisfactorily by many of the Lord's servants, who being dead yet speak; but we deem this a suitable occasion to call the attention of the reader to a Catechism on this subject by the late Dr. Anderson, in which he will find it treated by the hand of a master and all difficulties cleared up. Its cost is only twelve and a half cents, and an edition has lately issued from the press. It is an invaluable summary of scripture doctrine on this point, and should be read by every professor of the Christian religion capable of reading the English language.

lemn work in her highest Judicatory, as a constituted Court of Christ's house; since which time, through the mercy of God, there has been a regular succession of covenanting in the Secession, down to the present day. In 1829, the Associate Synod renewed her covenant obligations at Pittsburgh; and in the following year, at Philadelphia, since which time, a goodly number of congregations have followed in the same work. With the *civil* part of the Solemn League and Covenant, the Associate Synod has nothing to do, judging it improper to connect civil and religious matters, while at the same time she approves of what was then done. The circumstances in which the church found herself placed at that time justified the step taken; and hence the Associate church acknowledges the descending obligation of the *ecclesiastical* part of that covenant; because the church of God is one and indivisible. She is the same now that she was when first constituted on earth, and she will continue to be the same, till the *angel standing upon the earth and the sea, shall swear by him that liveth forever and ever, that time shall be no longer.*

Although it is foreign to our present design to prove the divine warrant for this duty, yet it may not be unsuitable to answer some of the most common objections brought against its observance.

It is objected, then, that "covenanting under the Old Testament, was a ceremonial duty, and therefore is not warranted under the New." We reply, that this objection is invalid. 1. Because covenanting is a moral duty. To avouch the Lord to be our God is certainly a moral duty; otherwise, the duty of acknowledging God must have been confined to the Jewish nation, and must have ceased to be binding on any of the human race, when the ceremonial rites ceased to be observed; an absurdity no one will maintain. 2d. Because it is predicted that this duty shall be performed in New Testament times. "In that day shall five cities in the land of Egypt speak the language of Canaan, and swear to the Lord of hosts: one shall be called, the city of destruction. In that day shall there be an altar to the Lord in the midst of the land of Egypt, and a pillar at the border thereof to the Lord. And it shall be for a sign and for a witness unto the Lord of hosts in the land of Egypt: for they shall cry unto the Lord because of the oppressors, and he shall send them a saviour, and a great one, and he shall deliver them. And the Lord shall be known to Egypt, and the Egyptians shall know the Lord in that day, and shall do sacrifice and oblation; yea, they shall vow a vow unto the Lord, and perform it." Isa. xix. 21—18. "One shall say, I am the Lord's; and another shall call himself by the name of Jacob; and another shall subscribe with his hand unto the Lord, and surname himself by the name of Israel." Isa. xlv. 5. "They shall ask the way to Zion, with their faces thitherward, saying, Come, and let us join ourselves to the Lord in a perpetual covenant that shall not be forgotten." Jer. 1. 5.

It is objected, that the moral law, being perfect, imposes the highest obligation, therefore, covenanting is unwarrantable, and cannot impose any additional obligation. We reply, that the moral law is indeed perfect, and that in covenanting, we attempt obedience to one of its requirements. And thus *voluntarily* yield our assent to those things which were previously binding on us. And further, the law binds us to yield a perfect obedience to whatever God reveals; but if we voluntarily swear to yield this obedience, then, by disobeying, we incur the additional guilt of perjury, and, in a more direct manner, violate the ninth commandment, than could otherwise be the case. Therefore, in covenanting, there is no addition made to the perfection of the moral law, but there is a superadded obligation on us to keep that law. This is illustrated in the affairs of men. Every subject of a well ordered government is bound to obey all its lawful requirements; but if he *swears allegiance* to the government,

he unquestionably adds to his former obligation of obedience. And if men swear allegiance to earthly potentates, how much more shall they not swear allegiance to the King of Zion, who "is the King of kings, and Lord of lords."

It is objected, that "posterity are not bound by the covenant engagements of their ancestors." To make this objection valid, one of two things must be proved; to wit: either that the church of God is not the same in all ages, or that the matter of the covenant engagements of their ancestors is not scriptural. Now this has not been done by any one of all the enemies of this duty; nor can it be done. And although it may be conceded, without any detriment to our argument, that mistakes may be connected with the manner of entering into a covenant, or that there may be an addition of extraneous matter; yet if the substance of the covenant be there the deed is valid; notwithstanding one of the parties may be ignorant, at the time, of the full extent of the obligation assumed. For although the Israelites entered into a rash covenant with the Gibeonites, yet the matter being *lawful*, the covenant was binding on them and on their posterity. Josh. ix. 14—19. And if a covenant among men, entered into under such circumstances, cannot be disannulled, much more cannot the covenant of God be set aside. So that any supposed difficulty some of the enemies of this work have thrown in the way, because our ancestors entered into the covenant of God under different circumstances from those in which we are placed, or because extraneous matters entered into their covenant, falls to the ground. The descending obligation of the covenant of our ancestors then rests on us, because the maker of the covenant, God himself, declares it to be everlasting; because they entered into it really and truly, and because we actually swore *IN THEM*; otherwise we are not members of the same body of Christ. Why, then, should this plain position be rejected, especially by such as acknowledge the right of infants to baptism. In baptism, do not the covenant obligations of the parents rest upon the children?

This subject addresses itself to Protestant churches in a language that cannot be misunderstood. They are the descendants of covenanting ancestors; and they have not only neglected the duty, but have thrown contempt upon it. Will not God be avenged on such a nation? Will he not bring a sword upon them, that shall avenge the quarrel of his covenant? Lev. xxvi. 25. For "the church, in her transaction with God, is considered by Him as a permanent body, unaffected by the lapse of time, or by the change of individuals. Therefore, many ages after, He thus addresses that church which had sworn to Him in the wilderness; *I remember thee, the kindness of thy youth, the love of thine espousals: of old time, I have broken thy yoke, and burst thy bands, and thou saidst I will not transgress.* Jer. ii. 2—20. He considers her members as bound by this covenant, as really as if they had been the very persons with whom it was originally made, *I swear unto thee, and entered into a covenant with thee, saith the Lord, and thou becamest mine.* Ezek. xvi. 8. We accordingly find, that the guilt of covenant breaking was charged on succeeding generations, even although they had not formally renewed their covenant; and that they were punished as covenant breakers. 2 Kings xviii. 11, 12; Judges ii. 20, 21.*

It is objected, that this work is not necessary, because we engage to the same covenant of duty in the observance of the Lord's Supper. To this we reply, that the observance of one duty can never excuse the neglect of another, even though the duties be similar in many respects, any more than refraining from the commission of murder can excuse for

* Secession Testimony, 1804, pp. 109, 110.

the violation of the Sabbath. For the same covenant is entered into in baptism, and this surely cannot excuse the neglect of the supper; but rather increases the obligation to observe it: so in like manner the observance of the Lord's supper increases the obligation to engage in the duty of covenanting.

This ordinance of God's appointment, like that of the Lord's supper, is not restricted to stated times and seasons; but is always seasonable, although, from its solemn nature and the duties connected with it, it should not be too frequently engaged in. The oath of allegiance to our King needs not, from its nature, be taken but once; yet every congregation should engage in it with sufficient frequency to give young members an opportunity of engaging; and on such occasions, it is sufficient, that those who have formerly engaged give assent to their former deed. But there are times and circumstances which call loudly upon the people of God to enter into His covenant in a formal, explicit manner, to wit: when the despisers of this duty are increasing in numbers and boldness; when error is disseminated with increasing zeal and success; when the spirit of persecution is arising and increasing in bitterness; when backsliders go farther and farther in apostacy, and refuse to be reclaimed; when divine truth has ceased to have any binding authority on the consciences of men: when the preaching of the gospel is, in a great measure, "like water spilled upon the ground which cannot be gathered;" when the doctrines of the grace of God are supplanted by the metaphysical speculations of men of corrupt minds, and human inventions substituted in the room of divine ordinances; when the few that make a public profession of religion know not what they profess, nor the obligations they assume; when the civil authorities enact laws contrary to the revealed will of God; and when the people welcome and cherish among them the persecuting church of Rome; and when we are in imminent danger of divine judgments. Surely, in such a time, we are called upon to return to the Lord with weeping and with supplication, and "join ourselves to the Lord in an everlasting covenant," that we may find protection and safety, "when he cometh out of his place to punish the inhabitants of the earth for their iniquity." And we have a confluence of all these evils in our day, and in this nation. Who, with the Scriptures of truth in his hand, can contemplate such a state of things without trembling for the cause of reformation principles and the spiritual interests of his countrymen? And let it be remembered, that with this cause must go civil liberty and all that is essential to the great body of the people in temporal peace and prosperity. Gospel ordinances will be either removed entirely, or which is more probable, be converted into engines of oppression, to strip the poor, not merely of their little of this world's goods, but also of their hope of heaven and future blessedness, that prowling Jesuits may riot in luxury, debauchery and crime, by means of their traffic in the souls of men. This nation appears to be fast approaching that awful precipice from which the Jewish nation, distinguished by Jehovah more than all the other nations of the earth, plunged into the gulph of misery and despair; and to whom the long period of eighteen hundred years has brought no relief. They have alternately suffered the fires of the Beast, and the bowstring of the false prophet. They are still a "people scattered and peeled." They wander in pagan lands the most abject and miserable of human beings, subsisting by beggary and having no certain dwelling place. If such be their outward condition, who can tell the darkness and misery that reign in their souls? They are conscious of the anger of the Almighty, and yet they have no heart to return to him. Whence, then, all this misery? Every Christian knows the answer. God, speaking by the prophet Isaiah, (chap. lxxv. 12—16,) and looking forward to

the time when the cup of their iniquity should become wholly filled, says, "Therefore will I number you to the sword, and ye shall bow down to the slaughter: because when I called, ye did not answer; when I spake, ye did not hear; but did evil before mine eyes, and did choose that wherein I delighted not. Therefore thus saith the Lord God, Behold, *my* servants [*they* were nominally *his* servants like the inhabitants of our own land] shall drink, but ye shall be thirsty: behold, my servants shall rejoice, but ye shall be ashamed: behold, my servants shall sing for joy of heart, but ye shall cry for sorrow of heart, and shall howl for vexation of spirit. And ye shall leave your name for a curse unto my chosen: for the Lord God shall slay thee, and call his servants by another name: that he who blesseth himself in the earth shall bless himself in the God of truth: and he that SWEARETH in the earth, shall swear by the God of truth.

It is not supposed, that the same *kind* of judgments can ever come upon any other nation for contempt of God's authority, and abuse of privileges; but they may be equally disastrous to individuals. Yet we have no fears for the church of the living God. Her boundaries may be greatly reduced; but she cannot be destroyed. Many who have been brought into the visible kingdom of God, on earth, may be destroyed in a most signal manner, for their abuse of privileges; but God will bestow these upon others; and there shall still be a people who shall *bleſs themſelves in the God of truth, and ſhall ſwear by the God of truth.*

These observations have already extended beyond any thing that was designed, and must come to a close. They were occasioned by recently witnessing this solemn work in the Associate congregation of South Argyle, Washington county, N. Y., under the pastoral inspection of the Rev. James P. Miller. On Thursday, 20th of June, 104 persons, 92 of whom were members of this congregation, entered into the solemn covenant of God, and 18 who had formerly engaged in this work gave assent to their former deed. Seven ministers were present, who took part in the work; and on the following Sabbath the sacrament of the supper was dispensed, and nearly four hundred received this seal of the covenant. Seldom have we witnessed a more solemn or interesting scene. It was a fertile spot in a barren desert, and demonstrated to the humble believer, that however low the church may be at times reduced, God will not leave himself without a witness. May we not hope, that this example will be extensively followed by other congregations in connection with us. The most happy fruits, with the blessing of God, might reasonably be expected to follow. For this ordinance is calculated to lead persons to a thorough examination and knowledge of their religious profession, without which their religion is of little value. It is calculated to strengthen confidence among brethren, and, where it has been impaired, to restore it. We are to be mutual helpers of one another; and how can we be helpers to our brethren better than to give the assurance, that we will stand by them, sympathise with them, and encourage them in all their struggles to maintain truth and holiness in the earth? It is a sifting ordinance; it leads directly to self-examination, and enables persons to discover whether they are prepared to surrender all and follow Christ, or whether they still cherish the lingering fear, that they shall one day forsake his service. It is a comforting ordinance; it brings the believer in a direct and formal manner under the dominion and powerful protection of the "King Eternal." The kingdoms of this world may dash one against another, and be broken as a potter's vessel; but he is a citizen of a kingdom that cannot be moved. The fires of persecution may be kindled, but he is undismayed. Death ceases to be terrible to him; for he is put in possession of all the benefits of Christ's purchase; "*he that hath the*

Son hath eternal life." It is a glorious ordinance, in which God condescends to pledge his glorious perfections for the salvation of the believer. And it is all of grace. In it God comes to us with his everlasting covenant; and the Lord Jesus comes to us as our surety, having fulfilled for us the condition which God has annexed to this covenant, so that the true-hearted covenanter, notwithstanding his overwhelming sense of sinfulness and weakness, may say with David, "He hath made with me an everlasting covenant, ordered in all things and sure," which "is all my salvation and all my desire." O Lord, "forget not the congregation of thy poor forever. Have respect unto thy COVENANT: for the dark places of the earth are full of the habitations of cruelty."

To conclude, we notice an error into which some of the friends of this duty have fallen, respecting the *extent* of the obligations assumed in covenanting with God. Some suppose that the covenanter does not engage to *perfect*, but *universal* obedience, and thus make a distinction where none ought to be made. God requires of every intelligent being in the universe perfect and perpetual obedience, be he saint or sinner, angel or devil; and his language is, "be ye holy, for I am holy;" and, says Christ, "be ye perfect even as your Father in Heaven is perfect." Now these requirements of the divine law lead the true covenanter out of himself wholly unto Christ as his only and great Law-fulfiller. It is the perfect obedience and strength of Christ, that the covenanter has respect to, and it is this God has respect to in accepting him in this service. The covenanter beholds Christ as his, in the gift and grant of God in the gospel, and in this ordinance takes hold of him by faith, and appropriates him as his own; and so God, looking upon the covenanter in Christ, and regarding him as one with Christ, beholds no iniquity in him. And in this way does the believer become perfect and holy in the eye of the law, though *all* his dross which he has, *in himself considered*, will not be taken away till death. "I am the true vine, and my Father is the husbandman. 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. Abide in me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; no more can ye, except ye abide in me. I am the vine, ye are the branches: he that abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit; for without me ye can do nothing." John xv. 1, 2, 4, 5. Thus it is manifest, that the covenanter engages to *perfect* obedience, which he truly possesses, not indeed in himself, but in Christ his Head and Surety.

ART. IV. *Strictures on a Dissertation on the Second Psalm.*

WE have received a number of complaints respecting certain expressions found in the *Dissertation* which we published in the last Monitor. It may be proper to state that we had intended to have accompanied that paper with some remarks on the points complained of; but in our absence, it was conveyed to the printer, and before our return, was worked off. Our correspondent, in his "strictures," below, has so fully anticipated us in what we intended at present to say, that we choose to let him speak in our place, and the rather as he is not in connection with the Associate Church. Hence the author of the *Dissertation* (who is a respected minister of another ecclesiastical body, but favourably known to our community by his published works) will perceive that the complaints above alluded to are not confined to members of our denomination. Indeed some of those who have complained to us have taken it for granted, that the author was one of our own ministers, and were, accordingly, exceedingly grieved at what they

considered his unsoundness in the faith. One Brother thus writes us—"I have no knowledge of the writer, he may be some one of my best friends, but this could not change my views of his opinions," &c. The faulty expressions in the Dissertation must have arisen, we think, from inattention; and may we not hope that the author will correct them? We have seen his Dissertations on two other of the Psalms, with which we were exceedingly pleased. We regard a work of the kind which he has in contemplation to be needed, and provided it should not contradict the doctrines and principles espoused by the Associate church, he may confidently expect to meet with encouragement from that quarter. But we will not detain the reader any longer from the following STRUCTURES.

MR. EDITOR—The last Number of the Monitor contains an "Extract from a work soon to be published, which is to be entitled 'Helps to Christian Devotion, consisting of Dissertations on the Psalms.'" I am about to offer a few remarks on that Extract. It is a dissertation on the second psalm. While I speak in commendation of the author's many excellent remarks in that dissertation, I must not forbear to express also my belief and regret, that, unless I mistake, he deviates from the truth on the fundamental doctrine of the Trinity. I indulge a hope, that, before the publication of the work, he will be rectified in regard to that all-important doctrine; and that, if such of his sentiments on that doctrine, as in my view appear to be erroneous to a very dangerous extent, and to be an error into which he seems to have slipped probably through more than ordinary carelessness, were exposed with the spirit of meekness, and barely pointed out to him, he would immediately renounce them.

The author says, "It appears, from the history of creation and providence," (but why not of redemption? for he immediately adds,) "as it is presented to us in the word of God, that the principal object, which God the Father had in view in all his works, in this world, and in all his works among the angels, was to honour his only begotten Son." To say that the "principal" object was to honour the Son, signifies, to my apprehension, what is absolutely impossible; viz. that the Son can be honoured exclusively of the other two persons in the Godhead. I can understand "that all men should honour the Son, EVEN AS they honour the Father;" and thus also should honour the Father, EVEN AS they honour the Son; but how one of the persons can be honoured exclusively of the other two I can not conceive. If either of the persons were excluded from any honour whatever in any degree, the whole Godhead would be excluded from that honour in the same degree: for each of the persons possesses the whole Godhead, so that the whole Godhead would be excluded in the excluded person. "The LORD," says the Supreme Wisdom, "POSSESSED ME in the beginning of his way, before his works of old." "Believe me," says Jesus, "that I am IN THE FATHER, and the Father IN ME." "My name," says the Father, "is in him." "As the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself;" and surely that is independent divine life, it being from eternity. From everlasting to everlasting does God the Father communicate the whole divine essence to the Son; and from everlasting to everlasting does God the Father communicate, through the Son, who likewise communicates, though as the second person in order, the whole divine essence to the Holy Spirit; each person always retaining and possessing the whole divine essence without beginning, succession, or ending of duration. Consequently, "he that honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father;" and the Holy Spirit is not excluded, for "these three are one." But I will not enlarge here with express texts for proof; my present purpose being little more than to specificate the author's error.

The great business of the sacred scriptures is, to exhibit the three-fold economy of the Triune God, one in essence, and three in persons. From

the manner of God's existence arises a distinctive order of the persons, and of their operations; the operations and works being according to the manner of existence, and the order of the persons; and the persons being first the Father, second the Word or Son, and third the Holy Ghost. (1 John v. 7.) The manner and order appear most clearly in the three-fold economy of the persons in the execution of the covenant of grace, where the three distinct persons act respectively as Judge, Surety, Sanctifier, &c. for, though all God's workings outwards, his transient works, technically called *opera ad extra*, are common, since his omniscience, omnipotence, every divine perfection, the whole divine essence, whence the works proceed, are common, to the three persons, there is a greater manifestation of one of the persons in a work specially ascribed to him, than of the other two persons in that work. But God's workings terminating inwards, technically called *opera ad intra*, are personal. Under the covenant of grace there are also several duties and sins very clearly distinguished in respect of the three distinct persons; as in the commands and exhortations, "Kiss the Son," "Quench not the Spirit," &c. But neither does the manner of the existence of God, nor the order of the persons and of their operations, nor the respective distinction of duties and sins, imply any inferiority of dignity on the part of either of the persons, as if the three persons were not to be equally honoured as the one true God, simply and perfectly but one, so perfectly simple, that an angel, though a pure spirit, can not be so simply but one. How then could God the Father's "*principal*" object have been to honour his only begotten Son. I am not aware that any of the orthodox did ever disapprove of the sentiment which Marck, in his System, (chap. v. sec. 5.) expresses in the words, "*Convenire personas . . . in ἰσότητι seu æqualitate honoris:*" viz. the persons unite in identity or equality of dignity and honour.

After an unwarrantable attempt to honour the Son, the author of the dissertation seems to degrade him. The dissertation reads, "But there is the distinction of authority. The Father has authority over the Son, and the Spirit, for he sends them both into the world, as he sends the angels. He gives his command, and they obey; and the Holy Spirit obeys both the Father and the Son." Here, not by way of treating with levity the all-important subject before us, but by way of shewing how strangely some will err in respect of the subject, I remark, that I have known one who conceived, that the distinction was very similar to that between the respective authorities of a colonel, a major, and a captain. I do not suppose, however, that the author of the dissertation means any such similarity. The source of his error here seems to be, that he lost sight of "the covenant" of which he himself has been speaking. Neither of the persons in the Godhead is inferior to the other two in authority, or in any respect, except by the eternal "counsel of peace;" and even there the inferiority is not proper, but economical. By that eternal counsel, contract, covenant, or free voluntary compact between the three persons, the first person asserts, manifests, and vindicates the majesty and honour of the Godhead in general; prescribes a law for the second person as the Surety for the elect; demands perfect satisfaction of him as the surety; and rewards him as being not naturally, but voluntarily, a "servant," whose "reward for the travail of his soul" is with his God, and in whose hand "the pleasure of the Lord" is prospering. Thus the first person is "the God of our Lord Jesus Christ" as *Mediator*, God and man in one person, a *voluntary* servant; who, addressing the first person, says, "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:" for, irrespectively of the Mediatorial office, the first person could not be the God of the second. What we have now said applies to all such scripture texts as

imply inferiority on the part of the second or of the third person: for, as the exalted Jesus has "received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost," the third person is not excluded from the covenant, but pertains to the promised reward. Irrespectively of that covenant compact, the words *begotten*, *sent*, &c. applied to the second and the third persons, do not imply various degrees of authority, but refer to the manner and order of existence. It is in the eternal nature of God, that the divine essence exists in Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; the Father begetting the Son, the Son begotten by the Father, and the Holy Spirit proceeding from both. It is no imperfection that some things ascribed to one of the persons, cannot be ascribed to another person in the Godhead; but to exist in three distinct persons, each person having his personal properties, is a perfection of the whole Godhead, and of each person.

The author of the dissertation says, "The Father, therefore, decreed from eternity, that the Son should always proceed from him, and be his representative; and the Sonship of Christ, in his divine nature was eternal as the decree was eternal." Here the author, I think, is inconsistent with himself. He has already told us, correctly too, that the decree mentioned in the second Psalm, is "the covenant," though perhaps he might rather have said certain covenant stipulations. Now here he makes the eternal Sonship dependent on that covenant or decree. But how could the Father and the Son enter mutually into a covenant, which, in the order of nature, if the author be correct, was prior to the Sonship? Though the eternal filiation is the Father's "daily delight," indeed, still it does not depend on his decree, or good-pleasure, but flows from his nature. He is the *natural* Father of the Son, whose Sonship is not by a decree, but *by nature*. The ground of that filial relation is not an eternal decree, but an eternal *generation*. The Father, addressing the Son, says, "This day," i. e. in eternity, as the author admits, "have I BEGOTTEN thee." The word *begotten* there signifies the same relation, all imperfections excepted, as a father among mankind sustains to his natural son. True, among men, paternity and sonship imply priority and dependence; but imperfections do not exist in the Godhead. Nor do we find, among men, time or duration without succession; but we dare not suppose, therefore, that God's eternity consists of successive moments. "Adam begat a son in his own likeness." God the Father begets a Son who is "the brightness of the Father's glory, and the EXPRESS image of the Father's person." Not in a figurative, but in a most literal, a perfect, and a complete sense, then, all imperfections excepted, is the first person, the eternal natural "Father of our Lord Jesus Christ" as the eternal natural Son.

The dissertation contains yet one particular to be specially noticed; though there are more, but I omit to point them out, that do not meet my approbation. I do not agree with the author in some of his remarks concerning the human nature of Christ, and the filial relation of the regenerate. "The holy thing that was to be born of the virgin," and to "be called the Son of God," was not merely the human nature of Christ, but the person of the Mediator. Christ's human nature never existed separately from his divine, whether in his conception, birth, death, or sepulchre. Though his body and soul had separated, both remained united to his divine nature. It was the Prince of Life, who was crucified, dead, and buried. Ye "have killed the Prince of Life, whom God hath raised from the dead." But if, as the author admits, the second person is the eternal Son of God; and if, in an inferior sense, "the human nature of Jesus Christ," as the author expressly says, "is the Son of God;" then, as Nestorius maintained, there must be two sons, and thus two persons, as well as two natures, in the Mediator. The author,

in his inference from Rom. i. 4. says, "Jesus Christ, as to his human nature, is declared to be the Son of God with power;" but the proper inference is, I believe, that, as the Son actively, by his own power, arose from the dead, he was declared to be the Son according to his *divine* nature, viz: "according to the Spirit of holiness," his divine nature being sometimes called "the Spirit," Heb. ix. 14. 1 Tim. iii. 16, &c., and not according to his human nature. In respect of our filial relation to God, the author might have been explicit, if he had not made Christ's dependent on the decree. Our filial relation to God does depend on his decree, grace, good-pleasure: Christ's does not, &c. The psalms, and especially the eighty-ninth psalm in which there is even a contrast between David and Christ, contain many things not applicable to David. The covenant or decree mentioned in the second psalm, I have said, is not the ground of Christ's eternal Sonship: the Sonship was a ground of the covenant. As if our Lord had said, I am going to tell concerning the decree, institute, or ordinance; it having just now been mentioned, that I am set King upon the holy hill of Zion. The first thing to be noticed, before I exhibit particularly the nature of the covenant or decree, is, that, even as the LORD hath said unto me, I am the Son by eternal generation; my eternal Sonship being a prerequisite to my entering into the covenant; "for who is this that engaged his heart to approach unto me? saith the LORD."

I think I have exposed several real blemishes in the dissertation: but it contains also many excellent things, too good to be lost.

You that have read these few strictures, permit me to exhort you to be well established on the all-important doctrine of the Trinity. That doctrine is the foundation of the whole gospel. Let us be willingly subject to the three-fold economy of the triune God. Let us render to each of the persons respectively the praise, honour, and service pertaining to him agreeably to that economy: for thus we shall then ascribe equal and undivided honours to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. Reverence the majesty of the Father: obey the Son as the King and Lord of glory: grieve not, resist not, quench not, vex not the Holy Spirit. Then shall "the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you."

V. D. M.

ART. V. *Sketch of the Life of Mr. John Craig, who flourished in the Reign of James VI. of Scotland, and commonly called that King's Minister; taken from the Christian Magazine.*

THE memory of the just is blessed. As you have very commendably inserted the memoirs of several godly men in your useful Miscellany, a few passages of the life and death of Mr. John Craig are extracted, chiefly from Archbishop Spottiswood's History of the Church of Scotland, for the entertainment of your numerous readers. The lives of good men, and especially of godly ministers, will always be read with avidity and relish by those who have a regard for virtue and godliness. They are useful in two respects, to rouse the indolent, and to encourage the diligent. The life of this good man is chiefly calculated to invigorate trust in imminent dangers. He lost his father in his early years, who was slain at the battle of Flodden. Providence, however, provided him with a liberal education at the University of St. Andrew's. When he had passed his degrees there, he went into England, and became tutor to the children of Lord Dacres, in which station he continued for two years. But war breaking out between Scotland and England, he returned to his native country. He then became a monk of the Dominican order. But, (though it does not appear that he then had distinct scriptural notions of the truth) he soon fell under the suspicion of what was called *heresy* in those days of ignorance and oppression, and was cast into prison. Being cleared of that imputation, and released from his imprisonment, he went back to England, flattering himself that, by the interest of his patron, Lord Dacres, he might obtain a place in the University of Cambridge. However, that failing, he went over to France, and thence to Rome. There he found much favour with some of the highest orders of the clergy,

even with one of the cardinals. By the recommendation of Cardinal Pole, he was received among the Dominicans in Bononia, now called Bologna. Being a man of good learning and great dexterity, he was honored with some of the highest employments belonging to his order. And that he had suffered to continue in the darkness of Popery, he might no doubt have obtained the most lucrative employments.

But even in the territories of Antichristian Babylon, sovereign mercy sought and found him. The Lord Christ, the great Shepherd of his sheep, will seek and find all his own, wherever they are, and whatever hazard of perpetually straying they may be exposed unto. (Ezek. xxxiv. 11, 12. John x. 16.) The manner of his conversion to the Protestant faith is exceedingly remarkable. By his employment, he had access to the libraries, particularly to that of the *Inquisition*; and even there he finds *Calvin's Institutions*; a book which was blessed for making a great light to arise in the church. But it might be there for being burnt. This blessed book opened Mr. Craig's eyes, and made the scales of ignorance fall off. The good news of a free justification, which he now read, he could not conceal within his own breast. Wishing others to become partakers with him of the same inestimable privilege, he opened his mind; but prudently, doing it to an old venerable man belonging to the monastery where he now was. His friend confirmed him in the judgment which he had formed of the truth; but at the same time cautioned him against making his mind known, because the times were perilous, as he soon found them to be. This caution would have been thought prudent by any of less zeal than our young convert. When the Lord opened Paul's eyes, *straightway he preached Christ*. And as it is common for people, when the light of gospel truth first breaks up in their minds, to be very warm, he declared himself more freely than worldly prudence would have dictated. This could not be tolerated in those days of clerical tyranny; so he was presently accused of heresy, and sent to Rome, where, after examination, he was imprisoned for nine months, and lay all that time in great misery. This was not all. Being brought before the judge of the *Inquisition*, and making a clear confession of his faith, he was condemned to be burnt the very next day.

But God had great work for him to do in Scotland. Behold! how wonderfully, therefore, Providence interposes in his behalf; "The wicked shall be a ransom for the righteous, and the transgressor for the upright." (Prov. xxi. 18.) That very night the Pope, Paul IV. dies. His holiness being hated by the populace, they pulled down his marble statue, dragged it through the streets of Rome for three days, and at last threw it into the Tyber. In the tumult all the prisons were broke open, and the prisoners set free, and among the rest Mr. Craig had his liberty.

It is easy to suppose, he would stay no longer in Rome than till he could escape out of it. But how shall he get out of it in safety? and whither shall he flee? He wished to go to Bononia, where he had some acquaintances, who, he hoped, might give him some relief. But how shall he be supported by the road? The Lord interposed in his behalf in both these respects most wonderfully, I may say miraculously. As he was passing along in the suburbs, he met a company of *banditti*, of whom he was no doubt dreadfully afraid. But behold! one of the company taking him aside, demanded if he had been at any time in Bononia? He answered that he had been some time there. "Do ye not, then, remember," said he, "that walking on a time in the fields with some young noblemen, there came unto you a poor maimed soldier, intreating some relief?" Mr. Craig replying that he did not well remember, "But I do," said he, "and I am the man to whom ye showed kindness at that time. Be not afraid of us, ye shall incur no danger." And so conveying him through the suburbs, and showing what was his safest course, he gave him as much money as might defray the expense of his journey to Bononia. It was very much that such a man recollected him; still more that he should shew such gratitude for what might perhaps be only some small matter: But it was the wonderful goodness of God, that he should meet Mr. Craig just in the time of his extreme need.

When he came to Bononia, his friends looked strange. So, fearing to be again entrapped, he slipped away secretly, taking his course to Milan. "By the way," adds the historian, "another accident (I would call it a merciful providence) befel him, which I should scarcely relate, so incredible it seemeth, if to many of good place he himself had not often repeated it, as a singular testimony of God's care of him, and this it was: When he had travelled some days, declining the high-ways out of fear, he came into a forest, a wild and desert place; and being wearied, lay down among some bushes on the side of a little brook to refresh himself. Lying there, pensive and full of thoughts; (for neither knew he in what part he was, nor had he any means to bear him out of the way,) a dog cometh fawning with a purse in his teeth, and lays it down before him. He, stricken with fear, riseth up, and constraining the same to proceed from God's favourable providence toward him, followed his way till he came to a little village, where he met with some that were travelling to Vienna in Austria, and changing his intended course, went in their company thither."

When he was come to Vienna, as he professed himself to be of the Dominican order, he was brought to preach before the Emperor Maximilian II. The Emperor much pleased with his manner of preaching, would willingly have retained him in his service. But Pope Pius III. hearing of Mr. Craig's being at Vienna, required Maximilian, by his letters, to send him back to Rome, as one that was condemned for heresy. And the Emperor, not willing, or perhaps not daring, to fall out with the Pope, dismissed Mr. Craig, but gave him letters of *safe-conduct* to prosecute his journey. When he came to England, he was informed that the *Reformation* was begun in Scotland, so he returned to his native country, and having joined the Reformed Church, offered his service as a minister. But having been about twenty-four years out of the country, he had almost forgot his native tongue. For some time he preached in Latin to such as could understand him, in a chapel in the city of Edinburgh. But having in a short time, recovered the language of the country, he then officiated as a minister of the gospel, in different places, for about forty years. He was first settled as the Minister at Holyrood-house. The next year he was taken to Edinburgh, and served as colleague to the famous John Knox for nine years. Then, by the ordinance of the Assembly, he was translated to Moatrose, where he continued two years. Next

he was removed to Aberdeen, and had the inspection of the churches of Marr and Buchan committed to him, as *superintendent*, according to the style of those days. In the year 1579, he was called to be minister, and I suppose domestic chaplain, to James VI. and afterwards was commonly called the King's minister. He continued in this station till worn down by the weight of years, he was obliged to retire from public service. He lived sometime in private, comforting himself with the remembrance of the mercies of God that he had tasted in his past life, and with the assured hopes of a glorious and blessed immortality in the world to come. He departed this life in peace, and without any pain, on the 12th of December, 1601, in the 88th year of his age. "Mark thou the perfect, and behold the upright; for the end of that man is peace." (Psal. xxxvii. 37.)

He appears to have been all along a man of peace. As Spottiswood (page 161) writes, "Whilst he lived he was held in great esteem, a great divine and an excellent preacher, of a grave behaviour, sincere, inclining to no faction; and, which increased his reputation, living honestly, without ostentation, or desire of vain glory." His first days were exceedingly trying, and his last equally peaceful; which was a great happiness and comfort.

Though he perhaps intermeddled less in public affairs, than any of his abilities and station in those boisterous times, he was the author of two very notable pieces. He composed a small, but excellent Catechism, which was commonly known by the name of *Craig's Catechism*, and is bound up in the *Collection of Confessions*. This Catechism was appointed by the General Assembly in the year 1592 to be used by ministers in examining people before the communion. And it appears to have continued in common use till it was superseded by the Westminster Assembly's Catechisms. In the year 1580, "certain dispensations sent from Rome, were intercepted, whereby the Catholics were permitted to promise, swear, subscribe, and do what else should be required of them, so as in mind they continued firm, and did use their diligence to advance in secret the Roman Faith. These dispensations being showed to the King, he caused his minister, Mr. John Craig, to form a short Confession of Faith, wherein all the corruptions of Rome, as well in doctrine as in outward rites, were particularly abjured, and a clause inserted, (because of these dispensations,) by which the subscribers did call God to witness, that in their minds and hearts they did fully agree to the said Confession, and did not feign or dissemble in any sort." This Confession was sworn and subscribed by the King and his household, with the whole Court, for an example to the whole kingdom, on the 8th of January, 1581,* according to the new account.† Such was the origin of this famous transaction, and the hand that Mr. Craig had in it. SPICILEGUS.

ART. VI. *The Doctrine of Calvin respecting the Extent of the Atonement.*

MR. EDITOR,—It has been often asserted, that Calvin did not hold the doctrine of a limited atonement. This has not only been stated in periodical publications, but recorded in books, and in books professedly written respecting Calvin and his principles. If my memory does not very much deceive me, his American biographer has roundly asserted this; and, for my own part, I have never seen it contradicted. Having access to the most of his writings, I have frequently searched for something which would clearly indicate his opinion. He always speaks consistently with the doctrine of a limited atonement, but says little directly on the subject. The following extract, translated from his exposition of 1 John ii. 2, will, however, not only show that he held this doctrine, but explain the reason why he has said so little respecting it. T. B.

1 John ii. 2.—*And not for ours only.* The apostle adds this as an amplification, that believers might be certainly persuaded that the expiation made by Christ extends to all who embrace the gospel by faith. But here a question is raised, "How can it be said, that the sins of the whole world are expiated?" I pass by the raving of fanatics, who, under this pretext, admit all the reprobate, and so Satan himself, to salvation. Such a monstrous doctrine is unworthy of refutation. Those who wish to avoid this absurdity say, that Christ suffered sufficiently for the whole

* Spottiswood, p. 308, 309. Calderwood, p. 96.

† The people of Scotland in those days did not reckon the year to commence till the 25th of March. So the National Covenant, in the title prefixed to it, is said to have been subscribed at first by the King's Majesty and his household in the year 1580, thereafter by persons of all ranks in the year 1581. But supposing the year to begin on the 1st of January, it was subscribed by the King, &c. as above stated, and by the rest of the kingdom in the course of that year.

world, but effectually, for the elect only. This solution has prevailed generally in the schools. But though I confess, that what they say is true, I deny that it is applicable to this text; for the design of John was nothing else than to state this to be the common benefit of the whole church; and, therefore, under *all*, he does not comprehend the reprobate, but intends those who should believe, and who were also scattered through the different parts of the world. For then the grace of Christ is illustrated truly and properly when he is preached as the only salvation of the world.

ART. VII. *Religious Establishments—Intelligence from Scotland.*

MR. EDITOR: I am glad to see, that you have made arrangements for securing some religious intelligence occasionally from Scotland; and, in the meantime, as I have lately been favored with a few sketches of the state of things there, I will state a few particulars, which I have gathered from letters and pamphlets, which you may not consider unworthy of the attention of your readers.

“The present truth” that is contested there most keenly, is the connection of Church and State. It must be well known to all your readers, that the Secession church, whose glory has been that it is a *reforming* church, in her advances in truth, has long been preeminently enlightened on this subject. About the beginning of this century, the work of one of her ministers, Mr. Graham of Newcastle, on ecclesiastical establishments, changed, as it is allowed by the historians of the English dissenters, the system of warfare entirely between the established and dissenting bodies, obliging establishments to take the defensive ever afterwards; so powerful was his attack. By the progress of discussion, the principles of his work are now embraced by almost all classes of dissenters in Scotland.

Amidst the distresses of the nation and the necessity of looking out for political resources, the rich revenues of the established churches of England and Ireland have frequently been pointed to, as national property, which might be wisely and lawfully appropriated to lighten public burdens. The example of dissenters, who, contributing their share as other subjects of the State for the established church, have at the same time maintained their own pastors, have often been held out as an argument to show how little real religion wants the enjoyment of expensive endowments and extorted revenues. Representations of this sort have had so far an effect with government as to lead at this time to considerable changes in the church of Ireland, a proposal of discontinuing the support of the established clergy in some of the colonies, and some slight alterations in the church of England.

The secularity of the church of England and Ireland had long been known; but the church of Scotland was often attempted to be held out as the model of an establishment, one that “works well.” But of late its true character has been drawn by some of its neighbors. Mr. Balantyne, of the United Secession, who wrote, a few years ago, a book called a *Comparison of Established and Dissenting Churches*, in which he excellently applies the doctrines of Mr. Graham, says, “Let the truth be told of this establishment: the one-half of its ministers are mere schoolmasters put into the pulpit, men whose study was not to be great divines, but accomplished tutors; that after pleasing some patron in the educating of his family, they might receive a living in the church; and who now go forward every Sabbath to repeat the same formal prayers which they have learned by heart, and to read sermons which they never wrote.”

The arrogance of their claims, too, in their demands for new churches, asking accommodation in their houses for all the population, without respect to the numbers of dissenters in a country where the majority are such, has done much to bring their sect into disfavor. The support of this church has long been felt a heavy burden, especially in the large cities. In Edinburgh, £14,000 sterling has been collected annually, by a tax of 6 per cent. upon all rents within the Royal Burgh. A few individuals, two years ago, began to let their goods be taken, rather than pay such a tax against their conscience; but of late, the number has greatly increased, and the church of Scotland is now forced, with worse success than the church of Ireland at this time, to resort to the same odious means of raising her revenue. Store-keepers' goods and householders' furniture are often taken and exposed for public sale, where no bidders can be found, when the public are acquainted with the cause of the distraint.

In the meantime the Tower Council, the patrons of most of this city's churches, who used to select evangelical preachers, as often as they could, to fill vacancies, and encourage attendance for the profit of the seat rents, (which at one time was so abundant as to afford a surplus for civic purposes, such as paving the street,) have been petitioned by the starving clergy, as this last year their income has only been £300, instead of £600, or £700, as it used to be. This body, however, is not able to afford relief to their petitioners, as they have been obliged to declare the city bankrupt, while the Lord Provost, in assigning the causes of the failure, states some of the chief to be the building and ornamenting of established churches.

My most enlightened correspondents do not consider the nation as yet ready to throw off the yoke of an establishment, but they are determined to agitate the question, and spread what light they can upon the subject. Many pamphlets have been written, and some of the most eminent of the dissenters have come forward as the public advocates of their cause. As yet no name of note in the establishment has been engaged openly on that side; but some poor licentiate has been forced forward into the brunt of the battle; and, in a case or two, the consciousness of defeat has been soothed by the consolation of an early appointment to some vacant charge among the good livings of the church.

To prevent the calamity which some foresee, a few of the leading men are now striving in the petitioning for the abolition of patronage. The contest rages. Each party, instead of being led by a blind charity, as of late, in lending their aid to some united effort for the accomplishment of some mighty distant good, now seems determined to secure its own work under its own inspection, and go to the field under its own standard. Hence the spirit of party seems to predominate more at this time than for many years; and some of the great voluntary establishments, as the Scottish Missionary Society, are breaking up, which is nothing to be regretted, considering the wasteful manner in which they were managed, they often being but a shabby appendix to that system of patronage which is the curse of many of the institutions besides the established religion of that country.

"Voluntary church associations" are now forming throughout all the country. They are joined by most classes of dissenters, and by many private members of the established church. Their intention is to give the public information, by their speeches and writings, and show, that religion may prosper without its ministers being stipendiaries of the state. Meetings have been held in most of the large cities in Scotland; and, at this time, I shall conclude by giving an extract from a Report of the Speeches at a very numerous meeting held some time ago in Edinburgh.

FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES OF THE SOCIETY.

"That a compulsory support of religious institutions is inconsistent with the nature of religion, the spirit of the gospel, the express appointments of Jesus Christ, and the civil rights of man; that in every case, where the individual disapproves of the system supported, or of the principles of its support, it is an unwarrantable attack on the right of property, and a direct invasion of the rights of conscience: that it keeps in a state of unnatural separation those who ought to be united, and in a state of unnatural union those who ought to be separate: that its tendency, as exhibited in its effects, is to secularize religion, promote hypocrisy, perpetuate error, produce infidelity, destroy the unity and purity of the church, and disturb the peace and order of civil society: that, by its direct and indirect influence, it is among the principal causes of the low state of Christianity in those countries where it is professed, and of the slowness of its progress throughout the world; and, that while thus unreasonable, impolitic, unjust, and mischievous, it has not even the plea of necessity—Christianity having within itself, in the native influence of its doctrines on the minds of those who believe them, every thing which is requisite for its efficient support and indefinite extension." S.

ART. VIII. *The Compromise.*

On the 6th of June, 1832, agreeably to the decision of the General Assembly, the second Presbytery was organized. When the Synod of Philadelphia met in the following October, they refused to acknowledge the existence of a Presbytery, which had been formed in violation of the Constitution; and it was encouraging to those among them who stood up for their rights, to find that two other respectable Synods had determined to present memorials to the next Assembly, requesting the reversion of the improper act of the last. These were the Synods of Pittsburgh and Cincinnati. The Synod of Philadelphia determined to unite with these Synods, in a remonstrance to the next Assembly, on the same subject; some extracts from which our readers have already seen, in Mr. M'Calla's Letter, copied in the Standard two weeks ago. The remonstrances of three Synods, embracing 21 Presbyteries, and about 360 ministers, of whom we may venture to say, *three hundred* regarded the act of the Assembly, against which the remonstrances were drawn up, as unconstitutional, should have had some weight with the Assembly.*

On the 21st of last May, the complaints of a very small minority of Synod, (*three persons*,) and of the second Presbytery of Philadelphia, against the Synod of Philadelphia, for refusing to acknowledge the said Presbytery, were reported to the General Assembly by their judicial committee. These complaints, instead of being heard, and the Synod furnished with an opportunity of defending themselves, were committed to a select committee, who were to "endeavor to effect a compromise, if practicable, between the parties concerned." It is evident from these words of their resolution, that the Assembly did not regard the question, thus brought before them, as one which involved an important constitutional principle, but merely as a *personal* disagreement among the members of a Synod, which might be settled by *accommodation*. For, certainly, if they had looked at the matter as it really stood, they would have seen that they were instructing their committee to obtain, or to surrender, by compromise, what the constitution has already decided,—the specific right of Synods to divide and erect Presbyteries. It was not the business of Assembly to seek a compromise in such circumstances; but

* On looking over the minutes of last Assembly relative to the second Presbytery, we see no mention of the memorial from the Synod of Pittsburgh, which their communication to the Synod of Philadelphia, last October, had led the latter Synod to expect. We set down its non-appearance among the many other *inexplicables*, which are rife in these days. The deduction of the Synod of Pittsburgh, reduces the numbers given above, to 13 Presbyteries, and 237 ministers—probably 180 approving of the remonstrances against the act of the Assembly.

to set their face to the business like men, and to rectify at once, and with the spirit of genuine Presbyterians, what had been done amiss. But peace—peace upon any terms—appears to have been more precious in the eyes of the majority of the Assembly, than a strict adherence to the constitution.

The select committee sent for the second Presbytery, and asked on what terms they would withdraw their complaint. The Presbytery, which, as if in anticipation of this very movement, had adjourned at its last meeting to convene at the call of the Moderator, answered in writing, that “they would withdraw all complaint, on condition that the integrity of their Presbytery should not be violated by this Assembly, and that the consideration of all complaints, petitions, remonstrances, references, and other papers from Synods, Presbyteries, and individuals, should be indefinitely postponed, without debate, in the Assembly.” The select committee, in undertaking to prosecute their negotiations, on such terms, must have forgotten that it was not in their power, nor in the power of the General Assembly itself, to *compromise* away the right of the Synod of Cincinnati, who certainly were not among “the parties concerned,” between which the compromise was to be effected. That Synod ought to have been heard remonstrating against the anti-Presbyterian principle acted upon, in the Assembly of '32; and some of the members of that Synod firmly pressed their right, for a time, before the Assembly; but peace—peace at any price—*peace* was rung in their ears, and arrayed against their arguments, until they were obliged to yield, lest they should be reckoned the enemies of what no doubt appeared to them, at the moment, *legitimate* peace;—an imputation from which the pious mind shrinks with horror.

The select committee next had an interview with 31 of the members of the Synod of Philadelphia, including, we presume, a committee of six, appointed by the Synod to defend them in the case of the 2d Presbytery. According to the tenor of the terms which the select committee had brought with them from the Presbytery, they ought to have summoned around them as many members of the Synod of Cincinnati also, as they could find, in order to ascertain whether *they* would be willing to give up the right of their Synod to be heard on the constitutional question, by the Assembly. It was certainly a curious oversight. Deducting the Synodical committee from the members of the Philadelphia Synod, there were 25 who either acceded to the overtures of the select committee, or were silent. The committee of Synod replied in the terms of the following document:

“The Committee appointed by the Synod to advocate their cause, agree in maintaining the following principles and measures:

“1. That the Synod, and not the Assembly, is the constitutional authority for erecting Presbyteries.

“2. They believe that the Synod itself has no right to form a Presbytery by elective affinity.

“3. That neither this Committee, nor the Synod, nor the Assembly, has a right to establish a new principle, or a new Presbytery not acknowledged by the constitution.

“4. This is the ground upon which the Synod appointed this Committee: and the Committee do not see their way clear to forsake it, either as individuals, or representatives of the Synod.

“5. The Committee feel their responsibility to God and the Synod, and they sincerely desire to do any thing and every thing for peace, which can be done consistently with principle. But they are obliged to maintain a good conscience, and they do it in sincere and tender affection towards those who may differ from them.

“Signed by order of the Committee,

“W. L. M'CALLA, Chairman.”

From this document it appears, that the Synod, as represented by its own committee, did not accede to the compromise; and that the few who did assent, could only do it in their individual capacity, forming, at

the same time, a very small fraction of "the parties concerned" in the matter which was to be effected by the select committee. Still, the Committee did what was "practicable," according to their instructions, with the exception of the oversight already noticed.

But the greatest oversight of all, committed both by the Assembly and their committee, was their not seeing that the principle involved in the compromise was an affair in which the whole Presbyterian church was a "party concerned;" and it should either have been settled according to the constitution, or postponed until it should be ascertained whether or not the Presbyteries were disposed to transfer the right of Synods to the General Assembly, or make it the common right of both, to divide and erect Presbyteries.

The Select Committee reported to the General Assembly what they had done, together with a resolution granting every thing which the Second Presbytery had demanded. Having thus evaded a question which they should have settled; the New School party being rejoiced at an issue which augured so favorably to their cause; the moderate men good naturedly supposing that they had now achieved lasting peace for the church; and the Old School-men being puzzled, amidst the excited sympathies of the moment, to know whether things were going right or wrong; it is not surprising, all things considered, that there should have been a short season of joy and thanksgiving. Misrepresented as the Old School party have been, as possessing a contentious and uncompromising spirit, they have in reality, feeling and affectionate souls; as they who have thought them deficient in sensibility and brotherly love, would most assuredly experience, if they would only return to the good, old fashioned, gospel path, in which our forefathers walked, to the glory of their great Redeemer.

By this compromise, the General Assembly sanctioned the following principles. 1. That Presbyteries may be divided without any regard to geographical limits, upon the principle of elective affinity, or personal preference. Consequently, every Presbytery which is at all disturbed by new doctrines, or new measures, may properly ask a division on that principle; and so may Synods; and so may the Assembly itself. 2. That the power of dividing and creating Presbyteries does not belong specifically and solely to Synods, but to the General Assembly also. 3. That accommodation is lawful in religious matters, even in those which are regulated and defined by the laws of the church. And consequently, 4. That the power of the General Assembly is paramount to the constitution of the church. We might legitimately draw additional inferences; but let these suffice. They are sufficiently characteristic of a decision, in which none but the enemies of the Presbyterian church should rejoice.—*Cincinnati Standard*.

CORRECTION.—We cheerfully give place to the following note, and beg leave to say to the intelligent and respected Session of Cambridge, that our mortification is as great as theirs can be, that the note to which they allude should have appeared in the Monitor. Had the "reports" which they speak of, as "*widely in circulation*," reached our ears, it would have prevented its appearance. It was not known, at that time, that the allusion in the note was to any congregation in connection with the Associate Church. Great caution should be exercised by correspondents in their statements of matters of fact; and, in general, we have no cause for complaint on this ground; but in the present instance, if the

allusion was made, as is supposed by the Session of Cambridge, and others, the statement had been better omitted, even though well authenticated. But while thus freely expressing our views of the note in question, justice requires us to say, from a long and tried acquaintance with our esteemed correspondent, who has fallen into the error in this instance, we have the fullest confidence, that it was altogether an inadvertency in him, and that no one regrets the appearance of that note in the Religious Monitor, more than himself.

CAMBRIDGE, June 18th, 1838.

To the Editor of the Religious Monitor.

SIR: The undersigned, members of the Session of the Associate Congregation, of Cambridge, are aware that some suppose the note in the last number of the Religious Monitor, (stating that the congregation of a certain Rev. Dr. in the state of New York was surprised to find in every pew of the meeting-house a copy of the Constitution of another ecclesiastical body,) refers to this congregation. This, together with reports widely in circulation, that such did take place here, makes us believe that it is our duty to undeceive the readers of the Monitor. We can assure them, that no such thing did take place, to our knowledge; nor do we know of any thing that could give rise to such a report, unless it be that at one of our monthly meetings a copy of the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church was brought in by one of the members of Session, for a use, we believe, to be perfectly harmless, and was forgotten. We would, for the sake of truth, request the insertion of this communication in the next number, and would also add, that we hope it will be a caution to the writer of the note, to ascertain the truth of such reports before he publishes them.

John M'Clellan, John Ashton, William McGeoch, Edward Cook, Edward Small, John Dobbin, George Lourie, John Shiland, John Robertson, James Lourie.

ART. IX. *Ecclesiastical Record.*

At the meeting of the Associate Presbytery of Philadelphia, July 8d, the Rev. Archibald Whyte, jr. offered the resignation of his charge of the Associate congregation of Baltimore, which was accepted. A call to him from the united congregations of Steel Creek and Bethany, N. C. the late charge of the Rev. Abraham Anderson, was at the same time presented and accepted. By this means the Presbytery of the Carolinas has been revived, having been previously reduced to one minister. The aforesaid congregations not having a Presbytery of their own, were obliged to have their call sustained and presented through the medium of another Presbytery. May the Lord turn again their captivity as the streams in the south.

The call from the Associate congregation of Henderson, Warren county, Illinois, was presented to the Rev. James Bruce, on the 9th of May, by a committee of Miami Presbytery, and accepted. The installation took place on the 11th of May, Rev. Mr. Ingles having preached from Ezek. iii. 17.

Mr. Alexander Boyd was ordained to the office of the holy ministry, at New Castle, on Wednesday the 5th inst., by the Associate Presbytery of Ohio, and installed pastor of the Associate congregations of New Castle, Wilmington, and Mount Prospect.

On Wednesday, 8d July, Mr. James Strang, preacher, was ordained to the office of the holy ministry and to the pastoral inspection of the Associate Presbyterian Congregation assembling in Galt, Dumfries, Upper Canada, by the Associate Presbytery of Albany, N. Y. The Rev. John Russel, Stamford, U. C. presided in the ordination. He preached from Ezekiel, chap. ii. from the middle of the 4th verse with the 5th. He likewise addressed, as is usual, the pastor, after ordination. He was succeeded by the Rev. Thomas Ferrier, who addressed the congregation, and afterwards preached from 2 Cor. ii. 15, 16. The services of the day were performed in the presence of a large and devout auditory. To the greater number present, it had rarely happened to be present at the separation of one to the holy ministry; many had never seen such a sight. May the day be remarkable in the felicitous records of the church, and of the pastor; and may similar days soon be enjoyed by the destitute congregations of the Secession Church.

Mr. Russel and Mr. Ferrier were dispensing the sacrament of the Supper, at Esquimaux, on the Sabbath previous to the ordination. The congregation there has received considerable increase; and being well knit, animated with a generous and liberal spirit, and zealous, there is good hope of a place of worship very soon, and that according to the days wherein they have been afflicted, and the years wherein they have seen evil, they shall be made glad. Mr. Ferrier, who is at present laboring as an itinerant in the Province, went off immediately after the ordination, with two elders from the church in the English Settlement, London District, who had come to witness the solemnity. After spending some time in London, Mr. F. intends proceeding to Harwich.

There is yet much land to be possessed. The honor which the Associate Synod of N. America has gained in Upper Canada, is great encouragement to seek after some additional concessions of the moral wastes which are so extensive.—*Communicated.*

THE
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,

AND

EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

SEPTEMBER, 1833.

ART. I. *The Parts of the Revelation that exhibit the Church in our own Time, considered.*

(Concluded from page 73.)

THE only passage that remains to be considered, is in the end of verse 10th, of the xiii. chap. viz: "Here is the patience and the faith of the saints." We find a similar passage in the xiv. chap., relating to a time subsequent to the 1260 days: "Here is the patience of the saints: here are they that keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus," ver. 12, and although there are some circumstantial differences they are substantially the same. In this xiii. chapter, we have a particular account of the rise and progress of the Popish System, under the symbol of two monsters, one of which rises out of the sea, and the other out of the earth. The first describes the civil and political power of the pope, as a prince, or horn, having jurisdiction over a certain territory, and as a head of power and influence over the other princes or horns that had arisen up in the ancient empire of Rome; and the second describes the spiritual authority to which he lays claim, over the whole Christian world. Under each figure is comprehended all the subordinate agents or ministers, in church or state, by whom these respective powers are exercised. The temporal authority is described first, and the spiritual last; not because this was the order in which they came into existence, for the spiritual made its appearance first, under the symbol of a star falling from heaven and burning as a lamp, in the end of chap. viii., and of a star falling to the earth, in the beginning of chap. ix.; but because the temporal power and authority was held to be first in importance, and the spiritual power was made subservient to it. And this is plainly declared in the chapter. The chief concern of the second beast, is to cause all the mandates and assumed prerogatives of the first to be respected. Neither are we to suppose, because the account of these two beasts is reserved to the xiii. chapter, that all the events recorded before were prior in the order of time; for the sea and the earth had brought both of them forth at the time that the angel of the covenant sets his feet upon them, chap. x. ver. 2. And I have before shown that they are cotemporary with the *Witnesses*, chap. xi., and with the *woman*, chap. xii., and that the time allotted to them to continue, "forty and two months," is the same time with that of the witnesses and the woman. But the description is deferred to this chapter,

by the love and tender mercy of Christ to his people, that he may first set before them the provision, comfort and safety which he has provided for them, under this long and sore trial of their faith and patience, by this cruel, fierce and dreadful enemy; and that the full-drawn portrait of this enemy might stand immediately before the account of his destruction.

I have shown, in the explanation of the 12th chapter, that the dragon's opposition to the woman is of two sorts, viz. violence and deceit; and in this chapter we have a description of the two instruments which he has prepared for this purpose. The first is for violence, and the second for deceit. The first is not more singular and remarkable for his monstrous shape than for his cruelty and savageness of temper. The powers of the most savage and terrible beasts that roam in the forest are borrowed in figure to set him forth. He has the claws of the bear, to tear in pieces; the mouth of the lion, to devour; a head with ten horns, to push and to gore; and the strength of *the Devil*, to use them all. It may well be said of him, that "he is dreadful, and terrible, and strong, exceedingly;" and that he "has great iron teeth; that he devours, breaks in pieces, and stamps the residue with his feet." Dan. vii. 7. He commands the fear and reverence of the world. And all this is to be employed against God, and his ordinances, and his people. (See verses 5, 6, 7, of this chapter.) The second beast is equally well fitted for the work of deception. His power and abilities for this is of the same extent, and his success is not inferior. He causes the great part of the world, "the small and great, rich and poor, bond and free," "all that dwell upon the earth, whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain, from the foundation of the world," to worship the first beast. By these two are the graces of the saints, "*patience and faith*," tried to the utmost. And you may observe, that the passage which proposes them to our consideration is placed in the middle between these two. Their *patience* is tried by the first, and their *faith* by the last.

The words seem to import two things, principally. First. Here is the *most notable trial* to which patience and faith were ever subjected: and second, here is to be seen these two graces most remarkably displayed in their *standing out* this trial, and *triumphing* over these terrible foes. As these are leading graces in the christian character, and the chief means by which the saints are to stand, fight and conquer in the war which these beasts make upon them during the present period, it will be the wisdom of every professing Christian at this time to ascertain first, what the Spirit of God means under these two terms; and, second, whether he himself is possessed of it. For if this dreadful and terrible foe come against him, and he be equipped with *any other* weapons than the *very patience and faith* here intended, he will certainly be vanquished. To aid in this important inquiry, I shall, before I proceed to consider the two things imported in the words, make a few observations illustrative of their nature.

I begin with *faith*, because, although it is last mentioned here, it is first in the order of existence and of operation.

1st. It is a supernatural grace. It does not come within the scope of natural principles. These cannot, under any circumstances, bring it forth in the soul. They cannot reason it into being; although aided by ever so much intellectual light. They cannot do it under the utmost extent of moral suasion that can be brought to bear on the human mind. Nor is there any such happy combination of circumstances possible, in which mere persuasion can produce it, although Christ himself were the persuader. The heart will still be an "evil heart of unbelief which departs from the living God." Heb. iii. 12. The carnal mind will still "be en-

mity against God—not subject to the law of God, neither indeed *can be.*” Rom. viii. 7. “The natural man *receiveth* not the “things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him, neither *can* he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” 1 Cor. ii. 14. It is “not of ourselves, it is the *gift of God.*” Eph. ii. 8. “It is given us in the *behalf of Christ to believe.*” Phil. i. 29. There must be a principle for it *created* by the power of the Spirit of God, making us a new creature.

2d. Faith is the act of the *will*, as well as of the understanding. The mere assent of the understanding to the truth may and does receive the appellation of faith from some divines who set metaphysics above Bible definitions; but it is a dead faith that cannot save; a faith not incompatible with the state of the damned. Our Catechisms rightly define it to be an *embracing, receiving, and resting* on Christ. The Scriptures uniformly employ some term to express it, that denotes *application* of the thing believed to the person believing. When the Israelites that were bitten looked to the brazen serpent, it was to receive healing virtue. When the prophet invites to the exercise of faith, he says, “*Come ye, to the waters.*” So Christ himself says, “*Come unto me all ye that labor.*” “*Him that cometh unto me I will in no wise cast out.*” “*If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink.*” “*The Spirit and the Bride say, come.*” It is sometimes called *taking*. “*Let him take the water of life freely.*” Sometimes it is called eating and drinking. “*He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood dwelleth in me and I in him.*” Again, it is called *keeping*. “*If a man keep my sayings he shall never see death.*” But to say that these terms mean nothing more than the assent of the understanding, were to say, that the Bible is calculated to deceive. Depend upon it, unless your faith has feet that walk, and a hand that stretches forth and takes, all your thoughts about the waters of life will turn out to be but a dream, when you wake up in the eternal world.

3d. Faith can stand only on the *testimony* of God in the word and ordinances. Not that we must have it immediately from God’s own mouth, or the first written copy of it, but that which we believe must be either the written word, or what is necessarily implied under it, or fairly deduced from it; and we must believe it under, the notion of something which God has said in his word. It follows, as an inference, that when the doctrine believed is not in the word of God, or, being in it, is not believed as such, our belief is not the faith of the saints. If we believe a sentiment which has no higher origin than the “commandment of men,” or if we believe the truths of God’s word only because we believe them to agree with some theory of our own, or because the belief of them is a popular thing, or because they are believed by the learned; our faith will be, in both cases, alike vain—vain as a part of service and worship offered to God, for he will not accept of it at our hands; and vain as a means of saving the soul, for it will not produce any of the effects characteristic of salvation. The faith of Abraham is a true copy of the faith of the saints in all ages, and it is sent down to all generations as an essential point in his faith, that “he believed *God.*” Gal. iii. 6. He not only believed the thing which God said, but *because God said it.*

4th. Faith is the *instrumental cause* of our justification. “Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness.” It was not the act of believing itself that was so accounted, but the object on which his faith rested. God made promise to him of Christ, and he received and rested in Christ promised, and Christ’s righteousness was set over to his account; and in the settling of his account with law and justice, this righteousness was “reckoned to him.” “Therefore, being justified by faith, we have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ.” Rom. v. 1. And there is no other way by which guilty men can be brought

into an accepted state but this of faith's receiving the righteousness of Christ freely and unconditionally, as it is offered in the gospel, and having it imputed or reckoned to us by God, the Judge of all.

5th. Faith is a *calculating* principle. It calculates and reckons in what relation the soul stands to things present and things future, and what proportion of intrinsic and relative value the one bears to the other. The following are some of the problems which it has solved: "God's law—is more to be desired than gold, yea, than much fine gold, sweeter also than honey, and the honey-comb." Ps. xix. 7—10. "The law of thy mouth is better unto me than thousands of gold and silver." Ps. cxix. 72. "Esteeming the reproach of Christ greater riches than all the treasures of Egypt." Heb. xi. 26. "For I reckon the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed in us." Rom. viii. 18. "What things were gain to me, those I counted loss for Christ; yea, doubtless, and I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ, my Lord." Phil. iii. 7—8.

6th. Faith is a *working principle*. It is its very nature to act. And if any man have a faith which exists without works, "it is dead, being alone." James ii. 17. It cannot save him—cannot profit him. It is not the "faith of the saints," but of the Devils. All good works are natural and proper to faith. It was created in Christ Jesus, unto good works, and there cannot one good work, properly so called, be done without faith. All spiritual acts are ascribed to it: "We walk by faith." "The just lives by faith." All right contending for the doctrines of the gospel is by faith, and all striving against the flesh is called, in a particular manner, the good fight of faith.

7th. The faith of the saints is altogether a *principle of obedience*. There cannot be an act of true faith which is not, at the same time, an act of obedience. The whole of the effects which faith instrumentally produces on the heart, is to bring it into conformity to the will of God, and to prepare it for acts of obedience; in other words, it purifies the heart. "And (God) put no difference between them and us, *purifying their hearts by faith.*" Act. xv. 9. That principle by which faith performs all its works is itself the "bond of perfectness," "the keeping of the whole law." "Faith worketh by love." Gal. v. 6. There is not a truth in the Bible which faith can embrace, without acting obedience. "Seeing (says Peter,) ye have purified your souls, in obeying the truth unto unfeigned love of the brethren." 1 Pet. i. 22. Whatever God has commanded is the rule and measure of faith's obedience, and beyond this it cannot go. Before it can move at all, it must stand on the divine testimony, and be directed by a divine command. Men may greatly flatter themselves, and tickle the world to admiration and wonder, by deeds done in the name of faith and love, which have no respect to these two things; but the "faith of the saints" will not acknowledge them, nor will God accept them.

By patience, I do not understand the simple endurance of evil of some kind, because that is frequently unavoidable, even to the most wicked and destitute of all good principle: neither can it have any more affinity to a sullen, proud, refusing to utter any complaint, or sense of suffering, nor can it be suffering for evil doing in any case; this deserves no thanks. But the patience of a saint is when "a man, for conscience towards God, endures grief, suffering wrongfully." "When ye do well and suffer for it, ye take that patiently; this is acceptable to God." 1 Pet. ii. 19—20. "For ye have need of patience, that after ye have done the will of God, ye might receive the promise." Heb. x. 36. This patience consists, first, in "*continuing* in well doing," while we are, at the same time, suffering for it, and *know* that it is for it. For it would not, or at least might not,

be patience to suffer for the good that is past. We may be suffering for what good we have done and also repenting of it, and saying within ourselves, had we known of all this trouble, we would not have done it. Second. There must be a spirit towards those who inflict the suffering that is becoming a christian. For if feelings of resentment, or purposes of revenge be indulged, and freely entertained, they will, like the dead fly in the pot of ointment, spoil the patience of the saint. This patience would "do good to them that hate us, bless them that curse us, and pray for them that despitefully use us and say all manner of evil against us falsely." Third. There must be faith in the truth, hope in the promise, and hearty attachment to the good cause for which we suffer. Indeed, faith is the very basis of this patience. If the good we are doing is not done by faith, it will not, how much soever we suffer for it, it *can not* be the patience of the saint.

This faith and patience is what we understand to be intended in the passage. For they are the graces, under that name, which are ascribed to the saints in the Bible elsewhere, and in the 11th chap. of the Heb. in particular, the professed object of which is to give an account of them, which the reader may do well to examine minutely. This is the faith that has been in former periods subjected to sore trials, and came forth more precious than gold seven times purified. And I am not afraid to affirm that this is the only faith that *can* stand the trial of this 1260 days, in other words, the trial of the violence and deceit of these two beasts. A few remarks on this trial are now offered. When a man is tried as to his faith, it appears what sort it is, "whether it be from Heaven or of men," a dead or a living faith, whether it rest on the testimony of God or not, whether it purifies the heart or not, and of what strength it is, and to what it tends. A man's faith is tried when any principle in him is brought into conflict with it. Thus it is a principle in our nature to be averse to suffering. When therefore we must either suffer or yield some particular belonging to the nature or right exercise of true and saving faith, this principle is brought into conflict with what in us stands for faith, and the event may serve to show which of them is the strongest, and whether they be of different origin or not.

The faith of Daniel's three companions was tried by the strength of their aversion at being burnt in Nebuchadnezzar's fiery furnace, and Daniel's own faith was tried by his aversion at being torn to pieces by lions. Again, it is a principle in us to esteem a good name, and to love our friends and relatives, and when we must either surrender these, or some thing belonging to faith, these principles are brought into conflict with it, and the event will show which is the strongest. In this way Abraham was tried, when he was called to offer up his son Isaac. The faith of the apostles was tried upon their esteem for a good name, when they were accounted as the "off-scouring of all things."

The degree of the trial depends on a variety of circumstances. It is a greater trial to faith to be burnt in the fire, than to be imprisoned, or to have our goods confiscated. It is a greater trial to surrender up an only son than to sacrifice a good name among ungodly men. When the trial is something new in the history of the godly, concerning which our own and others' experience can give us no information; when it is above the powers of reason; and seemingly contrary to it; when there is a confluence of trials on various points at once, and when the trial is continued for a great length of time by each of these circumstances, the degree of severity is greatly increased.

Now it may be asserted truly, that the trial of the faith and patience of the saints, during this period, has exceeded in severity all the trials that went before it. This may be inferred from the excess, cruelty and

craft in the character of their persecutor, over all that went before him in the same work, and still more, when we consider the enormous power which he wields, and the long period he is to continue, and withal that it is his purpose and his hope "to wear out the saints of the Most High," and finally comes so near it that he "kills the two witnesses." Faith and patience have been tried on every point, and the trial on each point carried to the utmost. Thus, when the trial was to be by suffering, all the powers of ingenuity were exhausted to increase it. So soon as some new and unheard of torture was discovered, at the very thought of which every feeling in the human bosom revolts with horror, it was with alacrity employed. When faith was to be tested by parting with friends and relatives, the parting was in such a way as to increase the pain of it to the utmost. It was not enough that the husband part with his beloved wife, but he must be compelled to see her first used in the most shocking and brutal manner, and then tortured and mangled as long as life was in her. The mother must, besides parting with her tender babe, see it in the ruthless hand of a human devil, and dashed against the stones. And these things were done under authority and from pretence of regard to the cause of Christ. When deception was to be practiced, and faith tried in its relation to the testimony of God, the deception was made as strong, as it was possible to make it. The scriptures were made to speak through an infallible interpreter, seconded by the voice of all antiquity. Omnipotence was made to give it countenance by miracles. Heaven, besides many good things in this life, was to be the reward of faith in the proposed doctrine, and a fair prospect, it may be, of being set down among the demi-gods. Nay, heaven could not be entered by another way. On the other hand, nothing more terrible could be presented to the imagination of mortal man than that which would be the consequences of rejecting it. At the same time that deceit was playing all this artillery upon the mind, it was often extremely difficult, and sometimes impracticable, to have access to the word of God for weapons of defence. Deceit and violence were generally combined in the attack, and assault was made on all points at once, and every interest of man in this life and the next was threatened with destruction, if there was not an immediate compliance, by a Potentate that affected to have heaven and hell in his keeping. And by the entreaties of friends, and the tears of dearest connections, the whole soul of the *man* was often brought to bear in one mighty effort against the faith of the *saint*. I am not here painting an imaginary scene. Reader, I fall immeasurably short of setting forth the full amount of the facts of this trial, that are already matters of history. It probably transcends the powers of a human mind, to estimate accurately the force of this trial. It was the designing of a spirit of the highest order of created intelligences—the Prince of the Devils. May it not then be said that the principle on which a man can stand against these combined forces, in the profession of the humbling doctrines of free grace, and in the practice of all self-denying duties, must be the supernatural grace of faith, which rests, in all circumstances, on the promise of God. And it is impossible that faith can be thus tried, without a corresponding exercise of patience. Here then "*is the patience and faith of the saints.*" It is not needful to illustrate the second thing implied, namely, that here is the victory of faith and patience, because, to stand the trial and to conquer is one and the same. When it adheres to the truth of God and perseveres in obedience to the commandment of God, the violence and deceit of Popes and Devils notwithstanding, it conquers, it triumphs, it reigns.

We may learn from this passage—1st. That in the exercise of faith and patience, the food and life of the saint is to be found during these

1260 days. Some may be ready to suppose that there is nothing here to feed on but opposition; but they look only at the one side of it: for, between God and the soul, which is on the other, there is only love and the sweetest fellowship that can exist on this side of heaven.—2d. By the exercise of these graces, is Christ to be most effectually served in the advancement of his kingdom, and destruction of Satan's—in extending of the means of salvation to the heathen—in saving sinners and comforting saints; and without them he is not served at all.—3d. In them lies the safety of professors, from the destruction intended to souls by the Dragon. They are the saint's panoply. Without them, the professor is fully exposed to the violence of the devil and the waters of his flood.—4th. It is peculiarly the duty and interest of Christians, at the present time, to ascertain whether they have this "faith and patience." For it is believed that this trial is not over, nor its severity abated, but only its manner and circumstances altered to suit the emergency of the times. Let me press the reader, as he regards his own safety and comfort, to bring himself to a clear decision, on each of the following questions:—1st. Does your faith rest on the testimony of God? 2d. Will you believe every thing that He has said, how incomprehensible soever it may be to your reason? 3d. Does your faith put forth the hand, and *take* whatsoever is set before it in the word of God? 4th. Does it act good works from love to God and obedience to Christ? 5th. Is there any consideration sufficient to induce it to part with any truth of God?

Lastly, we may learn, that it is agreeable to the nature of these graces, to bear witness to every known truth, in the most public and express manner possible, as well as maintain the same in practice. And if many of those, whose public profession bears this character, give but very small evidence of faith and patience, yet it is not the fault of their profession. It is clearly the very element of these graces, to move and act in such a profession, and to hold it fast; and therefore, to be indifferent to it, much more to be opposed to it, is a strong evidence of being more under the delusion of the devil, than of faith and patience.

ART. II. On Divine Love.

(Continued from page 49.)

CONTEMPLATION III. PART II. REFLECTIONS.

A GREAT number of important inferences might be mentioned, as flowing from the preceding *Evidences* of Christ's love. We begin by observing, in general, that we may see the *necessity* and *excellency* of divine revelation. Though this observation has been repeatedly mentioned, we give it a place here,—*first*, because it so evidently appears from the subject of this, as well as the two preceding contemplations. *Second*, to show our *fervent* and *compassionate zeal* for the salvation of the Deists. For we differ from Dean Swift, who said, "It is needless to *reason* with a set of men who are *determined* to be *damn'd*, whether God will or not." Because Christ himself *reasoned* with the *Sadducees*, who are the most ancient *ancestors* of our modern *mortal Deists*, or rather *Atheists*, that we read of. The heathen knew there was one who made the heavens and the earth, and all nations of men, and therefore called themselves *his offspring*. But they could not "declare his name, or his son's name;" nor did they apprehend an eternal Spirit who garnished the heavens. Least of all, had they any knowledge of a counsel of peace between the Father and the Son, or of the Spirit who furnished the Saviour, and applies the great salvation. These were articles of pure revelation.

Nay, the heathen historians and poets give a very *different* and *opposite* account of their Gods, by describing their *contests* and *battles*. "Plato would not suffer *Homer* in his commonwealth, for entrenching upon the imaginary blessedness of their dunghill deities; making *Jupiter* to grieve for the death of *Sarpadon*; *Mars* to be wounded by *Diomedes*, and *roar* thereupon with disputes and conjectures in heaven among themselves, about the issue of the *Trojan war*."*

We don't put the doctrine of the Trinity upon any evidence besides that of divine authority; and this is so far from laying aside our *reason*, that *reason* never acts more like itself, than when it falls down at the feet of the *Author of reason*, believing what he *saith*, and submitting to what he *appoints*, without gainsaying. Is nature mystery all over, and does grace lie all open?" Can man's wisdom declare how nature was formed, received all its laws, and *how* they are continued? It is "through *faith* we understand that the worlds were formed, by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear. Thus, the apostle condemns that beloved notion, "Ex nihilo nihil fit," i. e., from nothing, nothing is. Let the most *learned* and *candid Deists* give us their free thoughts upon *daylight*: what fire is without fuel: the annual *return*, and yet the *variation* of the seasons: the ebbing and flowing of the sea: the growth of the earth: the agency of spirits upon bodies: the union of our souls with our bodies, and the mutual sympathy between them. "Philosophy" saith, Matter "cannot think." What is the soul of brutes? How are creatures formed and quickened in the womb, and how can they live a considerable time there without *air*, and without *breathing*? Shall *men* who cannot describe the life of an *oyster*, or the wing of a *fly*, pretend to comprehend the *nature* of a *God*? "If in his works so wonderful, *himself* how wondrous then!"† Alas! there is no convincing them by arguments of reason. The more learning people have, the more they oppose this doctrine. Till the Spirit reveals what flesh and blood cannot, they shall be like men in a dungeon, groping and raving, dashing themselves against the grates through which the light should come. But when the day shines in, the ungodly foam is at an end. Then the doctrines that were most *inconceivable* are the most *welcome*. They will be "comforted unto all riches of the full assurance of understanding," (not to the comprehending by reason,) but "to the acknowledgment, (by faith,) of the mystery of God, *even* the Father, and of Christ."

Having mentioned this general observation, so necessary in this age of *Infidelity*, we shall briefly review the preceding evidences of Christ's love, and make particular reflections from each, for our instruction, comfort, and direction in duty.

1st. Did the Father appoint the Son to be our *Surety*, and to assume human nature to accomplish our salvation? Then we may admire divine *wisdom*, as well as divine *love*. Indeed, *why* the *Son*, and not the Father, nor the Spirit, was appointed to be the *Mediator*, must be resolved into absolute *sovereignty*. But, saith Dr. Owen, "Austin, in one instance, gives a rational account, why it was *condecant* unto divine *wisdom*, that the Son, and not the Father, nor the Spirit, should be incarnate." Saith he, "The Father did not assume flesh, nor the Holy Spirit, but the Son only, that he, who in the *Deity* was the Son of the Father, should be made the Son of Man, in his mother of the human race, that the name of the Son should not pass unto any other, who was not the Son by an eternal nativity." Thus, he who is the Son of God by *nature*, condescended to become the Son of man, that we might be made the son's of God by *grace*, i. e. by regeneration and adoption. This is one of his be-

* Dr. Owen, Vind. Evan., p. 30. † Young.

loved titles. He himself mentions it with pleasure and frequency. "The Son of Man came to give his life a ransom for many." "The Son of Man shall come in his own glory and in his Father's, and of the holy Angels;" and then he shall bring many sons to glory.

2d. Did Christ display his love by giving the last and best edition of the gospel? Then we ought to esteem and improve it as a valuable and distinguished privilege. Thus, Christ said to the disciples, "Blessed are those eyes which see these things that ye see. For I tell you, that many prophets and kings have desired to see these things which ye see, and have not seen them; and to hear these things which ye hear, and have not heard them." But people ought not to speak with contempt of the Old Testament, for their esteem of the New. There is not one doctrine made known to us by Christ and his apostles, which God had not revealed to his people of old, otherwise, they could not plead their "saying nothing but what Moses in the law, and the prophets did write." To affirm that the doctrine of the Trinity, and eternal life were not known till the coming of Christ, is quite wrong. Christ said to the Jews, "Search the scriptures, for in them ye think ye have *eternal life*, and these are they that testify of me." To think that we can take away any *dross* from the Psalms is a vile insinuation; especially as the sweet Psalmist of Israel has told us himself, "that the Spirit of the Lord spoke by him, and his word was in his mouth." And that "the words of the Lord are pure words; as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times."

3d. Did Christ display his love by working many miracles for relieving those in distress? Then we may see,

1. The error of the *Deists*, who, as they deny all the *mysteries* revealed in the gospel, also deny all the miracles wrought in providence. But the power of working miracles cannot be questioned by any who assert a Deity and a Providence. For the same divine power, that framed nature, gave it all its laws, and preserves them, can suspend alter or contradict them. But that we may place this subject in a clear light, we observe—

First. A miracle is different from those rare contingencies which lie hid in the order of causes in nature, and only break out at some times, which are called *prodigies*. Such as earthquakes, eruptions of a volcano, &c. "If all rare contingencies in nature are called prodigies, a wise man is the greatest prodigy."*

Secondly. A miracle is different from mere *juggles* and *impostures*. How far magic was an art, and how far Satan by his subtlety, imposed upon the eyes of spectators, we cannot tell. But "God alone doth wondrous works," i. e., performs real miracles. When Moses began to work miracles in Egypt, the magicians did so with their enchantments. But "Aaron's rod swallowed up their rods." And as to the miracle of the lice, (the original word is *Ciniphes*,) the magicians said, "This is the finger of God." And, lastly, "They could not stand before Moses, because of the boils, for the boil was upon the magicians." Thus, Simon Magus and Elymas could not stand before the apostles.

But the most eminent instance of the havoc that the grace of God made among the sorcerers, was at Ephesus, where the name of the Lord was magnified. "Many that believed came and confessed, and showed their deeds. Many of them also which used curious arts, brought their books together and burned them before all men: and they counted the price of them, and found it fifty thousand pieces of silver;" i. e., about fifteen hundred pounds sterling. "So mightily grew the word of God,

* Cicero.

and prevailed." "If any people had it in their power to detect the weakness of Christian doctrine, it must be *these men*, and therefore when they give such a public witness to the truth of religion, it comes after a fair trial."

Thirdly. Mahomet pretended to receive revelations from his *pigeon*, and do wonders upon his *ass*. But what did they amount to? Only, to prove his imposture. The same may be affirmed of the Popish miracles, which are ridiculous; as the apostle declares, "Whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power, and signs, and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish: because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved."

Jesus Christ was no magician, as some have blasphemously asserted. No. He wrought true and real miracles, by his own power to confirm a divine testimony. And this he did three ways:—

First. When the thing itself was within the *possibility* of second causes, and yet was performed without the help of them: as in the cure of diseases, by a *word*, a *touch*, or the *touch of a garment*. *Secondly.* When the thing itself was of that nature, that it could not be produced by second causes, as raising the dead, casting out devils by a *word*. *Thirdly.* When the laws of nature were suspended, opposed, and contradicted. Thus, Christ "rebuked the winds, and the sea, and there was a great calm." Christ wrought his miracles *openly* and at *once*, in the presence of multitudes, who believed them, though they did not acknowledge him as the *Messias*, nor believe the divinity of his person. The Pharisees themselves confessed the *truth* of them. "What do we? For this man doth many miracles." Nay, some of the most *learned* and *acute* of the *Deistical* tribe have *tacitly* confessed the *truth* of Christ's miracles. It was reported that Professor Campbell, in Aberdeen, before he published his treatise on miracles, sent the manuscript to *Hume*, who returned it, expressing a high esteem of his *candour*; but at the same time declared, "that he himself published his opinions to the world: mankind might judge for themselves; but he never intended to make any reply!"

2. We may see the error of the Socinians and Unitarians, who affirm that Christ performed all his miracles by a *derived power*, as Moses and the prophets did. But they are extremely mistaken. He wrought them by his own power, for the manifestation of his own glory, and his disciples believed in *HIM*. It was never said of a prophet, he had performed a thousand wonders, that he showed forth *his own glory*, and obliged, or so much as allowed people to *believe in him*. Nay, Christ himself put his working miracles upon his equality with the Father. When he cured the infirm man, at the pool of Bethesda, he said, "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work." The Jews understood him, and were offended, because, "by calling God his Father, was making himself *EQUAL* with God."

3. We may see the *unreasonableness* of the *Jews*, in rejecting Christ as the promised *Messias*. They first believed the *truth* of his miracles, and then denied the *truth attested* by them. For he repeatedly appealed to his miracles as a proof that he was the *Messias*. "The works which the Father hath given me to finish, the same works that I do, bear witness of me, that the Father hath sent me." Again, "If I had not done the works among them which no other man did, they had not had sin," i. e., in not believing in me. He did those works no man else did. No: not even Moses and Elias. He healed all manner of diseases, and cast out devils, by the word of his mouth. The *Jews* saw the miracles which Christ wrought: but they believed the miracles of Moses upon the *testimony* of their fathers. John Baptist wrought no miracle, and one observes, "No account can be given so *probable* as that the minds of the

people might not be troubled with any competition between Christ and him." And it is worth while to observe, that the prophecies concerning the miracles which the *Messias* should work, were fulfilled in Christ. "Then the eyes of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped, then shall the lame man leap as an hart, and the tongue of the dumb shall sing." Isaiah xxxv. 5, 6. Lastly, when we consider the dispersion of the Jews, which took place exactly according to the prediction of Christ, if the prophecies in the Old Testament be not fulfilled in him, it is impossible they should be fulfilled at all. "Let the people of the Jews be in their former condition, and then plead for a *Messias* to come."*

4. As Christ by his miracles, proved the divinity of his person, and that he was the promised *Messias*; then we may firmly believe, that the New Testament dispensation is of divine authority. Now, this cannot be true according to the Socinian and Unitarian blasphemy. *These men* cannot answer a *Jew*. He will tell them, "Our dispensation was given by a *God*, your's only by a *Creature*. Can a *God* by *office* disanul what was established by him, who is a *God* by *nature*. Here observe,

As Christ came to abolish the Old Testament manner of worship, which was settled by a power of miracles in Moses, and appoint a new one, it was necessary that he should work miracles, to induce the Jews to renounce the *former*, and embrace the *latter*. Moses was a servant in the house, and wrought his miracles by a *derived* power. As he himself saith, "Hereby ye shall know that the Lord hath sent me to do all these works, and I have not done them in mine own mind." But Christ "as a Son over his own house," wrought his miracles by his *own power*, as hath been proved. In giving the several appointments, Moses always expresseth himself by "thus saith the Lord." Christ expresseth himself thus: "Verily, verily, *I* say unto you." Thus he said to the disciples: "Ye believe in *God*; believe also in *ME*." So that he did not *absolutely* condemn the Jews, in requiring a sign, but their *hypocrisy*, in not being satisfied with his miracles, which so fully displayed his divine power. They required a σημειον, a something above δυναμις; a prodigy rather than a miracle. "An evil and an adulterous generation, seeketh after a sign, and there shall no sign be given it, but the sign of the prophet Jonas," i. e., by my resurrection. As if he had said, that, not so much for the conversion of such wilful unbelievers, as to testify my innocence. And one observes, "That the terrible signs at Mount Sinai, were suitable to the *severity* of the law, the gracious miracles of Christ, to the *sweetness* and *grace* of the gospel." In fine, as the Father and the Spirit never became visible, so it was the Son, who appeared and spake to *Moses* out of the bush, and afterwards gave him the tables of the Covenant, and the whole frame of the ceremonial worship. He declared to Moses, that his name was *I AM*; and to the Jews, before Abraham was, *I AM*. So that, as he had authority to give the ceremonial worship from mount Sinai, he had the same authority, (having himself fulfilled it,) to abolish it in the fulness of time, and establish the New Testament dispensation. Let us contemplate him, in this branch of his Providence. He said to his disciples, "With desire have I desired (i. e., I have heartily desired,) to eat this (last) passover with you before I suffer. For I say unto you, I will not any more eat thereof until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God. And he took the cup and gave thanks, and said, Take this and divide it among yourselves; for I say unto you, I will not drink of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God shall come." This was the *last* passover that was observed by a divine appointment. For not long after, "Christ our

* Tertullian.

passover was sacrificed for us." Thus, "he abolished in his flesh, the law of commandments contained in ordinances." Or, as it is expressed in another place, "He blotted out the hand-writing of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross."

After the Paschal supper, "He took bread, and gave thanks, and break it, and gave unto them, saying, This is my body given for you; this do in remembrance of me. Likewise also the cup after supper, saying, This cup is the New Testament in my blood, which is shed for you." And saith the apostle, "As often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew, (shew ye) the Lord's death till he come." After his resurrection from the dead, when about to go up to the kingdom, he fully and finally established a gospel ministry, confirmed and enlarged (as to its objects,) the ordinance of baptism, in lieu of circumcision. Saith he, "All power is given unto me, in heaven and in earth. Go ye, therefore, and teach *all nations*, baptizing *them* in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." When he saith, "all power is given unto me," it does not imply any inferiority, but rather a communion in the Godhead, and the result of the counsel of peace that was between the Father and himself, because on that occasion, he suffered himself to be worshipped. Lastly: He qualified them for going abroad, by bestowing on them the gift of tongues. This was peculiar to that age, and that set of preacher's; for tongues were to cease, and this sort of knowledge to vanish away. "They spake with tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance;" so that "many ran to and fro, and knowledge was increased." Thus, the Old Testament dispensation was consummated in the Christian. And this is "the kingdom that cannot be moved," till it consummate in the kingdom above.

5. Christ displayed his love and power, by his miracles, in overturning the kingdom of Satan in this world. When our Saviour was on earth, and some time after, Satan was, in a very eminent manner, "the god of this world." His design was to make this earth a *province* of hell, by his lying oracles, in his idolatrous temples and numerous possessions of the bodies of men. Thus, Christ had many opportunities of visibly triumphing over him. He was struck with terror at our Saviour's appearance: "Art thou come to torment us before the time?" His most numerous, powerful, and combined forces fled at his word. One *dispossessed* devil declared, that his name was *Legion*, i. e., according to the Roman calculation, five thousand. Of others, Christ said, "This kind cometh not out, but by prayer and fasting." And on another occasion he said, "I saw Satan falling, as lightning from heaven." Lastly, he said to the disciples, "These signs shall follow them that believe. In my name they shall cast out devils." This was not peculiar to the apostles, but done "by the meanest sort of Christians, merely by their prayers," saith Origen. And beyond the power of the gravest philosophers, who considered the Christian religion as a "sublimier kind of philosophy," as Tertullian tells us; but replies, "The devil was never afraid of a philosopher's beard, nor were diseases cured by a philosophic pallium," i. e., a philosopher's cloak. Thus Christ made it appear, that his power was greater than the devil's who had possession, because he overcame him, took from him all his armour, wherein he trusted, and divided his spoils, i. e., "dispossessed him of men's bodies, and his idolatrous temples, silenced his oracles, nonplussed his magicians, and at last, when Christianity had overcome by sufferings, wrested the worldly power of the empire out of his hands, and employed it against himself."*

* Stillingfleet's *Origines Sacrae*, p. 271.

6. Christ displayed his love and power by his miracles, in spreading the gospel over the world, and establishing it where Satan had his seat, with no other rational evidence, than was contained in the miracles wrought for the confirmation of it. Chrysostom saith, "It was the greatest miracle of all; the world should believe without miracles." The pretended ambiguity, and universal spread of the heathen religion, the prejudice of their education, and the laws of the Emperors, conspired to confirm them in their idolatry. Nay, the doctrines of Christianity were above their reason, and pure matters of faith; and as they struck them off, from the belief in a multiplicity of gods, they enjoined them to believe that there are three distinct persons existing in one divine nature, the same in substance, equal in power and glory; and lastly, the pure precepts of Christianity condemned all the impurity and filthiness of their worship and conversation. These were so many foils, to set off the evidence of the power of miracles, which was in those who published these things to the world. The apostles went forth and preached every where, "the Lord working with them, and confirming the word with signs following." We conclude this particular by observing, that when the gospel is *once* fully confirmed by *true* and *proper* miracles, there is no necessity for these being continued, or revived in any future period. This observation lays flat the pretended miracles of Mahomet, and the popish priests, all which were ridiculous, and not to confirm any truth of Christianity, but their own mysteries of iniquity. Saith Austin, "He that seeks for miracles still to *induce* him to faith, when the world is converted to the Christian faith, he needs not seek for prodigies abroad, he needs only a looking glass to discover one." For as he goes on, "Whence came it to pass, that in so learned and wary an age as that was, which the apostles preached in, the world, without miracles, should be brought to believe things so strangely incredible as those which Christ and his apostles preached."

It was judged necessary to illustrate the preceding observations for the benefit of common readers, though the learned know them; and to explode the gross errors, blasphemies, and even Atheism, which abound at present. There are many unruly and vain talkers, whose mouths must be stopped, who subvert whole houses, (and if they could, whole nations,) "teaching things which they ought not." Nay, a learned Heathen philosopher will tell them, "Take away the being and providence of God out of the world, and there follows nothing but perturbation and confusion in it, not only all sanctity, piety and devotion is destroyed, but all faith, virtue and human societies too."* All which are impossible to be upheld without religion, as not only *he*, but Plato, Aristotle, and Plutarch have fully demonstrated. These men, who deny the *truth* of Christ's miracles, the *divinity* of his person, or affirm that he wrought his miracles by a *derived* power, sap the foundation of the whole Christian religion, and nullify the divine authority of the New Testament dispensation.

4th. Hath Christ left us an example of practical religion? Then we ought to follow his steps and "walk as he walked." Indeed, we cannot walk so perfectly as he walked; but the higher we take our aim, we will walk the higher. Let us begin by imitating Christ in the exercise of devotion; and that,

1. In prayer. Indeed, Christ was under no *personal* necessity to pray to God. He had no *personal* sins to confess, no pardon, holiness and salvation to plead. His human nature, by virtue of union to the divine, had a full and an immediate title to the highest degree of glory and blessedness which it was capable of enjoying. But Christ was under the law

* Cicero.

as *Mediator*, and in that character, the Father made him the promise of assistance in his work, acceptance of it, and reward for it; accordingly he was frequently and fervently employed in prayer; this was in accomplishment of an ancient prophecy. Thus saith the Father, "My mercy and my faithfulness shall be with him, and in my name his horn shall be exalted. He shall cry unto me, thou art my Father, my God, and the rock of my salvation." But prayer is absolutely necessary for us. It is a duty we owe to God, in a way of *homage*, and to ourselves, in a way of pity.

The first thing that the grace of God does in the conversion of a sinner, is to bring him to his knees. "The jailer trembling fell down and cried, What shall I do to be saved?" The first breath of the new creature is drawn in prayer. "We have received the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father." The life of religion is maintained by prayer. Saith a great divine, "Prayer and praise are the lungs of a Christian: by prayer, he draws in the blessings of salvation, and by praise, he expresseth them, in a way of gratitude." What he receives as a *bounty*, he returns as an *offering*. "What shall I render to the Lord? *All* his benefits. I will take the cup of salvation, (the thanksgiving cup,) and call upon the name of the Lord." Religion on earth is often completed and concluded in prayer. Stephen kneeled down and prayed, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." We ought to pray in faith, with fervency, reverence, and godly fear, "*looking up*." There is not a sigh or a groan on account of sin, or for the cause of Christ, but is loud enough to *reach* heaven. The Lord has a book for the prayers, and a bottle for the tears of his people. But, alas! do not multitudes "cast off fear and restrain prayer before God?" Living as if they had brutal souls in human bodies. May not that sentence be engraven upon the lintel and door-posts of many dwellings? "God is not in this house." And in others, "The place where prayer was *wont* to be made," i. e., by pious ancestors. O, that prayerless sinners would consider the terror of that sentence, "God will pour his fury on the families that call not on his name," and imitate the example of Christ, who prayed as the head of a *wandering* family; and of *Joshua*, who said, "As for me and my house, we *will* serve the Lord." A prayerless soul is a graceless soul.

(To be continued.)

ART. III. *A Vindication of the Scottish Covenanters: consisting of a Review of the First Series of the Tales of My Landlord*

(Continued from Vol. ix. page 756.)

As Dryden had ridiculed the English Puritans on the stage, our Scottish Episcopalians thought it necessary to attempt something in the same style, and therefore got up a comedy. In their preface to this piece, they say, "It may be objected, that for all our pretences to truth and sincerity in matters of fact, yet we talk at random in the last scene, where we make the Presbyterian ministers speak basely and maliciously of all kings.—This is easily answered.—It may be considered that the Presbyterians are enemies to monarchy; for this is the third time that Presbytery has been established in Scotland and still upon the death or banishment of some of their lawful sovereigns."—"The Chorus is as pertinent as any thing can be, since they are a set of men who never forgive an injury, and, instead of praying for the conversion, they pour down

curses for the confusion of their enemies. Our design in this essay, is fully to represent the villainy and folly of the fanatics, that so, when they are in sober mood, they may seriously reflect on them, and repent for what is past, and make amends for the future, *if it be possible*; or else that the civil government may be awakened, and roused to rid us of this gang, who injuriously treat all good and learned men, and are enemies to human society itself.* The writers were abundantly sanguine in their expectations of success, and dreamed of nothing but blowing up the Presbyterian church by their well contrived plot. To use their own language—

“ True Comedy should humour represent:
I think, for once, we’ve well enough bit on’t,
No character’s too wild, nor yet extravagant:
For there is nothing treated in our play,
But what all know the Whigs do act and say;
Thus you’ve a taste of their new gospel-way.”

They were, however, disappointed: the Scots saw no truth, and the English no humor in it; those which they had “laid up in store,” were not called for; and the authors were obliged to console themselves with the excuse,

“ Our northern country seldom tastes of wit,
The too cold clime is justly blamed for it.”

The truth is, they had mistaken their own talent, which did not lie in comedy, but in tragic scenes; and luckily for the Presbyterians, they did not obtain an opportunity of reacting these. “I’ll tell thee, man, to believe a Presbyterian protestation, is as much as to think a man cannot cheat because he lies. I’m resolved ne’er to trust a fanatic till I get him on his chair of verity, the stone i’ the Grass-market; the villain is then tempted to tell something of the truth; that is to say, that he dies a rogue and a rebel.

And now, since prayers are so much in vogue,
We will with one conclude this epilogue:
Let the just Heav’ns our king and peace restore,
And villains never vex us any more.”†

Passing over, at present, *The Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence*, and *The Whigg’s Supplication*, we shall finish this chain of authorities by an extract from a work of sober argumentation, in which the following character is given of Presbyterians. “They are naturally rigid and severe, and therefore conclude that God is such a one as themselves. They damn all who differ from them, and therefore think that God does the same. And because they love themselves, they are pleased to persuade themselves that they are his special favorites. Hence they conclude that they owe them no civilities whom God neglects, nor kind offices whom he hates. He neglects and hates all who are not capable of his grace, which none are (say they) who are not of their way. This wicked persuasion sanctifies not only the ill manners, but which is worse, the ill nature of the party towards all who differ from them. It contradicts the ends of society and government, and is only calculated to advance the private interest of a partial and designing set of men.”‡ In the same work, it is shewn that the Presbyterian spirit is *enthusiastical*—an *animal or mechanical* spirit—a *partial* spirit—a *narrow and mean* spirit—a *malicious, unforgiving* spirit—an *unconversable* spirit—a *disloyal, rebellious* spirit—a spirit of *division*—an *unneighborly, cruel, and barbarous* spirit.§

We have not made these extracts for the purpose of amusing the

* The Assembly, or Scotch Reformation, a comedy.

† The Assembly, &c. p. 4, and epilogue. ‡ Rhind’s Apology, p. 208. § Ibid. *passim*.

reader, nor can we be charged with wantonly or unnecessarily exposing the violence of the individuals or the party from whose speeches or writings they have been taken. So far as this may be the consequence of the disclosure, it is chargeable on the aggressor, and not on those who act on the defensive, and who are allowed, nay bound, to make use of every legitimate weapon of defence. In the first place, it is of the greatest consequence, in judging of the truth or falsehood of a charge, to inquire exactly into its origin, and to ascertain the character and probable motives of the person or persons who gave rise to it. And this is still more necessary in the case of general prejudices and vague accusations, which are not supported by reference to specific facts. In the second place, we are of opinion, that the quotations which we have made, while they lead to the source of the calumnies circulated against Presbyterians, at the same time discover the grounds on which they rest, and must dispose every candid person to regard them with the strongest suspicion. For example, when we find Jeffries and Sacheverell employing the same language in speaking of the friends of civil and religious liberty in England, which Mackenzie and Rhind applied to the Scots Presbyterians and field-preachers, does not this afford a strong presumption, that both were actuated by the same motives, and that, whatever circumstantial differences might exist, the grounds of offence given by the objects of persecution and calumny in the two nations, were radically and substantially the same? In the third place, we have quoted from the very authorities upon which the author of the *Tales* has depended in forming his representation. To these he must be understood as referring, when he tells us, in the enigmatical style of his preliminary discourse, that he has been enabled to "qualify the narratives of Old Mortality and his Cameronian friends by the reports of more than one descendant of ancient and honourable families—more than one non-juring bishop—here and there a laird or two—and the game-keepers of these gentlemen;" for surely he did not intend his readers to understand him as intimating that he had been guided literally by traditional reports, either on the one side or the other. Lastly, although the author has not brought forward all the charges contained in these extracts, and has in general expressed them in more temperate language, yet was it necessary to give them at large. It was necessary, because almost every one of them will be found to be insinuated or involved in some part of his representation. It was necessary, to show that some of the authors are totally inadmissible as witnesses in this cause, owing to the malice which they discover against the Presbyterians, and the injuries which they had done them. It was necessary, to shew that the evidence given by others of them ought to be received *cum nota*, because they discover deep prejudice, and bear testimony to many things which are utterly incredible, or notoriously false. And it was necessary, to put the reader in the possession of the notions which they attached to the words *puritanism*, *fanaticism*, and *rebellion*, with which they have so liberally aspersed their adversaries.—We now proceed to a more particular examination of the character which the author of the *Tales* has given of the Covenanters.

And, first, of their *puritanism*.—On this topic, the author talks quite at ease, and, we dare say, never dreamt that his representation would be controverted, or that a single question would be put to him on the subject. Accordingly, in speaking of Presbyterians, the use of the epithets *puritanical* and *precise* is just as much a matter of course with him, as it is in the West Indies to speak of whites, mulattoes, and people of color. We are not among the number of those who are disposed to pay much regard to such names,—we can hear them applied to ourselves with indifference, and condemn the ignorant or uncivil sneer with which they

may be accompanied. But we know the influence which they have upon the vulgar, both great and small; and we beg leave to offer the author an advice or two on this point. First, it is not very consistent or becoming in one who has ridiculed the Covenanters for calling their opponents Erastians and Papa-Prelatists, to commit the same fault, by bandying terms which are equally reproachful, and of still more loose and indeterminate signification. Secondly, we would advise him not to employ, or, at least, not to repeat names of whose meaning he may not have a distinct and definite idea. We strongly suspect that, if interrogated, his ideas on this subject would be found as vague and shifting as those of the vulgar are respecting the extreme points of north and south. What is it that constitutes a puritan, or wherein does precisianism lie? Does it lie in scrupling to be present at a wappin-schaw, and to shoot at a mark? Does it lie in repining at the use of the Common Prayer-Book, the surplice, or the sign of the cross?—Or, does it consist in laying claim to perfect spotlessness, or in confining saintship within the pale of a particular church or party? If so, let it be proved that this ever was the sentiment of Presbyterians. Or, were they puritans because they pretended to greater strictness in practice than the court and clergy who persecuted them? This, surely, they might do without being “religious overmuch,” or proudly arrogating to themselves any uncommon degrees of holiness.—Again, we would remind the author, that the injudicious use of this senseless term of opprobrium was in former times productive of the most ruinous consequences to those who were so foolish as to encourage the practice. James, who had unadvisedly applied it to the principles of Presbyterians in his Basilicon Doron, found it prudent to retract the imputation, even after he had ascended the English throne. Charles I. was not equally wise. His parasitical and aspiring clergy were encouraged to load his best subjects with this obnoxious charge, until they filled the parliament and the army with puritans, and brought the misguided and unhappy monarch to the block. Untutored by adversity, and incapable of reaping instruction from their father’s fate, the two sons of Charles pursued the same infatuated course; while they proscribed and persecuted the most sober and conscientious part of the nation as seditious and disaffected persons, they employed hiring preachers, poets, and drolls, to deride them as precise bigots, and fanatical knaves; and the result was, that the Stuarts were driven from the throne, and, by their merited misfortunes, proclaimed at last to the world who were the real bigots and fanatics. It is no good omen of the present times, that a spirit of the same kind should have been revived.

On this subject we beg leave to quote the words of a sensible author, who wrote immediately before the breaking out of the civil war in England, and who was no Presbyterian. “Let us then (says he) a little farther search into the mysterious abuse and misapplication of this word Puritan. Those whom we ordinarily call Puritans are men of strict life, and precise opinions, which cannot be hated for any thing but their singularity in zeale and piety; and certainly the number of such men is too small, and their condition too low and dejected: but they which are the devil’s chiefe artificers in abusing this word, when they please, can so stretch and extend the same, that scarce any civill honest Protestant, which is hearty and true to his religion, can avoid the aspersion of it; and when they list againe, they can so shrink it into a narrow sense, that it shall seem to be aimed at none but monstrous abominable heretickes and miscreants. Thus by its latitude it strikes generally, by its contraction it pierces deeply, by its confused application it deceives invisibly. Small scruples first intitle mee to the name of Puritan, and then the name of Puritan entitles me further to all mischiefe whatsoever.”—“There are

many men amongst us now which brooke bishops and ceremonies well enough, and perhaps favourably interpret our late innovations; and yet these may be too grave to escape the name of Puritans. To be a Protestant may be allowed, but to dispute against Papists smels of preciseness; to hold the Pope fallible is tolerated, but to hold him Antichrist is abominable Puritanisme; to goe to church is fashionable, but to complain of the masse, or to be grieved at the publick countenance of Popery, whereby it intertwines our religion, and now drinks up that sap which is scarce afforded to Protestantisme, or at all to take notice how far some of our divines are hereat conniving, if not co-operating, is a sumptome of a deepe infected Puritan. He that is not moderate in religion is a Puritan; and hee that is not a Cassandrian, or of Father Francis Syncer's faith, is not moderate; he savours too much of Calvin's grosse learning, exploded now by our finest wits. But I passe from this kinde of Puritan to another, whom I shall call my political Puritan; for the bounds of Puritanisme are yet larger, and inclose men of other conditions. Some there are yet which perhaps disfavour not at all either ecclesiasticall policy, or moderate Papists; and yet, neverthesse, this is not sufficient to acquit them from the name of Puritans, if they ascribe any thing to the lawes and liberties of this realme, or hold the prerogative royall to be limitable by any law whatsoever. If they hold not against parliaments and with ship-money, they are injurious to kings; and to be injurious to kings is *proprium quarto modo* to a Puritan.

"This detested odious name of Puritan first began in the church presently after the Reformation, but now it extends it selfe further, and, gaining strength as it goes, it diffuses its poisonous ignominy further, and being not contented to gangrene religion, ecclesiasticall and civill policy, it now threatens destruction to all morality also. The honest strict demeanour, and civill conversation, which is so eminent in some men, does so upbraid and convince the Antipuritan, that even honesty, strictnesse, and civility it selfe must become disgracefull, or else they which are contrary cannot remaine in grace. But, because it is too grosse to deride vertue under the name of vertue, therefore other colours are invented, and so the same thing undergoes derision under an other name. The zealous man is despised under the name of zealot, the religious honest man has the vizard of an hypocrite and dissembler put upon him to make him odious. My Lord of Downe professes, that the first thing which made him distest the religion of Puritans (besides their grosse hypocrisie) was sedition. So, grosse hypocrisie, it seems, was the first. What is grosse or visible hypocrisie to the bishop, I know not, for I can see no windowes or casements in men's breasts, neither doe I thinke him indued with St. Peter's propheticall spirit whereby to perceive and search into the reines and hearts of hypocrites; but let him proceed. 'It is a plausible matter (sayes he) with the people to heare men in authority depraved, and to understand of any liberty and power appertaining to themselves. The profession also of extraordinary zeale, and as it were contempt of the world, workes with the multitude. When they see men goe simply in the streets, and bow downe their heads like a bull-rush, their inward parts burning with deceit, wringing their necks awry, shaking their heads as if they were in some present griefe, lifting up the white of their eyes at the sight of some vanity, giving great groanes, crying out against this sin and that sinne in their superiours, under colour of long prayers devouring widowes and married wives houses; when the multitude heares and sees such men, they are carryed away with a great conceit of them; but if they should judge of these men by their fruits, not by outward appearance, they should find them to be very farre from the true religion.' See here the froth of a scurrilous libeller, whereby it is concluded that he

that is of severe life, and averse from the common vanities of the time, is an hypocrite. If these descriptions of outward austerity shall not onely shew what is an hypocrite, but point out also who is an hypocrite, our Saviour himselfe wil hardly escape this description. Doubtless our Saviour, and many of his devoutest followers, did groane, shake their heads, and lift up their eyes at the sight of some publick sins, and vanities, and did not spare to taxe the vices of superiours, and to preach too and admonish the meaner sort of the people; yet who but an Annas or Caiphas will infer from hence, that therefore their inward parts burne with deceit, and that their end is meerely to carry away the multitude—such as judge onely by outward appearance, and have not their senses exercised to discern betwixt good and evil?

“’Tis a miserable thing to see how farre this word Puritan, in an ethical sense, dilates it selfe. Heretofore it was Puritanicall to abstain from small sinnes; but now ’tis so to abstaine from grosse open sinnes. In the mouth of a drunkard, he is a Puritane which refuseth his cups; in the mouth of a swearer, he which feares an oath; in the mouth of a libertine, he which makes any scruple of common sinnes; in the mouth of a rude soldier, he which wisheth the Scotch warre at an end without blood. It is sufficient that such men thinke themselves tacitly checked and affronted by the unblameable conversation of Puritans.”—“The Papist we see hates one kind of Puritans, the hierarchist another, the court sycophant another, the sensual libertine another; yet all hate a Puritan, and under the same name many times hate the same thing. In the yeare of grace 1588, when the Spanish armado had miscarried, notwithstanding that his Holinesse of Rome had so peremptorily christened it, and as it were conjured for it, one of that religion was strangely distempered at it, and his speech was, as ’tis reported, God himselfe was turned Lutheran; by which, for certaine, he meant hereticall. ’Tis much therefore that my Lord of Downe, now that Episcopacy is so foyled in Scotland, has not raged in the like manner, and charged God of turning Puritan; but surely, if he has spared God, he has not spared any thing else that is good; and if he has pared to call God puritan, he has not spared to call Puritan devill. But, to conclude, if the confused misapplication of this foule word Puritan be not reformed in England, and that with speed, we can expect nothing but a suddaine universall downfall of all goodnesse whatsoever.”—*A Discourse concerning Puritans*, pp. 8, 41, 50, 54, 57. Printed 1641.

The author of the *Tales* is not more sparing in the use of this term of reproach, and others of similar import, than his predecessors were. The Puritan whom he exposes, is not one who scruples at a few indifferent ceremonies, or who superciliously condemns all harmless recreations—he is one who refuses conformity to any kind of religion which may be enjoined by his superiors, or who is so squeamish as to stickle at occasionally transgressing the rules of decency, or laws that are vulgarly reckoned divine. Thus he introduces his hero as saying to Burley, “My uncle is of opinion, that we enjoy a reasonable freedom of conscience under the indulged clergymen, and I *must necessarily* be guided by his sentiments respecting the choice of a place of worship for his family.” (Vol. ii. p. 92.) This is passive obedience with a witness! to the utter prostration of the rights of conscience, and leading to all the extent of the wicked principle of Hobbes! The disciples of that philosopher boasted of his discovery as calculated to put an end to religious persecution. Yes, it is so; but it is at the expense of banishing all religion all morality from the world, and reducing men to the level of a brute. Upon this principle, a person not only may, but “*must necessarily*” be a Papist at Rome, a Mahomedan at Constantinople, and a Pagan at Peking; for surely

it will not be pleaded, that less obedience is due to the supreme government of a country than to an uncle. If the author really meant what his words natively suggest, and if he intended to express his own sentiments by the mouth of his hero, then we cease to wonder at the partiality which he has shewn to an oppressive government, and his want of sympathy for the objects of persecution. There is another instance to which we must refer as a commentary upon the author's sentiments respecting puritanism and precision. In describing the scene at Milnwood, when visited by a military party, he informs us, that "the agony of his avarice," at the thoughts of parting with his money, overcame old Morton's "puritanic precision." And how did this appear? By his making use of one of the most vulgar, gross, and indecent words which one can apply to a woman—so indecent, that the author, or his printer, could express it only by giving the initial and final letters, and, when he afterward introduces a trooper as using the same word, judged it fit to drop one of these! (vol. ii. pp. 189, 243.) *Ex ungue leonem*. Such are the refined and liberal notions of the author of the Tales! It is "puritanic precision" to boggle at an indecent expression; and it argues the same weakness of mind, no question, to scruple at taking the name or word of God in vain. And yet this is the gentleman who complains that the Covenanters wanted "good manners"—who derides the coarse and vulgar dialect of their preachers, and is the advocate for elegant studies and accomplishments!

The author seems to have forgotten, that he is not living in the days of Charles II. and that the religion of the Covenanters has now obtained the sanction of the national laws, and is the established religion of his country. We beg leave to inform him, if he does not already know it, that every thing for which the Covenanters contended, both in point of principle and of practice, is contained in the standards of the national church. These were composed in pursuance of the Solemn League and Covenant, by the Assembly of Divines which met at Westminster, under the authority of the Parliament of England, and during the civil war. They explicitly contain the Calvinistic tenets, and the doctrine concerning what he is pleased to denominate, "a judaical observance of the Sabbath;" they assert the parity of ministers of the Gospel, in opposition to Prelatic hierarchy; and, in opposition to Erastian encroachments by civil rulers, they assert that Christ is the alone King and Head of his church, and that he has appointed a government in it distinct from the civil magistrate, who "may not assume to himself the power of the keys of the kingdom of heaven." These, according to the author's own shewing, embrace all the leading articles which the Covenanters maintained, and for adhering to which they suffered. If, therefore, there is any justice or force in his ridicule, the weight of it must fall upon the established religion of Scotland. It is this which he has all along been deriding under the name of puritanism and precisianism. If he disapproves of it, he is at liberty to do so; let him bring forth his strong reasons, and they shall be examined; but whether it is decent and becoming in him to hold up its principles to derision, as if they were unworthy of serious argument, we shall leave the public to judge when the cause is fairly before them.

If he shall say, that he has not ridiculed these principles, but merely the conduct of those men who maintained them in former times,—we deny this; and we add, that these constitute the merits of the cause; and, provided they are cleared from misrepresentation, the portion of ridicule which remains in the Tale will turn out to be excessively trifling and childish. What did our Presbyterian ancestors do, but maintain their religious profession, and defend their rights and privileges, against

the attempts which were made to wrest these from them? This was the body and front of their offending. And were they not entitled to act this part? Were they not bound to do it? What although, in discharging this arduous duty, in times of unexampled trial, they were guilty of partial irregularities, and some of them of individual crimes? What although the language in which they expressed themselves was homely, and appears to our ears coarse, and unsuitable to the subject? What although they gave a greater prominence to some points, and laid a greater stress on some articles, than we may now think they were entitled to? What although they discovered an immoderate heat and irritation of spirit, considering the barbarous and brutal manner in which they had long been treated? What although they fell into parties, and quarrelled among themselves, when we consider the crafty and insidious measures employed by their adversaries to disunite them—and when we can perceive them actuated by honesty and principle, even in the greatest errors into which they were betrayed? These, granting them to be all true, may form a proper subject for sober statement, and for cool animadversion; but never for turning the whole of their conduct into ridicule, or treating them with scurrilous buffoonery. No enlightened friend to civil and religious liberty—no person, whose moral and humane feelings have not been warped by the most lamentable party-prejudices, would ever think of treating them in this manner. They were sufferers—they were suffering unjustly—they were demanding only what they were entitled to enjoy—they persevered in their demands until they were successful—and to their disinterested struggles, and their astonishing perseverance, we are indebted, under God, for the blessings which we enjoy. And we can assure our author, that his statements are not so correct, nor his ridicule so well directed and powerful, as to deter us from their vindication.

(To be continued.)

ART. IV. *The Danger of Latitudinarian Schemes of Union and Fellowship.*

MOURNFUL as the divisions of the church are, and anxious as all its genuine friends must be to see them cured, it is their duty to examine carefully the plans which may be proposed for attaining this desirable end. We must not do evil that good may come; and there are sacrifices too costly to be made for the procuring of peace with fellow-christians. Is it necessary to remind you, that unity and peace are not always good, nor a sure and infallible mark of a true and pure church? We know that there is a church which has long boasted of her catholic unity notwithstanding all the corruptions which pollute her communion; and that within her pale the whole world called Christian once enjoyed a profound repose, and it could be said, "Behold, the people is one, and they have all one language." It was a union and peace founded in ignorance, delusion, implicit faith, and a base subjection to human authority; and supported by the arts of compulsion and terror. But there are other methods by which Christians may be deceived, and the interests of religion deeply injured, under the pretext or with the view of uniting its friends. Among these I know none more imposing, nor from which greater danger is to be apprehended in the present time, than that which proceeds on the scheme of principles usually styled latitudinarian.

It has obtained this name because it proclaims an undue latitude in matters of religion, which persons may take to themselves or give to

others. Its abettors make light of the differences which subsist among religious parties, and propose to unite them on the common principles on which they are already agreed, in the way of burying the rest in silence, or of stipulating mutual forbearance and charity with respect to every thing about which they may differ in opinion or in practice. Some plead for this on the ground that the several professions of religion differ very little from one another, and are all conducive to the happiness of mankind and the honour of God, who is pleased with the various and diversified modes in which men profess their regard to him, provided only they are sincere in their professions; a principle of difformity, which, however congenial to the system of polytheism, is utterly eversive of a religion founded on the unity of the divine nature and will, and on a revelation which teaches us what we are to believe concerning God, and what duty he requires of us. But the ground on which this plan is ordinarily made to rest is a distinction made among the articles of religion. Some of these are called essential, or necessary, or principal; others circumstantial, or non-fundamental, or unnecessary or less important. The former, it is pleaded, are embraced by all true Christians; the latter form the subjects of difference among them, and ought not to enter into the terms of ecclesiastical fellowship.* On this principle some of them would conciliate and unite all the Christian denominations, not excepting Papists, Arians and Socinians; while others restrict their plan to those called evangelical, who differ mainly in their views and practice as to the worship, order, and discipline of the Church.

The distinction on which this scheme rests, is itself liable to objections which appear insuperable. It is not warranted by the word of God; and the most acute of its defenders have never been able to state it in a manner that is satisfactory, or which renders it subservient to any practical use. The scripture, indeed, speaks of certain truths which may be called the foundation, because they are first laid, and others depend on them—first principles, or elementary truths, which are to be taught before others. But their priority or posteriority in point of order, in conception or instruction, does not determine the relative importance of doctrines, or their necessity in order to salvation, far less does it determine the propriety of their being made to enter into the religious profession of Christians and Christian churches. There are doctrines, too, which intrinsically, and on different accounts, may be said to have a peculiar and superior degree of importance; and this, so far as known, may properly be urged as a motive for our giving the more earnest heed to them. It is not however, their comparative importance or utility, but their truth and the authority of him who has revealed them, which is the formal and proper reason of our receiving, professing, and maintaining them. And this applies equally to all the contents of a divine revelation. The relations of truths, especially those of a supernatural kind, are manifold and incomprehensible by us; it is not our part to pronounce a judgment on them; and if we could see them, as God does, in all their extent and at once, we would behold the lesser joined to the greater, the most remote connected with the primary, by necessary and indissoluble links, and all together conspiring to form one beautiful and harmonious and indivisible whole. Whatever God has revealed we are bound to receive and hold fast, whatever he has enjoined we are bound to obey; and the liberty which we dare not arrogate to ourselves we cannot give to others. It is not, indeed, necessa-

* The distinction is variously expressed. Some modern writers on the subject of communion adhere to the distinction between what is essential, or not essential to salvation. Others, aware of what has been urged against it, chuse to substitute the word fundamental in the room of essential; and, for security's sake, they would add a few other articles to the fundamental. But what the one or the other are they do not tell.

ry that the confession or testimony of the church (meaning by this that which is explicitly made by her, as distinguished from her declared adherence to the whole word of God,) should contain all truths; but then any of them may come to be included in it, when opposed and endangered; and it is no sufficient reason for excluding any of them that they are less important than others, or that they have been doubted and denied by good and learned men. Whatever forbearance may be exercised to persons, "the word of the Lord," in all its extent, "must have free course and be glorified;" and any act of men—call it forbearance or what you will—which serves as a screen and protection to error or sin, and prevents it from being opposed and removed by any proper means, is contrary to the divine law, and consequently is destitute of all intrinsic force and validity. There are truths also which are more immediately connected with salvation. But who will pretend to fix those propositions which are absolutely necessary to be known, in order to salvation—by all persons—of all capacities—an in all situations; or say how low a God of grace and salvation may descend in dealing with particular individuals? Or, if we could determine this extreme point, who would say that it ought to fix the rule of our dealing with others, or the extent of a church's profession of faith? Is nothing else to be kept in view in settling articles of faith and fellowship, but what may be necessary to the salvation of sinners? Do we not owe a paramount regard to the glory of God in the highest, to the edifying of the body of Christ, to the advancing of the general interests of religion, and to the preserving, in purity, of those external means, by which, in the economy of providence and grace, the salvation of men, both initial and progressive, may be promoted to an incalculable extent from age to age? In fine, there is reason for complaining that the criteria or marks given for determining these fundamental or necessary articles, are uncertain or contradictory. Is it alleged that they are clearly taught in scripture? This is true of others also. "That they are few and simple?" This is contradicted by their own attempts to state them. "That they are such as the scripture has declared to be necessary?" Why then have we not yet been furnished with a catalogue of them? "That they are such as are embraced by all true Christians?" Have they a secret tact by which they are able to discover such characters? If not, can they avoid running into a vicious circle in reasoning, by first determining who are true Christians by their embracing certain doctrines, and then determining that these doctrines are fundamental because they are embraced by persons of that description?

Many who have contributed to give currency to this scheme have been actuated, I have no doubt, by motives which are in themselves highly commendable. They wished to fix the attention of men on matters confessedly of great importance, and were anxious to put an end to the dissensions of Christians by discovering a mean point in which the views of all might harmoniously meet. But surely those who cherish a supreme regard for divine authority will be afraid of contemning or of teaching others to think lightly of any thing which bears its sacred impress. They will be disposed carefully to reconsider an opinion, or an interpretation of any part of Scripture, which seems to imply in it, that God has given to men a power to dispense with some of his own laws. And they will be cautious of originating or countenancing plans of communion that may involve a principle of such a complexion. These plans are more or less dangerous according to the extent to which they are carried, and the errors or abuses which may prevail among the parties which they embrace. But however limited they may be, they set an example which may be carried to any extent. So far as it is agreed and stipulated, that any

truth or duty shall be sacrificed or neglected, and that any error or *sift* shall be treated as indifferent or trivial, the essence of latitudinarianism is adopted, room is made for further advancements, and the way is prepared for ascending, through successive gradations, to the very highest degree in the scale.

Another plan of communion, apparently opposite to the former, but proceeding on the same general principle, has been zealously recommended, and in some instances reduced to practice, in the present day. According to it, the several religious parties are allowed to remain separate, and to preserve their distinct constitution and peculiarities, while a species of partial or occasional communion is established among them. This plan is liable to all the objections which lie against the former, with the addition of another that is peculiar to itself. It is inconsistent and self-contradictory. It strikes against the radical principles of the unity of the Church, and confirms schism by a law; while it provides that the parties shall remain separate, at the same time that it proceeds on the supposition that there is no scriptural or conscientious ground of difference between them. By defending such occasional conformity, English Dissenters at a former period contradicted the reasons of their dissent from the establishment, and exposed themselves to their opponents: for where communion is lawful, it will not be easy to vindicate separation from the charge of schism. The world has for some time beheld annually the spectacle of Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Independents, Methodists, and Seceders, sitting down together at the Lord's table, and then going away and maintaining communion, through the remainder of the year, on their own separate and contradictory professions. Nay, it has of late become the practice to keep in the same church, an open communion table for Christians of different denominations on one part of the day, and a close one for those of a particular sect on the other part of the day; while the same minister officiates, and many individuals communicate, on both these occasions. And all this is cried up as a proof of liberality, and a mind that has freed itself from the trammels of party!

It is difficult to say which of these plans is most objectionable. By the former, that church which is most faithful, and has made the greatest progress in reformation, must always be the loser, without having the satisfaction to think that she has conveyed any benefit to her new associates. It behoves her profession and managements to yield, and be reduced to the standard of those societies which are defective and less reformed; and thus by a process opposite to that mentioned by the apostle, those who have built on the foundation "gold, silver, precious stones," are the persons who shall "suffer loss." By the latter, all the good effects which might be expected from warrantable and necessary separations are lost, without the compensation of a rational and effective conjunction; purity of communion is endangered; persons are encouraged to continue in connection with the most corrupt churches; and a faithful testimony against errors and abuses, with all consistent attempts to have them removed or prevented, is held up to odium and reproach, as dictated by bigotry, and as tending to revive old dissensions, and to defeat the delightful prospect of those halcyon days of peace which are anticipated under the reign of mutual forbearance and charity.—*Dr. M' Crie on the Unity of the Church.*

ART. V. A Burning Heart.

A BURNING heart, or a heart on fire with love to the adorable Redeemer, is mentioned but once in the whole Bible. The persons who were favored with this sweet experience, were the "two disciples going to Emmaus." It was produced by the conversation of the condescending Saviour, and the effect arising from it was what might have been expected. It was, indeed, peculiarly delightful. Let us join the interesting travellers, and see how much instruction we can gain from their society.

On first coming up with them, we hear them *reasoning*. The name of the one was Cleopas, but the name of the other disciple is unknown. No doubt they witnessed the scenes of Gethsemane, where their Master was apprehended; they also saw him on Mount Calvary, nailed to the cross, and insulted by the multitude, and pierced by the soldier's spear. When Christ was apprehended in the garden, all his disciples forsook him and fled; but they soon began to collect together again. John followed his Lord to the high priest's hall; and poor Peter could not refrain from getting as near to him as possible, though, in doing it, he fell into bad company, and Satan sifted him as wheat, and there he thrice denied his Master. Oh! we cannot tell with what an anxious and disappointed look they gazed on Him whom they once thought would have redeemed Israel. But now he is crucified, dead and buried; and their enemies were indulging their insolent triumph, and the disciples were scattered as sheep having no shepherd. Cleopas and another had now left Jerusalem, and were going to a village about 60 furlongs off; and as they went they reasoned.

In a time of great darkness, of spiritual conflict and depression, the enemy is peculiarly active. All his fiery darts are levelled at the soul. This is the hour and power of darkness. It is Satan's sifting time; and a truly pious man may be so harassed by temptation, as to be ready to give up all for lost—to be hopeless—to dispute—to doubt—to despair.

Perhaps all these feelings were operating, at this moment, upon the heart of Cleopas and his brother; for we next perceive they were *gloomy*. Joy and peace flow from believing; but gloom and unbelief are intimate companions, and they are seldom long absent from each other. What a dreadful state of mind is this! and what a still more dreadful state it leads to, if boundless mercy do not interpose! For "the fearful and unbelieving shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone." But, happily for these gloomy disciples, there is one near them who can turn their mourning into joy. Jesus himself drew near, and said unto them, "What manner of communications are these that ye have one with another, as ye walk, and are sad?" This question seems to have astonished them. "Sad?" Strange, if it were not so! If thou wert merely a stranger in Jerusalem, thou couldst not have asked this question. How can we help being sad? Hast thou not heard what things are come to pass there in these days? And he said, "What things?" "Concerning Jesus of Nazareth, who was a prophet mighty in word and deed before God and all the people, and how the chief priests and our rulers have delivered him to be condemned to death, and have crucified him; but we trusted that it had been he who should have redeemed Israel." Yes, once we had great hopes; we saw his miracles; we witnessed his devotion; we heard the gracious words which proceeded out of his mouth; and we surely thought, this is the promised Seed, the Virgin's Son, the Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace; but now he is crucified as a blasphemer, and all our hopes are buried in his grave. Yet, we know not how to

account for it, but we cannot give up all hope respecting him. Surely, he cannot be a deceiver. There is yet truth in all he said. Thus our minds are torn asunder between hope and fear, and joy and grief. Yea, and certain women also of our company made us astonished, who were early at the sepulchre; and, when they found not his body, they came, saying, that they had seen a vision of angels, which said, that he was alive. What can all this mean? This, this is the cause of all our sadness.

Now, mark the change. Christ begins by chiding them. "O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken! Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory?" Was it not a suffering Messiah that was promised? Was he not to have been cut off, but not for himself? Is it not by his stripes that sinners must be healed? Why, you seem quite to have mistaken the matter. You fancied that you were to have a Messiah crowned with the glories of this world, and forgot that he was to be "a man of sorrow and acquainted with grief." "And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them, in all the Scriptures, the things concerning himself."

And now, now is the happy moment when the heart begins to warm, a spark is kindled; and as he proceeds, the flame increases. "Did not our hearts burn within us, while he talked with us by the way, and while he opened to us the Scriptures?"

Here let us mark the advantages of being acquainted with the Scriptures in early life. As soon as the verses were quoted, they recollected them; as soon as their connexion was pointed out, they saw it; as soon as their suitableness to describe the person, and character, and work, and sufferings of Christ was mentioned, they felt it; it burst at once upon their view, and they saw it clearly.

You, who are engaged in the delightful work of educating youth in the principles of the Bible, may take great encouragement from this. Behold here, one of the advantages which will result from your pious labors. You are preparing the way for training up a noble race of holy and enlightened people. You are sowing seed which one shower of divine grace will cause to spring up, and produce a plentiful harvest; you are preparing materials, and the divine blessing falling upon them will be like a spark on tinder, it will set the whole in a flame. Therefore, "be steadfast and immovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labor is not in vain in the Lord."

Now let us trace the effects of this burning heart on the two disciples.

First: Behold their kindness to the stranger. "Their eyes were holden, that they should not know him," but he had touched a string in their hearts which set their whole souls in motion. They felt an indescribable attachment to him, and here we see it.

The village, whither they went, was at hand. The stranger "made as though he would have gone further," but that could not be: no, no; you have made our hearts glad; you have cheered our souls with those views of divine truth which you have given us; and though you are a stranger, yet we cannot permit you to pass this village without one mark of our grateful esteem. "Abide with us, for it is toward evening, and the day is far spent." We hail you as a friend and a brother.

Is not this a lovely sight? Does it not confirm what we have often heard, that the chief ingredient in the religion of the Bible is *love*? How many pious people have been comforted by the assurance that they loved the brethren! for if this be laid down as an evidence of having passed from death unto life, then they possess it. And where this is wanting, it makes the character not only defective, but suspicious. Be not deceived; religion, destitute of love, is not the religion of Christ. "If a

brother or sister be naked, and destitute of daily food, and one of you say, "Depart in peace, be ye warmed and filled, notwithstanding ye give them not those things which they need, what doth it profit? Even so faith, if it have not works, is *dead*, being alone." True religion is very practical; but it is not a hard service. It is not enforced by a task-master. No, it is the fruit of love, the sweet expression of a *warm* heart, if not of a heart on *fire*.

Second: It led to an affectionate and reciprocal communication of their religious experience. Their hearts had been burning for some time; yet they knew not what was passing in each other's breast, until their lips unfolded the secret. "Did not our hearts burn within us while he talked with us by the way, and opened to us the Scriptures?"

This may furnish some observations on the conversation of disciples. What profitable moments might be spent while visiting a friend, if the time were occupied in a reciprocal communication of religious experience. Christ cannot be expected to draw near, and to introduce himself, and to warm your hearts, if all the talk is engrossed by worldly things. We need not wonder at the coldness, and leanness, and uselessness of multitudes, where so much of their precious time is spent about matters, if not sinful, yet of no importance.

Travellers, whether by sea or land, may here discover the true way to secure a visit from the Saviour. Let your mind fix upon him. Speak for him and to him, and then you will not have to complain that he hid his face from you. That some men do not like to speak about religion is not to be wondered at; the reason is pretty obvious; but we ought to hope and pray that they may be brought to *feel* it, and *delight* in it; for it will be dreadful indeed for them, if they die without experiencing it. But there are others, who talk on religious subjects, who had far better be silent. When a man's words and actions do not harmonize on this point, we would rather he should talk about any other thing than religion. We can almost see a mark in his forehead, which proves that Christ is not his Master.

I am always afraid that religion is in a languishing state, when controverted subjects are called in to fill up the hour. A burning heart would produce something better; and where two or three burning hearts meet in the same company, we may expect the most profitable, edifying, comforting, and animating conversation.

Third: They made known the glad tidings to others. The flame was at work; and although it was a hidden fire at first, yet it could not long remain so; it must have vent. Midnight was approaching, and it might not appear quite so safe to return to Jerusalem at that unseasonable hour; yet to wait until the morning, was impossible. They had something to communicate to their brethren, which to them appeared of infinite importance; and away they go—"the love of Christ constrained them." *Sleep, distance, midnight, difficulties, dangers*—all, all seemed as nothing to the enraptured disciples. Oh, what a mercy would it be, if there were such a heart in every one of us!—if the word of the Lord were like a fire in our bones!—if we felt a zeal for God not to be repressed or intimidated; which would lead us to rise up early and sit up late, and to labor in season and out of season; yea, to circumnavigate the globe, in order to proclaim the love of the crucified and risen Saviour! This would be delightful indeed. Oh, if this feeling were general among Christians, then we might confidently expect that the gospel would soon be preached to every creature.

These men afterwards became preachers, and *what* preachers? We cannot expect equal endowments in the present day; yet it may be set down as a solemn truth, that, whatever qualifications a preacher may

have, if his heart is not warm, there will be little good done by his ministry. A blunt instrument, if it be burning hot, will make a deep impression. Nothing can stand before fire.*—*Evangelical Magazine.*

ART. VI. *Happy Poverty.*

Happy is he that hath the God of Jacob for his help, whose hope is in the Lord his God.
Psalm cxlvii.

THE happiness of God's children is of one and the same kind, whatever may be their station or external circumstances, whether in private or public life, rich or poor, high or low, young or old, bond or free. The source or fountain whence the happiness of God's redeemed children flows, is precisely the same. It is the same God and Father who hath loved them; one Mediator and Redeemer, to whom they are united, and who has made one offering of himself upon the cross for them, now forever lives to make intercession for them before the throne of God. And there is one divine Spirit who operates upon all as the Spirit of life, and is the only communicator of all the blessings of salvation. The manner in which the personal happiness of the soul commences, is likewise the same,—conversion to God. "Except you be converted and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven." "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God," whether it be in heaven above, or in the church upon earth. As there is but one kind of natural birth, for every man born into the world of nature, whether he be the child of a prince, or the child of a beggar; so there is but one spiritual birth into the world of grace, let the external circumstances of the man be rich or poor. The *realities* which constitute the substantial happiness of the soul of a real Christian are exactly the same, let his particular religious denomination, age, or condition in the world, be prosperous or adverse. There is one blood of atonement, one justifying righteousness, and one spirit of adoption, whereby he enjoys communion with his God and Father. There is but one Gospel, and not another, which directs the soul under all the variety of its wants, changes, and afflictions, to the one great source, the fulness of Christ, from which to receive grace for grace. Besides, the graces which God bestows are all of the same kind; faith, repentance, love, hope, joy, peace. The whole of these truths are not only evident in the Scriptures, but from the experience of every man who has tasted that the Lord is gracious, let his nation, language, tongue, or outward condition be what they may. And as one sun gives light and joy to all, and as one heaven drops down rain and dew upon all, so "Christ is all in all," to all that believe. And as society promotes man's felicity on earth, so the Lord hath established his church, which is called "the house of God," and "the household of faith;" in which all his children have an equal right, the same Gospel ministry, one baptism, one supper of the Lord, and one spiritual communion, so that they are all one in Christ Jesus. If the rich man, like king David, can say, "It is good for me that I draw near to God," the poorest of God's children can say the same. The services of the Christian poor are as acceptable to the Lord as those of the rich. Jesus took more approving notice of the poor widow's mite, than of the abundance which the rich cast into the treasury. There is but one vale of death to pass through from time to eternity, for rich and poor. The act of dying, whether on a bed

* The influence of the Holy Spirit, however, is necessary to give efficiency to the instrument.

of down, or on a bed of straw, makes no difference to the soul of that man who dies in the Lord. And certainly there is but one heavenly home, where all are employed in singing praises to God and the Lamb forever and ever, as the consummation of their happiness.

Every Christian is Christ's property, and Christ's servant. The service of Christ, the glory of Christ, and the salvation of the world are as much the interest of the weakest believer, as they were that of the apostle Paul. Every Christian owes his all to the Redeemer, and Paul could owe no more. We may not be honored to preach the gospel, or to die for the gospel; but to live and die to Christ is the honor and privilege of all his saints. The life which is consecrated to his service, and the talents which are devoted to his glory, will be found the happiest, and, in the end, the most productive. It may be short, it may be long, as the will of God shall determine—that is not our concern, and ought not to cause our anxiety. But it ought to be our anxious and unceasing desire, that "whether we live, we may live unto the Lord; or whether we die, we may die unto the Lord; that, whether we live or die, we may be the Lord's." We are constantly reminded, by the events which occur, of the truth of the scriptures: "all flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass. The grass withereth, and the flower thereof falleth away." While these things humble us, and remind us of our sinfulness and mortality, we still have hope. "We are cast down, but not destroyed; we are sorrowful, yet always rejoicing;" for while "the world passeth away, and the lust thereof;" we know that "he that doeth the will of God abideth forever."—*Orme's Memoir of John Urquhart.*

ART. VII. *Influence of the Jesuits.*

Look at this matter—see what means are resorted to by the servants of the Pope to gain influence and proselytes among Republicans! The following remarks on this subject are from one who is known in Virginia as a respected member of the Bar, and from public services in official stations; and who is highly esteemed for his private worth, integrity and talents. From a personal acquaintance with young men who have been educated in one of the Romish Seminaries of our country, he has a good opportunity to know, and is of course qualified to expose the arts which are used to make proselytes in these institutions.—*Sothorn Rel Tel.*

MR. CONVERSE.—In addition to the religious considerations which you have suggested, in your Telegraph of the 10th of January, upon the election of C. Pise, a Romish Priest to be Chaplain to the Senate of the United States, I would add some others which, without infringing the most liberal principles of our government, ought to have some weight as well with the mere politician as the religious man against making such an appointment.

One principle which, we all agree, ought never to be lost sight of, as well for the preservation of the purity of the government as of religion, is to keep them not only *legally*, but *actually* separate, so that the government may neither be in its form or administration under the influence of any particular sect or denomination. From the quotations which you have made from the books of the Romish church, published in this country, it appears that an unconditional submission and implicit obedience is exacted by that church to itself from all its members. The Priests of that church in this country, who are nearly all Jesuits, have boldly expressed their confidence of being able to bring the whole people of these United States, or the greater part of them, within the pale of their church within a period not far distant. And whilst they are boasting of their success from year to year, they are vigorously pursuing means for that purpose. Now, sir, admitting that these gentlemen have been far too sanguine, yet let us suppose that a considerable portion of the people, though less than a majority, through the indefatigable efforts of that well disciplined ecclesiastical corps, should become members of that church: by the well known authority which those Priests have over their flock, according to the doctrines which you have quoted as well as from what we know to be the fact, they certainly could command or so influence their people in giving their votes, that they would move in one body, whilst all the others are so divided that the votes of the former would constitute a plurality, and thus obtain possession of the government. Let not this be considered chimerical, for the history of all nations where the church of Rome has had the consciences of the people in its keeping proves this. Look at the condition of Spain, Portugal and Italy, at the present time, in some of which countries, the clergy possess one-third of all the soil and the most fertile parts, which they hold free from taxation, whilst the populace of those countries who have to pay all the taxes, are amongst the most abject, degraded,

ignorant, and superstitious in any civilized country; much worse fed, lodged, and clothed than our slaves, and held by the clergy under more absolute control. The dominions of the Pope himself, whom the Romanists regard as the representative of God upon earth, are the worst governed of any part of Europe. The very genius of the Romish religion is at war with republicanism; they cannot exist together.

But it may be said that "the Romish religion is a different thing in this country." I answer *it is the same every where*, when it can obtain power. And who will say that it is not always aiming to obtain power: a power to influence the government! According to what it has done in Europe in our time, and is now doing, it may with truth be affirmed to be the most formidable enemy to civil liberty of the present day. It has been the chief instrument in defeating every attempt which the people have made, in those unhappy countries, to shake off their chains. When the ungrateful and perfidious Ferdinand was restored to his throne in Spain, from a prison in France, by the unyielding loyalty of his subjects, he promised to give them a constitution. He proved faithless. They arose to vindicate their rights: the Priests fought against them, and assisted the tyrant with money. And when the contest was still doubtful, the Pope issued his bull of excommunication against them, threatening them with damnation if they did not submit. This put an end to the struggle. This wretched people, thought it was best to endure the worst of slavery in this world, than to lose their souls forever, which they had been taught to believe by this same church would be the inevitable consequence, if they persisted to seek their liberty, after being thus forbid by the Pope. When Don Pedro of Portugal, gave a free constitution to his people, and abdicated in favor of his daughter, the horrible tyrant, Don Miguel, instigated and assisted by the Romish ecclesiastics, who could not endure that a constitutional monarchy should exist within the sphere of their influence, usurped the throne. They furnished money, and so completely carried on the war in his behalf, that the army fighting for him was styled *apostolical!* and humanity has ever since wept at their success.

A similar plan of despotism was meditated by these same ecclesiastics in France, but the people succeeded there in dethroning Charles X. For the true character of the Jesuits, let any one examine the expositions of it, given from their own books by Blaise Pascal, himself a Roman Catholic: from whence it will be seen, that for many years the Pope found himself under the necessity of suppressing the society. They certainly are the most shrewd, artful, polite, and calculating body of men upon the earth. Bound together by a tie the strongest which human ingenuity could devise, they could act as one. They have reduced the weakness of human nature to a system, so as to possess the skill of knowing at once by what avenue the heart of any man may be most easily approached, and by the flattering and indulging of what passion he is most easily won. Thus they have been almost uniformly the confessors of every Romish Monarch in Europe, with more power than prime minister. For when they have the keeping of the consciences of either Kings or Republicans, what can they not do? By these means and others they may perhaps, at this time, have the command of more wealth than any potentate in Europe; and they can throw the weight and influence of that wealth upon any point they please. And what might they not effect with it, even in this country, republican as it is? For what purpose is it, it may be asked, are they establishing schools and seminaries in all parts of our country, where the tuition fees which they charge can be no object, falling far short, in most cases of defraying the expenses of less costly establishments? Is it from mere philanthropy or love of science? Certainly not. These skillful rowers of St. Peter's barge, as the Pope called them, know how important it is to get possession of the minds of the young and rising generation; to imbue them with their religious principles; and in very many instances they make Romanists of their pupils and make strong impressions in their own favor upon all. For this they possess the most fascinating arts, indulging their pupils with so many pleasurable gratifications, even sports and pastimes on the Sabbath. At the Georgetown College near the city of Washington, the most sumptuous entertainments are given to visitors and large parties, who are invited. Even whole military companies are feasted there at once on the fourth of July, and other gala days, where every delicacy, the most rare and costly are set before them, and the richest wines are dealt out in the most unlimited profusion. What is more likely to make a religious sect popular than this? It is certainly a ready way to catch the public favor. Mankind are easily caught by such good cheer, and they will be disposed to think well of men who exhibit such convivial, bland and ingratiating manners.

But can it be supposed that the profits of the College for board and tuition boasted of as they are of being lower than at any other seminary, would furnish the funds for an annual wine and liquor bill alone, of nearly two thousand dollars, which that faculty admits it costs them? Certainly not; this expenditure, we must suppose then, can only be made up to them by looking ahead according to the maxim, that "with money they can get men, and with men they can get money." Moreover, it is said, that this same College intends to petition Congress, with good hope of success, for a donation of \$40,000. If these ecclesiastics calculate upon gaining the United States as they flatter themselves, they will not address themselves to the feelings and superstitions of the people in the first instance. No: it is quite reasonable to suppose that they will sap and mine the citadel to gain admittance through the medium of all that is pleasant and agreeable to appetites, but when they get in, they can do as they please; and what may please them to do, we may see by what they *have* done and *are doing* now in Europe. I insert here a quotation from Blackwood's Magazine, republished by E. Little, in Philadelphia. "Popery must be superior, or it is nothing. It can have no fellowship or citizenship with any other. Romanism must have the authority to resist the natural progress of the human mind; to live on the spoils of national industry, and to interpose between man and the right of choosing his own way to salvation; or it turns from the most abject flatterer of royalty or the most flaming devotee of Republicanism, into the most daring and indefatigable antagonist."

ART. VIII. *Carlshuld.*

We abstract from the archives of Christianity, the following statements regarding the recent events in Bavaria. It has previously been mentioned, that the Episcopal chancery of Augsburg had sent a letter to their clergy, on the abjuration and re-admission of the curate *Lutz*. The Rev. Messrs. Bombard and Krauss, and Messrs. Butters and Volk, have recently given an accurate account of the transactions. "We speak no more," say they, "in the name of this parish, (*Carlshuld*) which at the beginning of 1832 comprised six hundred souls, and which with *Lutz* left the Romish church. The steps which he has made backwards, drawing in his train a portion of those whom he had engaged to unite with the evangelical church are an evident confirmation of these words of the Lord: "They on the rock are they, which when they hear, receive the word with joy; and these have no root, which for a while believe, and in time of temptation fall away." Luke viii. 13; see also Matt. xviii. 47, 48.

"It would be hard to say what the reasons were which determined *Lutz* to quit our church and re-enter the one he had abandoned; for he has not made any explanation on this subject, and it is not always easy to divine the motives which influence men's conduct. He may perhaps find it suitable at some time to make public these explanations, and it is certainly his duty so to do, since he has published all that preceded this last movement, and has thus succeeded in exciting a lively interest. Nevertheless it is not of him that we mean to speak here.

"The majority of the members of the commune had confided the direction of their souls, and even their domestic concerns, to the curate *Lutz*, in a manner so absolute, that they re-entered the Romish church with him, when he invited them, without the least hesitation. Some of them have even been further off since that time than they were before; and are reckoned among the decided enemies of the evangelical church. Others among them remember the progress which they have made in the knowledge of the gospel, and, making no account of ceremonials, adhere to the scriptures. Another part of the commune, about sixty in number, have followed *Lutz*, not from personal affection, but from attachment to a plan which he had at first conceived of forming a parish of new Catholics, which should hold middle ground between the Roman Catholic and the Evangelical church. These persons left the Evangelical church as *Lutz* did; but it is in this point only that they have imitated him, for they have not returned with him to the Romish church. They are, up to the present time, in a state of separation, and appear to be waiting for *Lutz* to rejoin them, in order to realize his first plans, which were adopted by them with zeal.

"Finally there is a fourth class, composed of persons, who, notwithstanding the most powerful trials and temptations, remain firmly attached to the Evangelical church, and so witness that there was a time when *Lutz* preached the gospel clearly and faithfully, and that the accounts of *Carlshuld* published by him contain the facts in the case. These Christians remember him with affection and gratitude, and bless God for spreading over them, by so faithful a ministry, abundant temporal and spiritual blessings. They deplore at the same time the inconstancy and extreme weakness of character of him who otherwise instructed them so well, and are very far from being willing to follow his present aberrations. They call to mind these remarkable words, once addressed to them by him, as if he had foreseen what was to take place: "*If I ever reject the true doctrine, abide ye faithful to it,*" and, far from imitating his sad change, they are resolved to act agreeably to this counsel.

"Since his return to the church of Rome, *Lutz* has spared no pains to make his former parishioners imitate him, and it seems that he acts thus partly from orders of his superiors. But neither his conversations, nor his letters, nor the efforts of third persons employed with the same view, have been able to shake them, and every thing encourages the hope that they will persevere, so that no one shall take their crown."—*Presbyterian*.

ART. IX. *Miscellany.*

DEATH-BED REPENTANCE.—The following anecdote, illustrative of the uncertainty of the repentance of dying criminals, are from a letter of the Rev. J. Campbell, to the editors of the London Evangelical Magazine.

NOVEMBER 10, 1832.

MR. EDITOR,—I have just now laid down your November Magazine, after reading your review of the published conversion of Cook, the murderer, whose case appears, from your extract, not to have been written with much caution. It reminded me of a case of a female murderer, who was hanged in Edinburgh many years ago, and whose name was Margaret Dickson. A venerable parish minister in that city, when preaching on the doctrine of repentance, and when cautioning his hearers against trusting to a death-bed repentance, related the case of M. Dickson; that she was apprehended, tried and condemned to be hanged in the Grass-Market, for a barbarous act of child murder. She was allowed the ordinary term of six weeks to prepare for her execution. During that time she was visited by several pious ministers, by means of whose instruction she appeared to be brought under deep conviction of her guilt before God, professed great contrition for it, and, after being sometime in a despairing state of mind, professed to receive great relief and comfort from believing the gospel; that "Christ died for the

ungodly; for the chief of sinners; that his blood cleansed from all sin," &c. Before her execution the ministers were so well satisfied of her having experienced a work of grace upon her heart, and having obtained like precious faith with themselves, that they expressed their expectation of meeting her in heaven.

She was taken to the place of execution and hanged. The day being extremely wet, and there being no awning to protect the magistrates from the rain, they ordered her to be cut down before the usual time, put into the coffin that had been prepared for her, and given to her friends, who had brought a cart from their home in East Lothian, to carry the corpse to their own burying ground.

There was a little country public house near the eleventh mile-stone, into which the party went to have some ale, leaving the cart and coffin in front of the house. While enjoying their ale, a boy came in, under great alarm, declaring there was something making a noise in the coffin. All present hastened out to the cart, broke open the coffin, and to their no small surprise, found the corpse perfectly alive; the jolting of the cart having restored the circulation of the blood.

Her husband and she left the part of the country where they were known, and took up their residence in the town of Berwick upon Tweed, where she had several additions to their family; but, alas, gave no satisfactory evidence of a change of heart, so that all the favorable symptoms she showed, while under sentence of death, were thought to have proceeded from the workings of natural conscience.

Though I believe that one real, believing view of the Lamb of God will as effectually heal the maladies of the soul, as one glimpse of the brazen serpent healed those of the body; yet, with you, I think we ought to be very cautious in our assertions about the safety of persons who have hardly an opportunity of bringing forth the fruits of righteousness, or fruits meet to prove the genuineness of their repentance.

I remember the late Mr. Newton, of St. Mary Woolnoth, mentioning, at his own table, the death of a lady. A young lady, who sat opposite, immediately said, "O, sir, how did she die?" The venerable man replied, "there is a more important question than that, my dear, which you should have asked first." "Sir," said she, "What question can be more important than, How did she die?" "How did she live?" was his answer. But, in poor Cook's case, we cannot refer to his life; wherefore it is safest to leave it to the judgment of Him who can do nothing but what is wise, just and proper.

NOTICE OF AN OMISSION IN OWEN'S EXPOSITION OF THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

Any one who will turn to Owen's Exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews, chap. vi., latter part of the 6th verse, "Sreing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh," &c., will find nothing on the subject. He has, however, a very full and interesting exposition of these words, and of the two preceding verses, in his "Treatise on Apostacy." The omission appears to have been occasioned by the printer's extracting this part of the Exposition from the Treatise, and stopping at an apparent conclusion when he was not in reality within thirty pages of it. This fact is important to all the readers of that admirable work, and should be kept in mind when a future edition may be called for. The omission occurs in the late octavo, and, I suppose, also in the folio edition. B.

CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.—The General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, have adopted the following Resolutions:—

"1st. *Resolved*, That the General Assembly being convinced that the only sure foundation of sound morality and useful knowledge is to be found in the revealed word of God, are of opinion that no countenance from the government of the realm ought to be bestowed on any system of national education of which instruction in the Holy Scriptures does not form an essential part.

"2d. That they have observed with much regret and disappointment, that a system of national education is still maintained in Ireland, in which no adequate provision is made for the daily reading of the entire Word of God in the authorised version, without note or comment.

"3d. That they therefore feel it incumbent upon them, as representing a branch of the Protestant Church to petition Parliament against any further countenance being given to such a system."

The resolutions were carried by a vote of 157 to 58.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.—"Church and State, No. 3," has been received; also an article containing "*Strictures*" on the views of the publication of the intention of marriage contained in "Church and State, No. 2," both of which came to hand about a week too late for insertion in the present number. We had entertained serious doubts as to the propriety of admitting any thing further on this subject into the pages of the Monitor, till these papers were received. But justice to all parties seems to require the insertion of the strictures referred to; more especially as they possess merits which entitle them to an insertion, independent of a mere matter of right. We are also gratified to perceive in "Church and State, No. 3," what appears to us an improvement in *manner* and *spirit*. This writer, in his second number, weakened his natural strength, by bringing forward a number of things in such a way as to leave the impression on the mind of the reader, that he was laboring more to vanquish his opponent, than to elicit truth. We have perceived some indications of warmth on this subject, both in the writers and others, where nothing but cool and deliberate investigation should find place; and it is chiefly owing to the absence of this in the papers now before us, that we have concluded to give them an early insertion in the pages of the Monitor. We hope to be able to issue the next number in about a fortnight, that our readers may be in possession of these papers before the meeting of Synod.

THE
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,

AND

EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

OCTOBER, 1833.

ART. I. *Strictures on an Article entitled "Church and State."*

A WRITER in the Monitor, on the subject of marriage, over the signature of J. A., has taken my attention for some time past; so as that I designed to send you a few strictures on the arguments contained in the first paper written by him on the subject, until another writer appeared on the other side, who satisfied me, in the main, as the views of this writer corresponded with my own, in so far as my mind is at present engaged. J. A., in a late paper, complains of this writer, that he refers to no former article as the object of attack; doubtless supposing, that he might have had a reference to the paper written by said J. A. But I must say, for this writer, that he is to be excused; as, from the rambling manner in which J. A. conducts his reasoning on controversial subjects, it is no easy matter to reply to him in a direct way, and keep within limits in such a reply, which would make it suitable for insertion in a periodical, and at the same time do justice to the subject. It would require a volume: as you have not a connected chain of reasoning before you, by which you can get hold of him in particular points of controversy: but you have to take incidental observations, and give them, each one, by themselves, which is a tedious, and, in a great measure, an unprofitable way of managing controversy. Doubtless the writer of *Reasons for the Previous Publication of Marriage* saw this, and wisely adopted the mode he used. And for this very reason, with others, as I have concluded to say something on the subject, I am here to take a mode of my own.

I have said, that his reasoning upon the subject he treats of is very loose, and I am to show that this is undeniably the case. After a lengthy introduction, he launches out on his subject, by assuming three fundamental principles, which he takes for granted until the contrary be proved, upon which he builds his whole argument in the sequel of his first paper, and, of course, also in his second paper: which fundamental principles are, "1. That marriage is an institution purely civil. 2. In an organized state of the community it is the proper function of some officer of the peace, and is competent only to those who are authorized by the state, to administer the ordinance and oath of marriage. 3. The rule for the publication of banns, both matter and form of it, is a rule of mere human enactment, and derives its precedence over other rules in respect of authority; that is, it derives its whole authority from the power devising and enacting it." And, as a specimen of the manner of his reasoning, I

shall refer you to his paper in reply to the aforesaid writer, in his review of prop. 7, where he reasons as follows: "Prop. 7 is, in substance, that magistrates should be censured for celebrating a marriage without previous publication. It professes to be built upon the foregoing propositions, particularly this principle, 'that persons thus marrying, neglect God's mind and will, and violate his ordinance on this head.' It professes to be built upon the divine ordinance of publication. If so, the proposition has been shewn to be without foundation, and I might here close the disputation." The phrase "divine ordinance," I am not to defend or find fault with. But mark, reader, his conclusion: "It professes to be built upon the divine ordinance of publication. If so, the proposition has been shewn to be without foundation." Where was this shewn? Why, in his 3d fundamental principle *taken for granted*, namely, that "The rule for the publication of banns, both matter and form of it, is a rule of mere human enactment." He might prove any thing in this way, if he will get persons satisfied with such a mode of reasoning. I might prove easily in the same way, that the paper entitled *Church and State*, and the paper written by the other writer, are written by the same person. If it is asked, how? I might set out by saying, that I take the matter for granted, and then go on to say, "they spell some words in the same way; they treat on the same subject, and then affirm, that it is needless to say any more, for I have proven it sufficiently already. How? Why, I assumed it as a fundamental principle, when I commenced, that I will take the thing for granted." And thus he has been playing upon the good nature of your readers for months together, by long-winded arguments founded upon a thing taken for granted! And the foundation being such, the whole superstructure which is reared upon it is but as the "baseless fabric of a vision." Thus, too, your readers are left, before they can decide for themselves upon the subject he has so long treated upon, to go back to these assumed fundamental principles, and try whether they are principles which are really founded in truth, or not. And thus their time is wasted to no good purpose whatever: or if they have fallen in with him in the opinion he has formed on the subject, they but like himself, take the whole for granted. He should have shewn, for instance, upon good grounds, that marriage is really an institution purely civil, and also explained what he meant by it as an institution purely civil, or wherein it is so, as much of the controversy depends on the sense in which this expression is taken, if it is a warrantable one, when used in relation to marriage. He should have also established the truth of his 2d and 3d fundamental principles, in doing which, he had shewn that he designed not to take any advantage. And, in fact, the half of the work had been done: or rather, the thing he intended to prove, been established, and no more was necessary. For if he makes good his three fundamental principles, which he assumes for granted, few will differ from him on the point he intends to prove. I, for one, will not. A wise builder will endeavor to lay the foundation answerable to the superstructure he is to rear upon it. And as proof, was that which he designed to furnish his readers with, on the point he takes in hand to establish, it surely was the way most calculated to convince, to set out in the commencement of his argument with laying down well established principles; in doing which, if he had kept to his point, he would have carried conviction along with him, as he went on in the subsequent discussion of his subject. But he has not done so, and therefore his reasoning in the pages of the *Monitor*, on the subject of the previous publication of banns, will have little weight with candid enquirers after truth. It has a further defect, which is, that he often takes things for granted, in the course of his reasoning throughout. And a still further defect, that to

me he is often incomprehensible ; perhaps, in part, for the reasons mentioned. And to bring the matter to a point, I would submit to him the following questions, taken chiefly from his own papers, which treat on this subject ; an answer to which, as brief as possible, in the affirmative or negative, where this will suffice, and a little more largely where explanation is necessary, will tend much to bring the subject fairly before the public mind, and enable candid enquirers after truth to judge for themselves. In matters of truth and duty, to know what is right is always of great importance ; and unanimity of views upon this subject is an object much to be desired, as it might tend greatly to bring about that harmony which contrary views, if not a contrary practice, in respect to it has hitherto more or less interrupted. The questions I propose, are as follows.

1. J. A. asserts, that marriage is an institution or ordinance purely civil. How does marriage become a purely civil ordinance, when the Church has an equal interest in the matter with the State, and interests peculiar to herself in the case of those who are church members ? It is through marriage the Church as well as the State continue to exist ; and the church covenant embraces parents with children, just as the State takes in children with parents as its members. And it belongs to her as she is engaged in a public witnessing for God, to tell others around her what are their duties, and to see that none of her members, in any capacity whatever, give countenance to them in walking contrary thereto. And in what sense is it a civil ordinance different from that in which it is a religious ordinance, or a church ordinance ? Is it a civil ordinance in that sense in which the State has a right to enjoin marriage upon her members ? (which, I presume, J. A. will not assert.) In this sense, the Church will not claim it to be a religious ordinance ; or in the same sense as some of her ordinances are, which are confessedly religious ordinances, and which she has a right to enjoin upon her members the observance of. Or is it a civil ordinance in that sense that the civil State has a right to make laws respecting it, and take order how her members enter into it, who choose to marry ? Then what gives this right to the State, to make laws respecting it, which does not give the same right to the Church, in regard to those who are her members ? J. A. affirms, that marriage is an ordinance purely civil ; many deny this ; and when sides are taken upon a subject, it belongs to him who affirms to show why, and not to him who takes the negative side. The last has but to say, "I want proof."

2d. He admits, that both Church and State are included in the general title of father and mother, in the Fifth Commandment ; and yet seems to deny the Church the same right to make laws for her members which he allows to the State. If the Church and State are alike father and mother over their respective members, how is it that, in the case of marriage, the State has a right to make her laws and see them enforced, and the Church cannot make regulations that can or ought to operate at all, when the State interferes, or even when the State does not hinder, as in the case of previous publication ?

3d. He seems to deny the Church to have any right to interfere with the conduct of persons as members of State, and particularly with Church members, who are also civil officers in the execution of their civil authority. Has the Church no oversight whatever over her members, in things which are of a civil nature, say marriage ; (supposing it to be as J. A. asserts it to be an institution purely civil ;) paying of taxes ; a magistrate's exercise of his office, whether he discharges it faithfully or not ? —whether he sees to the just execution of the laws of the State or not ? —or violates just and useful regulations of the Church ? How, being a

member of the Church, does he become so privileged as a civil officer, if a privilege it is, that she has no oversight over him in these things: and cannot, if he violates a special rule of the Church, call him to an account?

4th. Those many precepts, exhortations and directions concerning marriage in itself, and the duties of married persons, contained in the Scriptures;—are they to be considered as simple advices, such as I may give to a neighbor, given by the several penmen in their private capacity? or are they to be considered as the Spirit of God, through them, laying before Church members and others to whom the word of God comes, their duty in such cases? And has the Church no right to see that her members walk conformably to them in their own case? and also that they do not assist and give countenance to others in the violation of them? or, is all that is said in our Bibles about marriage, as the account which is given of its original institution, with the laws respecting it, and duties of married persons, given there only for the use of the State; or also, and mainly, for the benefit of the Church? And if for the Church, is it only that private church members may know how to conduct themselves in the case? Or also, that Church courts may see it to be their duty to take cognizance of her members in the affair of marriage?

5th. If marriage is a purely civil ordinance, then how does it become the business of ministers of the Gospel at all to perform the ceremony? And if it belongs to persons only to solemnize this ordinance who are authorised by the State, have legislative bodies a right, if this is the case, to authorize ministers to do it, making them to be standing public officers of the State, and in virtue of their office too, especially under a republican constitution, which requires that its civil officers be put in by the people, who have the best and only right to choose their own public officers?

6. J. A. divides the solemnization of marriage, when the minister of the Gospel officiates, into two parts: that which is purely ecclesiastical, and that which is purely civil; referring the civil part to the civil officer as such, whether magistrate or minister acting as a civil officer in administering the oath of marriage: and the ecclesiastical to the gospel minister, in his ministerial benediction or prayer, with the word of instruction and exhortation accompanying it. But how can there be an ecclesiastical solemnization of a purely civil ordinance? If a gospel minister does not perform the whole ceremony, by virtue of his office as a minister of the Gospel, what call has he in all cases to perform that part of it which is ecclesiastical, as well as that part of it which is called civil, when he performs the ceremony of marriage? May not the civil magistrate, who officiates, pray for the Divine blessing on the married pair, equally with a minister of the Gospel? And why connect the word of exhortation with the civil institution of marriage, supposing it to be an institution purely civil, more than with any other civil institution whatever? How can there be an ecclesiastical solemnization of a thing about which the Church has no concern, and over which she has no authority, and that does not in any sense come under her jurisdiction?

7. He allows, that the Church may prohibit her ministers from solemnizing marriage in any of its parts, civil or ministerial, except in cases where her just and precautionary rules have been observed: while he denies to her a right to interfere with the conduct of a civil magistrate, in disregarding or acting contrary to these rules. But how can the Church have a power over her ministers to prevent them from solemnizing marriage in such cases, which she has not over her private members, as civil officers? The Church rules violated, are violated by each in the same way; and, according to his own declaration, as they are both acting in the same capacity as civil officers: and why make a dif-

ference? If he allows, that ministers may perform the ceremony at all, as civil officers, is not what is wrong in itself wrong in one man as well as another?—in a civil magistrate as well as a minister?

8th. He says, "the power and duty of the executive is, and in natural justice, ought to be defined and limited by the constitution and laws. Beyond these, he has no right nor authority to act, let the thing to be acted be in itself right or wrong. If these enjoin any thing sinful in its nature, it is duty not to accept of office, or if he have accepted, to resign. But the marrying of a couple whose right is known, is not rendered sinful in its nature by the neglect of publication, were it even of divine appointment." Would it not be sinful in a civil officer to assist and countenance that couple in such a case in violating the divine appointment, as really as if he assisted them in the act of stealing, or in violating the divine appointment in any way whatever. How could a man of a good conscience clear himself in such a case? If previous publication were in all cases by divine appointment, whence has this couple their right to marry or to be married without it, or in the neglect of it? He grants, indeed, more than we ask; but for a strange purpose, truly, as appears to me, namely, to tell us that such is the power which a civil magistrate has to exercise his office in things which are contrary to Church rules, when the civil State requires it, or even allows it, that he may even without sin do in this case himself, and assist others in doing what is contrary to the divine appointment. Truly this is divinity, with a witness! It but furnishes a civil magistrate, if he were so situated that his conduct in doing according to the doctrine here inculcated should be called into question by the courts of Christ's house, with such an answer as our first parents formed before him in a similar case: "The serpent beguiled me, and I did eat." "The woman whom thou gavest to be with me, she gave me of the fruit, and I did eat." I am verily guilty, but the blame is not mine who fell into the sin, but of those who were the means of bringing me into it. Let J. A. call this doctrine what he pleases, I cannot but call it the old doctrine of indulgences revived, with this difference, that instead of money to give a man liberty to transgress without blame, he has but to get into the office of civil magistracy, and then in many things he may do it; and though he is a church member, the Church can get no hold of him.

It is among the refinements of modern times to discover, that when a church member becomes a civil magistrate, he is more bound to respect the rules of the State than the rules of the Church; and that his official character relieves him from all culpability when he tramples upon church rules and flies in the face of the plainest dictates of the word of God. For instance, it is too common for those in civil office to plead, that though the scripture mode of swearing by uplifted hand is the only proper and warrantable mode of taking an oath, and swearing by kissing the book is confessedly sinful, and affirmation is not swearing, but a withholding of what in Scripture is required to the satisfying of parties in matters contested: that because they are civil officers, and the law allows it in either way, they may administer it in either way, if the persons giving testimony before them require it: the sin is not theirs, but of the State and of the party who, having it in his power to choose either way of giving his oath, chooses that which is improper. So it is also in the celebration of marriage. If there is blame, let it be laid on the State or somewhere else. The civil magistrate, in conforming to the regulations of the State, be they right or be they wrong, no blame must be attached to him. This puts one in mind of Naaman's request, "In this thing the Lord pardon thy servant, that when my master goeth into the house of Rimmon to worship there, and he leaneth on my hand, and I

bow myself in the house of Rimmon, the Lord pardon thy servant in this thing." Naaman was a civil officer, as a servant and attendant of the king of Syria; and it was a law of the land, or according to the custom, that he must go there with the king if he would keep his place as the king's servant, which was profitable to him and honorable: and therefore he pleads and expects this indulgence. *Quere?* Was he doing right in asking it, or taking it?

As to the questions, this shall, for the present, suffice; and after a few remarks, I shall close this paper.

If J. A. requires proof that it belongs to the Church to take cognizance of her members in respect to marriage, in their own case, and of those of them who are civil officers in the case of others, as he has a right to demand this, seeing we take the affirmative side of the question here; though it is what he did not give when he took the affirmative in laying down his three fundamental principles which he took for granted, I will give what I believe to be substantial proof of this. It is in these words; (1 Cor. xiv. 40.) "Let all things be done decently and in order." The *all things* there, are all things connected with the profession and duties of the Church and her members, both when they are attending on ordinances, and at other times. It is a summary exhortation in the close of this chapter, to all the duties he had been enjoining upon them in the preceding part of the epistle. Among the directions he gives them, are those given in this chapter, as to the manner in which they were to conduct themselves in the house of God: and, in former chapters, he gives directions in relation to other things, among which, marriage is one, both in the entering into the married state, and the duties which belong to those who are in it. And he concludes with this, "Let all things" (all these and others which might have been mentioned) "be done decently and in order." And whether the mode of celebrating marriage after publication of banns, by which every danger of imposition is most likely to be prevented, and those who enter into the married state go about it openly, and shew that they want not to practice any deception in the business: or by license granted by the clerk of a civil court, or without license, in either of which cases the deed may be done before those, who are deeply interested, may have an opportunity to shew that they are wronged; and if they can get any amends, it is but by a pecuniary allowance, that poorly answers for a marriage contract violated, which was secretly entered into by the parties between themselves, in prospect of a public and legal solemnization of it in due time, are the most decent and orderly ways of solemnizing it, any person of common discernment may judge. The mode of marriage by license and without previous publication, is an approach towards that character which is given in the Scriptures, of the men of the world, namely, that they are the children of darkness, and they love the works of darkness as there is much skulking, secret plotting, and abominable conduct, which attend it. It gives the opportunity, and it is almost as uniformly taken. Children flying off from their parents, and encouraged in this act of disobedience by magistrates, whose office is to preserve the peace and good order of society; and by ministers, those professed teachers of morality; ministers marrying with locked doors; multiplied instances of polygamy; elopements of married sires and dames; violation of promises and solemn pledges given in private, are things which accompany it, of which thousands and ten thousands of instances can be given; few or none of which things are to be found, or at least very seldom accompanying marriage in the regular and scriptural way of its administration, namely, after the publication of banns. And it surely becomes those who have the fear of God in them, and would in all things adorn the doctrine of God their

Saviour, to say, with respect to a mode of marriage which has such evils to attend it, and such a kind of people to practice according to it, "My soul, come not thou into their secret. Unto their assembly mine honor be not thou united." Believers are of the day; and it belongs to them, in a matter of this kind, to shew that they go forward in it with so clear a conscience that they fear no man, and have no cause to be ashamed of what they do. I could shew it by plain and necessary inference from other passages of Scripture; and I could shew it from examples in the cases of Isaac, Jacob, and Boaz, in all of which, what amounted to a previous publication of banns, according to existing circumstances they were in, took place, as they all engaged in it publicly and openly, and made all concerned acquainted with their intentions. In the case of the two first, their intention was made known to the Church, as the families of Abraham and Isaac were then the Church, their servants and attendants were many, and those among whom Isaac and Jacob were conversant. In the last case, it was at the gate of the city, perhaps, because there was no other public assembly than what met there in Boaz's time, who were members of the State, were also then generally members of the Church. But let it be publicly made, and I care not so much whether it be in a religious assembly or not, as one special object of publication is gained, though I am seriously of opinion, that there is no impropriety, but rather a great propriety in doing it in the congregation, publicly, and even on the Sabbath day. I might refer also to the circumstance of the espousals which, among the people of the Jews, went before marriage, and answered the same end as previous publication, the intention being, for a considerable time, made generally and publicly known, and among a people who were generally members of the Church, so as that all danger of improper marriages was prevented, and church members had an opportunity to give the espoused couple an interest in their prayers, in prospect of their entering into the married state in due time. I might refer to the case of Esau, who married without his parents' consent and, in all probability, without their knowledge, and in such a secret manner as marriage by license, or without publication, admits of. And how does the Spirit of God stamp his disapprobation upon it, "which were a grief of mind unto Isaac and to Rebekah." It carried the very evidences of untowardness, rebellion, and disorder with it.

The Editor of the Religious Examiner, a periodical, published in Washington, Ohio, treading in the footsteps of J. A., denies, in a review of *Reasons for the Previous Publication of Marriage*, that there is a divine precept for previous publication of marriage. But out of his own mouth he may be condemned, as he speaks as a member and minister of the Associate Reformed Church, through the Constitution, so called, of that Church, in the Directory appended to it, where the previous publication of marriage in the congregation is allowed to be proper. "It is an excellent means," say they, "of preventing improper or unlawful marriages, that the purpose of marriage, previously to the solemnization thereof, be published three several Sabbaths to the congregation, at the place or places where the parties usually reside." Can any thing be proper in religion, which is not according to the word of God, and founded thereon, and is not taught there by express precept, nor can be gathered from it by plain and necessary inference? If previous publication before marriage is proper, it must come under these "all things" which are to be done decently and in order, and are embraced in this injunction of the Spirit of God, by Paul. And if proper, why so much oppose it? It is probable the Editor will say, that though that church, he exercises his public ministry in connexion with, does speak so concerning it, yet they only view it as a merely civil matter, and they only give their opin-

ion concerning it in this light, not as a thing which properly comes under the cognizance of the Church. It alters not the case, however, for it is as a public ecclesiastical body professing to act under the authority of Christ as the King and Head of the Church, that they so express themselves; in which capacity it belongs to them not to give their own opinions, but to declare what is the will of God in their public ecclesiastical acts, either as more clearly stated in his Word, or as it is taught there by necessary inference: so that, according to his own shewing, as a minister and member of that Church, through this public instrument, there is a divine precept for it. But do they state it as a matter of mere opinion, why oppose and ridicule for doing what he himself, and the body he is connected with, judges to be proper? Let the words of the Associate Reformed Church, in their Directory, be put at the head of his review, in the next edition, as the motto, and see how it and the language of the review will correspond.

2d. It has been a customary rule of the Church to be guided by precedent, in things which were not in themselves considered to be unjust and improper. If the rule of the Church respecting previous publication be a good and wholesome rule, and no evil arises from putting it into practice—if it tends to prevent many evils, as it unquestionably does, for I know female members of the Secession Church, through the neglect of one day's publication, to be married to men who had other wives: and had two days' publication, instead of one, been used, it had been prevented, as the fact of previous marriage was made known before a week elapsed after the ceremony was performed. I have known a prevention of disappointment in this way by but one day's publication. And as being myself a minister of the Gospel, and of course occasionally employed in performing the ceremony, I have to state, that the very last couple I married, which was but a few weeks ago, an important end was accomplished and an evil prevented by previous publication of their intention. I say, if no evil whatever arises from it, and so much good is effected by means of it, why should not the Church be guided by precedent here?

The only pretended evils that arise from it are, 1st. That it is a violation of the Sabbath. If it were a purely civil ordinance, and the Church had no concern with it whatever, I admit that it would be no more proper on the Sabbath than the proclamation of a sale of cattle or of goods of any kind: and let some other way to make the intention public be adopted: and we do not plead very strenuously for its being done upon the Sabbath day, and in the congregation. Yet wherein is the Sabbath violated more then, or even so much, if a violation it is, as by calling week day meetings for purposes connected with the temporal interests of congregations, as is often done, and by various other things of a like nature, which are practised publicly on Sabbaths in congregations? But if it is considered as a thing which religion has a concern in; which is connected closely with the peace and comfort of families; the credit of professors; as a means of preventing many evils which would otherwise occur; and that the parties by this, in a purer and more refined state of religious society, would, by making their intentions thus known in the congregation, have the benefit of the Church's prayers, in prospect of entering into this new relation, as in all things we are by prayer and supplication to make our requests known unto God, and to pray for one another, I see a great propriety in it; and especially on the last account. It is a laudable custom, in some parts of the Christian world, for those who undertake sea voyages to be publicly mentioned in congregations, with a request that they have the prayers of the congregation in their behalf. And a common custom that persons on sick beds and death beds, and persons in a disordered state of mind, be prayed for publicly. And

what makes it improper that the intention of marriage be made public in congregations for this as well as for other reasons? The persons to enter into a married state are about to launch into a relation to one another, which will or ought to end only in the death of one of the parties; and as it is so important a step in the life of every individual who enters into the married state, much of their present and eternal interests being connected with it, and perhaps the interests of generations yet unborn, who are to spring from them; this makes it highly proper, laying aside other considerations, that they seek, and that they have the prayers of the Church in their behalf. Church members, who are to marry, are entitled to the fellowship of the Church in this way, and if this is not much thought of by those who are about to enter into a married state, and neglected by church members, who hear the fact of their intention announced, it is owing to a want of due consideration about these things. This is doubtless an end why it has been the received custom of the Church in times past to require that it be performed in this way: and what, among other things, the Westminster Assembly had an eye to, in the Directory compiled by them, when they say, that "Because such as marry are to marry in the Lord, and have special need of instruction, direction, and exhortation from the word of God at their entering into such a new condition, and of the blessing of God upon them, therein; we judge it expedient, that marriage be solemnized by a lawful minister of the Word, that he may accordingly counsel them and pray for a blessing upon them." And that this be by previous publication that private church members, as well as the minister, should give them a place in their prayers, as well as to prevent evils which might arise from the celebration of it otherwise. If precedent is allowed in the other cases, to warrant the custom that a public intimation be made in the congregation, for the ends mentioned, what may hinder that it may warrant it in this? There is no express command in those cases, more than in this. 2. It is said, that it gives an opportunity to the young and the giddy to smile and behave themselves indecently on the Sabbath day, and in the place of worship. And the editor of the Examiner gives this as what he concludes to be a formidable objection to the practice of previous publication, in his review of *Reasons for the Previous Publication of Marriage*. It gives not the opportunity, I would say; but in a corrupted state of society, this opportunity may be taken from it, as it is taken from the most solemn ordinances of the Church of Christ, by the giddy and profane in their outward attendance upon them. And the circumstance that some may take this opportunity from it, is no reason, if it is warrantable and proper in itself, why it may be laid aside. When Paul preached at Athens, concerning the resurrection of the dead, and some laughed, even to mocking, it was no reason why he should cease to preach the subject of the resurrection as a subject of divine revelation. And if the previous publication of marriage in the congregation be laudable in itself, as may be inferred from the word of God; the importance of the relation to be entered into, &c.; and, as is allowed by all the Protestant churches, and even in the Constitution, so called, of that church, of which this editor professes to be a member, and under the authority of which he exercises his public ministry, though the giddy should smile, and this editor should mock, this is no reason why it should not be done. Indeed it speaks not much for the congregation he exercises his own ministry among, if this is a reason why he does not observe the practice. It is an evidence which goes against the opinion he has adopted, and doubtless practises upon. And it but shews how readily the Lord writes confusion upon their designs, who easily give up with former attainments in religion which the Church has made, and lay aside good and wholesome rules of the Church,

with a view to simplify down religion into as little bounds as possible. The writer has practised it for many years in his congregations, and if the editor of the Examiner were present, he would see no such conduct carried on. For my own part, I can observe mal-conduct in a place of worship, when I am officiating, as readily as others; yet I do not know that I ever witnessed so much as a smile when an intention of this kind was made known; though in other things I observe misconduct sometimes among those who attend upon my public ministrations, as others have to witness it in the congregations where they officiate. It is well known, too, that the audiences in those congregations where the practice of previous publication is kept up, are not behind in general cases, for decency and sobriety in their attendance upon ordinances, when compared with the audiences which attend in those congregations where it is laid aside, if they do not generally exceed in this respect.

3. It is said, that it furnishes with a subject to think about and converse about, which is unsuitable for the Sabbath day. Is it so that by the intimation given publicly on a Sabbath day, that A and B are to enter into the married state, persons have greater temptations laid before them to unsuitable conversation, than they have by hearing that C is to go, or has gone on a long voyage on the deep, and asks the prayers of the Church: or, that D is on a sick bed or a death bed? If, by means of the public intimation made, the conversation or the thoughts are indeed made to turn upon the persons themselves in a carnal and worldly manner, it would be sinful and improper; but it would be no less so in the other cases. In respect to the person going abroad, if the conversation and thoughts were employed on a Sabbath day about what sort of a country he is going to; what is his business there, &c.;—and in respect to the person in sickness, who is the doctor that attends him? has he made his will? and will he leave his family in comfortable worldly circumstances, if he is taken away by death? &c.;—there is no more religion in these things than in talking or thinking about a couple on the eve of being married, in a similar way. And the opportunity given, or rather taken from the one, will as readily be taken from the other, by the un-serious and unthinking class of gospel hearers, who are ready to let any thing and every thing divert their minds away from the things which ought to be thought of and conversed about on the Sabbath day. If the thoughts and conversation turn towards marriage, they may be as suitably employed in respect to it, as in respect to the others. In regard to the man who intends a voyage, or is on his voyage, the dangers of the deep, with God's protecting care of his own by sea and land; the presence of God with his people wherever they are, and things of this nature, may be thought of and conversed about profitably. In regard to the sick man, or person on a death bed, the conversation may profitably turn upon the causes of our sorrows; how to have them sanctified; God's presence with his people in the furnace; and the importance of death, should it be in the cup. So as respects marriage. God builds up his Church, and continues her in this world by it. It being said of Zion, "this man and that man is born there," and through marriage, as a lawful means of raising up a "holy seed to the Church;" the importance of the relation; the duties of it, particularly those which belong to married persons as they are to be helpers of each others' faith and joy; the Lord's blessing on the head of families, &c. And were professors of religion living up more to their duties towards each other; were they concerned to carry the case of persons about to be entered into this very important relation to a throne of grace, and to a view of marriage in its close connexion with the Church, especially in respect of those who are church members, as it is set forth to us by the Spirit of God in the light of his Holy

Word, as in Psalms cxxvii. and cxxviii., and other portions of Scripture, the opposition to previous publication so often and so strongly made, I trust, would soon subside.

3d. J. A., if I understand him rightly, seems to deny the Church to have any authority from God to interfere in matters which relate to men's natural rights; and to assert, that the Church has not a right to use the means of preventing things which are even in themselves cognizable by her courts, after the commission of them: and this opinion of his, I presume, also taken for granted, as to the matter of it, he makes to hold in respect to marriage, which he places among men's natural rights. But in other cases, besides that of marriage, will this apply? Man has a natural right to eat and to drink; but excess in either, and particularly the last, when spirituous liquors are used, in the superabundant use of which the excess is more easily known, the Church has to deal with her members for this: and may she not adopt rules of expediency, whereby she may guard against this evil, as by declaring that church members shall not haunt taverns or other suspected places, by their frequent attendance at which, suspicion rises against them, and the credit of religion suffers, and they are themselves in danger of falling into the habitual practice of drunkenness; and make it censurable to do so?

To "cease to hear the instruction which causeth to err," and to witness such conduct as at camp-meetings and other places is carried on under the name of religion, is a divine injunction, though it is among a man's natural rights that he uses his eyes and his ears at his own discretion. So much for the Church's authority to interfere in matters which relate to men's natural rights.

Again, persons may be where error is preached, and not hear it; and where these things are carried on, and not see them; as they may shut their ears and close their eyes, and use other means, which, as they may conclude, will prevent it from taking their attention. Yet may not church courts adopt it as a standing rule, and a good and wholesome rule, that those in their communion are not to go to camp-meetings and other resorts of the kind, where they would be in danger, and do this in order to prevent the danger? And does not the divine command, in the very words now quoted, require this also as a preventive of error? We are not to suffer sin in our brother; which supposes that we are to use means to keep him from it when he is in danger of falling into the commission of it, as well as to reprove him for it afterward, and endeavor to bring him to repentance. And if the duty belongs to church members individually, it must belong much more to church courts in their official capacity. To prevent sin must be more desirable than to leave it to be committed, and then to deal with the individual for it by reproof or otherwise. The word of God deals much in preventives. In short, what are all the divine commands, warnings, and instructions concerning sin and duty, but preventives? And why, in the case of marriage, must there be an exception? This doctrine of J. A. concerning preventives, would go far to destroy all law and rule whatever, and even deny the State a right to make a law that persons intending to marry shall have previous license, or be previously published.

4th. J. A., though he professedly sets out to shew how Church and State stand toward each other, and declares them to be altogether independent kingdoms, yet he seems not rightly to understand his subject: or, from his great anxiety to establish his point concerning marriage, often contradicts himself, and grants to both Church and State rights over one another; rights which he seems to deny them, and mutual interference in things which belong to the one and the other exclusively; or rather, gives the State a right to interfere with the business of the

Church, while he will not allow the Church any right to exercise her authority over her own members in any case wherein the State is concerned. "The preservation of morality," he says, "yes, and of religion too, in the external form of it, is among the chief ends of all civil government and laws, &c." This is not the view taken of the subject by Seceders. According to them, as far as I know the principles of the Secession, on the subject of the connexion between the Church and State, with the differences which are between them, the ends of civil government are, the civil peace and well-being of the body politic; while morality, as such, is what properly belongs to the Church to look into; and religion, in the external form of it, which refers to the modes of worship, times of it, and circumstances immediately connected with it, are under the particular direction of the Church. These are things civil governments would be stepping out of their place entirely to intermeddle with further than to see that no form of religion should be observed, or any thing under the name of religion taught or professed, that would, in the nature of it, be directly subversive of the ends of civil government. The morality or immorality of any thing does not belong to the State, in the prevention or punishment of crime; so that if a member of State violates any of her laws, let it be even the laws respecting the Sabbath, or any other laws which respect things directly immoral in themselves, it is as they disturb the peace of civil society, and are in some way injurious to their true interests in a civil respect, that she takes cognizance of them. As they are immoral acts, it belongs to the Church to call to account her own members which are guilty, even after the State has performed her part, and deal with them upon an entirely different ground. And in making this the business of the State, he not only allows her to step into the precincts of the Church, and see whether or not her members, who are also members of the Church, perform their civil duties, but he allows her to take the Church's work out of her hands; while he will not allow the Church to enter into the inclosures of the State at all, to see whether her members, who are also members of the Church, conduct themselves agreeably to the rules of order she has formed for the weal of her members generally. If J. A. understood the different interests of the Church and State rightly, he would not deny the Church's right to take order in reference to marriage, and to tell her members in what way they shall enter into the married state themselves, if they will marry: or if their civil officers perform the ceremony, in the case of those who are not church members: and to tell them also that they will be considered as subject to the discipline of the Church, if they do otherwise. There is nothing which the State may take order about, on a civil account, which the Church may not take order about, on a moral account, in respect to those who are her members, whether they be private citizens or officers of State, in so far as morality is in danger: seeing that private church members shall not do any thing contrary to true morality, or which would have a tendency to lead to this: and that civil officers, who are members of the Church, shall not give countenance either to them or to others in such ways. It belongs to true morality, that children obey their parents: that private contracts of marriage between parties be fulfilled, &c.; that "all things be done decently and in order." And marriage by license, and without publication, having a contrary tendency, and giving a ready opportunity to practice all the evils incident to marriage, in these ways it becomes the Church's duty to deal with those of her members, who either marry or are married without previous publication. So far says

ALIIQUIS.

ART. II. *Church and State*, No. 3.

WHEN any practice is cherished and observed by the Church of Christ, as an ordinance of his appointment, one very reasonable enquiry concerning it is, when was this appointment made? And, in regard to those institutions which are genuine, and not spurious, the Bible always furnishes us with a ready answer. Thus the use of sacrifice may be traced to an origin as early as Adam; circumcision, from the days of Abraham; the Passover, and most of the Jewish festivals, from Moses. The divine ordinance and divine *form* of sacred psalmody was *delivered* by the sweet Psalmist of Israel. 1 Chron. xvi. 7. The beginning of baptism, and of the kingdom of heaven, was by the ministry of John. The Lord Jesus himself instituted the supper, the night in which he was betrayed. If it be but the natural and civil institution of marriage, by God, Creator and moral Governor, or both, the date and the express words of the institution can at any time be referred to for the decision of controversies and the solving of difficulties. But what nail has been driven, what score has been drawn, to mark the appointment of the divine ordinance of *the publication of the purpose of marriage*? It is not to be found in the history of the institution of this union, nor in the record of the nuptials of the first human pair. "For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and the twain shall become one flesh." As it is the natural parents, and not the ecclesiastical and civil, who are left in this case, we infer, that it is the former, and not the latter, who have the power to give and not to give in marriage. The Rabbins pretend to enumerate seven precepts of God to Noah; but the rule of publication has never been recounted among them, not even to *round off* the perfect number. Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob knew nothing of *the publication of banns*. Rebecca left the house of her kindred and her native country, upon her own consent and that of her parent and guardians; Joseph was married in Egypt; and Moses, in the land of Midian, according to the innocent usages of the respective countries in which they sojourned. Among the great number and variety of moral, ceremonial, and judicial precepts, with which the virtue of chastity was defined and guarded in the law given at Sinai, where is there an express or an implied injunction of the rite of proclamation? "It is not sufficient," says a writer on the subject of magistracy, "to gather up all the passages in the Bible, where there is any mention made of kings and rulers, and then boast a victory in argument over Seceders." So say I, it is not sufficient proof of the divine appointment of publication, that the Scriptures frequently take notice of people's marriages. The frequent mention of marriages without any hint of the rule or practice in question, and in circumstances which are plainly inconsistent with its observance, is, on the contrary, proof that no such rule existed. When "David sent messengers to Abigail to commune with her concerning a match, she arose and went with the messengers, and became his wife." But we are told as an argument in point, that Boaz married Ruth before the elders of the city. If so, they neither were espoused nor had previous publication. The day previous, they both had spent in the harvest field—a purpose of marriage being unknown even to themselves. There is no evidence, however, that Ruth was present in the gate, when Boaz transacted his business with the elders. It could not then be a marriage, being only of one. The transfer of *the shoe* from the foot of one Goel to that of another, was the business transacted, and could, according to the precept, be made in presence of the elders only. The ceremony of spitting in the delinquent Goel's face was not obligatory beyond the option of the woman, and, according to the learned, was seldom, if ever, prac-

tised. But Joseph and Mary were espoused. This is true. Yet *he was minded to put her away privately*. According to the opinion of Spanheim, Heinsius, and others, [on the place] this could have been done, in the most literal and proper sense of the word. The espousals then could not have been public; but only private, before two or three competent witnesses. See Brown's Antiquities, Paxton's Illustrations, Goodwin's Aaron and Moses,—none of which connect publication with espousals.

Again, much weight is laid upon the precept in Deut. xxii. 25, 26. We call upon the defendents of the divine right [of this rule] in order to their building an argument for such a right upon this precept, to establish each of the following positions, all of which we deny—1st. That it is the corruption of a female *by consent*, and not by *violence*, where it is there intended as incurring the penalty of death. 2d. That the penalty of adultery is not due the adulterer, unless he have other means than the woman's own testimony, of knowing her to be another man's wife. 3d. That espousals were in all ordinary cases *required* to precede marriage. 4th. That espousals were only tantamount to the purpose of marriage with us, and were not a solemn contract, to be dissolved only by death, or the formality of a divorce. Mary is called the *wife* of Joseph prior to marriage, and his *espoused* wife after it [being still a virgin.] Matt. i. 20; Luke ii. 5. According to the notion of *jure divino* publication, the "banns" should have been proclaimed before espousals, [not after them, when too late,] lest there might be any "secret lets or hindrances." That it is rape, and not simple adultery, which is intended in the above cited text, we have the testimony of Maimonides, the Septuagint—the Vulgate approving—Malvanda, and Menochius, in Pool's Synopsis, Ainsworth's, the marginal Bible, and Henry, the commentator. The culprit who, in the following verses, receives a more lenient sentence, is also a raptor, and his life is spared, not so much in mercy to him, as in favor to the woman, whose injury he may alleviate by marrying her. But this, in the former case, justice to the injured husband prohibited. The learned Bingham, who was indefatigable in his labors to establish every rite of the English Church from ANTIQUITIES, has produced two authorities which, on this point, he deems relevant. The one is from the epistle of Ignatius to Polycarp: "That it becomes those who marry, and those who are given in marriage, to take upon them this yoke (μετα γνωσης του επισκοπου,) with the advice and consent of the bishop." The other is from Tertullian, in his book *De Monagamia*, upon the duty of being but once married. The passage is also cited in Latin, by the venerable author of *Alexander and Rufus*, and deserves to be translated. "What kind of person art thou [the candidate for a second marriage] who askest permission of that marriage from those to whom it is unlawful to have it themselves? From the bishop who has but one marriage? From the presbyters and deacons, who are under the same [*sacramentum*] solemn oath? From the *widowed*, whose seat thou hast to thine own condemnation renounced. The *widowed* were a religious *order*, and also a class of officers of that period." The substance of this book is comprised in one syllogism of the author's, found in Chemnitius' *Examen of the Council of Trent*. It is built upon 1 Tim. iii. 2. "Let the priests be the husbands of one wife, that is, be but once married. But all Christians are priests. Therefore second nuptials are prohibited to all." For the Neacesarean council, says Chemnitius, subjects even second nuptials to public penance of long duration—which duration the Laodicean council afterwards decreed to shorten. This Laodicean council has been referred to, in order to exculpate the rule of publication from the charge of Antichristian origin. The reference has been *judicially* sanctioned by Presbytery, and unwarily admitted by the present writer, as correct in

point of fact. I must now retract the admission, finding but one *possible* ground for the reference. The author of *Notices of Particular Offences, &c.* quotes correctly the council of Laodicea, in opposition to "promiscuous dancing," and goes on to defend publication *upon other grounds*, in his subsequent pages. A certain writer, of cherished memory, refers to Bingham for proof that "the primitive Christians held the neglecters of publication censurable as guilty of adultery." That marriages formed contrary to the wholesome rules, both of the Church and of the State, were held *valid* by the Christians of primitive times, is amply and designedly proved by Bingham. Upon what authority is the antiquarian thus to fasten, as the probable one which Mr. Marshall had in his eye, I am at a loss to conjecture, unless it be one which is only cited to show that the *fact* of marriage was required to be made public in the time of it, and afterwards? It is also from Tertullian, as follows: "So with us, *secret conjunctions* also, that is, such as have not been previously *confessed* to the Church, are in danger of being judged as adultery and fornication! Nor let those who are in this manner connected elude censure under a *pretence* of matrimony."* Seceders have sworn their belief in all the doctrine of the Testimony—not in the opinions of our most respected authors. Ignatius expresses his opinion of what is *becoming* in a language which demonstrates that no proclaiming of purposes was known in his time. Deference in this matter to the judgment of the diocesan bishop was urged as *becoming*. Tertullian found in his day the mystery of iniquity—"which *forbids to marry and commands to abstain from meats*"—arrived at that degree which prohibited *second marriages* without leave asked and obtained—not of the public, but of all the religious orders. He wrote a book in favor of making the prohibition absolute. *Secret conjunctions* and the improper connection, or cohabitation of persons pretending *afterwards* to have been married, not having confessed the marriage *previously* to their being charged and called to answer for the sin, are justly accounted adultery and fornication in all ages. Nuptials celebrated with proclamation, are now deemed by some the opposite of clandestine. They are perhaps so termed in the language of some canons enacted since the beginning of the dark ages. Yet I have never seen any such use of the term "clandestine" in *any* ecclesiastic canon. The marriage of priests was canonized by the name *concubinage*.

A learned and ingenious friend of mine, who considers himself an advocate of publication, in a private correspondence expresses himself thus: "The first act respecting marriage, which I have found, though there no doubt must have been earlier, is by Pope Nicholas, A. D. 858. He ordered that after the betrothing of the persons to be married, the priest ought to cause the persons to come into the church *with their offerings*, and there give them his benediction." After producing a number of acts of a later date and similar authority, against clandestine marriages, which in my view are directed solely against the *celebration* of the thing in private places and companies—out of the church—the same correspondent adds:—"The first express mention of publication which I have found, is in what is known as the Fourth General Lateran Council, held under Pope Innocent III., A. D. 1215." He also cites the council of Trent as speaking thus:—"yet to prevent various evils we ordain, pursuant to the steps of the holy council of the Lateran, which was held under Innocent III., that for the future before any marriage be contracted, there shall be published on three consecutive festival days in the church by the proper parish priest of the contracting parties, during high mass, the

* Ideo penes nos occultæ conjunctiones, id est, non prius apud Ecclesiam confessæ, juxta mœchiam et fornicationem judicari periclitantur. Nec inde consortæ obtentu matrimonii crimen eludant.

names of the parties concerned, &c." Bernardinus de Moor traces the antiquity of publication no higher than the council of Trent. But as this reduplicates upon the authority of the Holy Lateran, I believe that both he and my learned friend are materially correct. And to those who know the character of these two *holy councils* no comment is needed.

"The First Book of Discipline of the church of Scotland, assigns the abuses of marriage, "in this accursed papistry," as the reason for giving judgment, how such confusion may in times coming be avoided. "And for avoiding of dangers, *expedient* it is," say they, "that the banns be publicly proclaimed." Further—"The Sunday before noon we think most expedient for marriage, and that it be used no day else without the consent of the whole ministry." Here the rule is expressly given as an *expedient*, not as a divine ordinance. The contrary of it is therefore, in their judgment lawful. (1 Cor. x. 23.) The stamp of *expediency only* is given this rule by the W. M. Assembly and other Reformers of that period. It is universally inserted—if adopted in any shape—in their Directories and Disciplines—never in their Confessions of Faith. The idea of this rule being either matter or form of it, contained in scripture is quite novel. The demand of the church that magistrates shall enforce it by refusing to marry persons till they comply, although no such requisition be made by the laws of the land, is still more novel; but one session in subordination to the Associate Synod—if that one did—made such a demand until the New Book of Discipline was enacted, or the enacting of it was in agitation. The thing which is harmless and indifferent in its own nature, is to be treated as *an abomination*, when it lays claim to divine honours. It becomes a Nehushtan. (2 Kings xviii. 4.) Paul circumcised Timothy as a matter of expediency. Others wished to have Titus circumcised as an ordinance of God. But "*to them he gave place by submission—no, not so much as an hour.*" J. A.

ART. III. *Hints to J. A., the author of "Church and State."*

THIS correspondent frowns very heavily on the seven propositions relative to marriage, in the February number, when I said, "Were I to define the contract *as it is entered* into by the parties, I would be obliged to call it sometimes a civil contract, sometimes a political one, and sometimes a religious one, or chiefly so," the meaning, obvious enough, was, that some in marrying, had civil ends chiefly in view; that others had political ends, as is notoriously the case in the marriage of most of princes, and that others have *religious* ends in view, or chiefly so. By stating these things as facts, I did not express an opinion about the marriage contract, as the next words may show. It was not my intention to do so. Neither "have I done so without being aware of it," his assertion notwithstanding. No doubt, had I taken my ground on the *religious contract* which he had in his eye, the prodigious charge fired off in his first pages would have blown me to atoms. But I am not hurt in the least, for I was not on the fatal spot. His skill and pains are lost. Why did he not take hold of the phrase *political contract*, as well as the *religious*, and prove thence that I was contending for that also? I said, that "Adam could not enter the covenant as the federal head of the human family, without the institution of marriage." His chief difficulty with this seemed to be, that "God had other means than marriage and natural generation lying within the immensity of his eternal wisdom and power. Else, whence came Eve?" (p. 17.) Who doubts this? God

could have made Adam with as many ribs in his body as there were to be human beings. But what is that to the point? God was pleased to "create man *male and female*." Gen. i. 27. This *manner* of creation is identified with the institution of marriage, with which this writer seems to confound the first marriage *contract*. The covenant was designed for man thus circumstanced, and he for it, in the purpose and providence of God. Could he enter it in other circumstances than these? or before he was created? He replies, (*ibid.*) "And so far is it from being true, that Adam could not enter the covenant as a federal head, without the institution of marriage, that the Scriptures plainly teach he did enter into covenant in that character, *without* that institution, and without any assurance that marriage *ever* would be instituted. Gen. xxviii. 17, compare 18—24." Let us read that passage, verse 17; "He was afraid and said, how dreadful is this place! It is none other than the house of God, and it is the gate of heaven. Ver. 18. And Jacob rose up early in the morning, and took the stone he had put for his pillow, and sat it up for a pillar, and poured oil on the top of it," &c. &c. There is but 22 verses in the chapter. It is possible, though not certain, that the author was thinking of the same verses in the 2d chapter of Genesis. If this was his meaning, the proof of his assertion must be in this, that the account of Adam's entering into covenant is given *before* the account of Eve's formation and of the first marriage. If this were good reasoning, then we must admit also, that Adam was formed *AFTER* the first Sabbath, and that the beasts were formed *after* him. For the same reason, we would be compelled to admit also, that repentance is before faith, for it is frequently first mentioned in Scripture. But, truly, this is slender footing; for we are informed of Eve's creation in the 1st chapter and 27th verse, as above quoted. The second chapter does not relate events in the order of time, and therefore makes nothing for his purpose.

Prop. II. God has not left it (the institution of marriage) subject to human legislation, *in any thing appertaining to the right and orderly constituting of the relation between the parties*. In this shape it does not answer him altogether. He first gives his own version of it, thus; "God has not left it subject to human legislation," and then directs his great ordinance against it, and makes it a very horrible thing. But here again I have only to say, that was not my proposition nor my meaning. The proposition, as I gave it, is not touched; it is even *affirmed* by him, in equivalent words, as I shall afterwards show. I quoted several passages from the Old Testament, to show that *God has* legislated on this subject, and straightway he finds me guilty of bringing the judicial law of Moses into the New Testament Church in full force. According to this sapient logic, if I had stated that God had not left the constitution, order, or worship of the *Church* subject to human legislation, and had quoted in proof the charge given to Moses, "See that thou make all things according to the pattern showed to thee in the mount," I would have been guilty of bringing in the ceremonial law also. Does this writer admit the Old Testament to be a part of the infallible rule, and of standing authority in the Christian Church? The passages quoted certainly set forth the Divine will on the subject, and substantiate the truth of my assertion, and prove besides, what he has denied, that God *did* legislate for the *times and circumstances* then being.

Prop. III. God has committed the administration and execution of his laws on this subject to Church and State, in all ordinary cases—completed by him thus: "It is a truth, that God has committed to Church and State, and heads of families, authority to administer and execute his laws on all subjects and in all cases." (p. 33.) No doubt this addition is a discovery of his own; and, as the reader will find, it is vitally im-

portant to his theory. Heads of families, then, have a co-ordinate and paramount authority on all subjects and in all cases. This is the obvious meaning of his language. And it is confirmed by the following passages: "But the author contradicts himself, the Bible, and the law of nature, in saying that the authority of natural parents is included in that of the civil and ecclesiastic. If it be included in it, it may be controlled by it;" "wherefore, to give or not to give, &c., is the natural and unalienable right of him who is the parent by nature or adoption—a right with which *no power between heaven and earth* may interfere." (p. 39.) Then they may excommunicate, banish, imprison, or put to death. They may give a sister to a brother to wife, and do all and such like things within the parental dominion, and no power *between heaven and earth* may interfere! Imperium in imperio! For aught I know, this doctrine may please a southern nullifier, as being the quintessence of his theory; but it is too repugnant to the common sense of mankind and the voice of Scripture to need any refutation, were it not that the author has left us room to hope that he may be reclaimed from it. For if it can be proved that parental authority is *controlled* by that of the "civil or ecclesiastic," he is bound in honor to give it up, and with all his dislike to the 3d and 5th propositions. Will any man in his senses refuse, that natural parents as such are but members or constituent parts of the two bodies just named? And then, is not the whole greater than any of its parts, and controls them? or, may the *foot* or the *hand* say to the *head*, neither you nor any power *between heaven and earth* have any right to interfere with my authority. My authority is not included in yours, and shall not be controlled by it; I will sooner resist unto blood! Sober reason blushes at the ignorance and audacity of this member's speech. When God gave forth his law on all subjects and for all cases, he delivered not a word of it immediately to heads of families, but to Moses, who, as an officer, belonged to Church and State; and he taught heads of families what their authority was, and what their duty. In the same capacity he commanded them to exercise the one and perform the other. "Teach them diligently to thy children," &c. Deut. vi. 7. And is it not a fair inference, that he who has authority to *command*, has also authority to call to an account? May be, this writer will charge this argument, too, with the consequence of bringing in the Mosaic law into gospel times; but it will not help him; for the apostle Paul, the great apostle of the Gentiles, explicitly commands parents as such. "Fathers provoke not your children to anger, lest they be discouraged." Col. iii. 21. "But bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." Eph. vi. 4. Does not the faithful discharge of ministerial duty, "giving to every one his portion of meat in due season," comprehend instruction to heads of families? When a minister "reproves, rebukes and exhorts, with all long-suffering and doctrine," is the delinquency of parents to be overlooked? No, verily.

Consider farther, that children too, as well as parents, are members of the bodies civil and ecclesiastic, and are directly and immediately under their authority. Both these have authority to *command* children, and say, "Children, obey your parents," and to punish them if they do not. Hence it is manifest, that parents are placed in a dependence on these powers for the enforcing of their just commands and the sustaining of their authority. If a child, during the years of minority, assumes independence of parents, or deserts, the Church calls the culprit to an account (at least has authority so to do) and inflicts on him her spiritual corrections. The State refuses him the power of transacting business, and sends her constable after him, to bring him back to the parental habitation, and to reduce him to due obedience. Parents are, notwithstanding

their natural rights in their offspring, *guardians* of them for Church and State. And, as respects the Church, is not this plain to be seen, when the parent, at the baptism of the child, pledges his authority to her for its instruction in the principles of truth. And when that authority is neglected, abused, or perverted, the parent is accountable. If a parent should be so inflated with the idea of his irresponsible authority as to venture on *giving* his daughter to his son, he would quickly find out that *his* authority was but a small *part included* in that of the higher powers: or if he should exercise despotic cruelty in correction, to the manifest injury of the child, in the judgment of the public, he would find that his right to it was not such but that it might be taken *from* him and placed under a better guardian. It would be but a silly quibble against this, to say, that a parent *has* no authority to do such things, and therefore his authority is not controlled; because, if it be as he says, although parents may indeed go beyond the line of their just authority in many things, as Church and State often do. Yet who between *heaven and earth* has the authority to point out to them this boundary line, and compel them to keep within it? Who does not see that this *controls* their authority? Look again: when natural parents are dead, or deserted, or in any way unable or disqualified to do a parent's part, do not these higher powers feel it incumbent on *them* to step forward and occupy their place? How can this be, unless they have parental authority *including* that of the other? Again: parental authority is controlled when it is limited, in respect of time, to 21 years; and this is by the State. Finally, the duties which we owe to the higher powers are included in the fifth command: of course they, as well as the natural parents, must be meant by *father and mother*. But these terms are in the singular. One of these parties must be included in the other—either Church and State in natural parents, or vice versa—the reader will correctly judge which. I have only hinted what might have been illustrated at length. Yet enough has been said, I think, to show that the authority in question is both *included* and *controlled*. Therefore, parents are not the "*ONLY*" party who have a right to give, or not to give. The *including* authority must also be consulted; and, consequently, the parties to a marriage are bound by nothing less than the *fifth precept* of God's law, to acquaint these two bodies with their *purpose*, as a part of honor and duty to them, as well as to the natural parents. And J. A., notwithstanding *all* he has said, concedes this point clearly, as I shall point out.

In the same 33d p. he asserts, that "If the violation of any of God's statutes and judgments, in regard to marriage, were to become general, there could be no Church at all," and asks, "Could the violation, I would ask, of any of the ten commandments become general, and there be a Church?" We know, certainly, there has been a *Church*, without any intermission, since the giving of the first promise, and that there *will* be a Church while sun and moon endure. The question, then, ought to be expressed this way: Has the violation of any of God's statutes respecting marriage, or of any of the ten commandments, ever been general? Did "all flesh corrupt his way?" Was "the earth filled with violence through this?" Was it ever general to have more wives than one? Did Abraham, when the Church was in his family, have more than one? Was idolatry ever general? Was popery ever general? Are there none of the ten commands generally violated at present? J. A. must either answer in the affirmative, or be at variance with his Bible and the common consent of the whole christian world. He may take his choice.

Prop. IV. Is, that since Church and State have authority to administer and execute the law, and, consequently, to judge of a proposed marriage, whether it is legal or not, therefore they have a *right* to know a sufficient

time previous to its celebration to prevent it, if illegal. On which the author remarks, "But this judgment they have a *right* to give on all purposes of marriage, previous to the act, SPECIFICALLY, not *individually*." (p. 34.) Every individual is included in the *species*, as every species is in the *genus*, and consequently, when we judge of the species we judge of all the individuals comprehended in it. To say, then, that we have a right to judge of the *species*, but not of the individuals in it, is a logical absurdity. And he himself avoids it when he comes to the point and speaks correctly. "The question is not, whether marriage formed without the knowledge of either of these powers, Church and State ought to be prohibited." (p. 35.) Here we are agreed. He would answer such a question as I would, in the *affirmative*. This is to say explicitly, that these two powers must be *informed* of the marriage *before* it is celebrated. I have plead for this, that they may judge the *individual* case *before* the act; and he, notwithstanding the above denial of this, agrees so well with it, that he has condescended on the *particulars* that ought to be placed before the authorities in evidence before the act. "These are the only particulars requisite to be known in order to *prevent* illegal marriages—the character of the parties, and the consent of the parents—are they single, and not too nearly joined already by affinity or consanguinity, &c." (p. 36.) This concedes the whole of my proposition. They have a right to *know*, in order to *judge* whether, in the individual case, the parties may lawfully marry. Yet, he denies *all this*, in no measured terms: "For the higher powers to *extort* from men by *INQUISITION*, a confession of their designs, in order to judge of them, implies either an impeachment of their designs as being *bad*, or of their *moral faculties*, as being *incapable of discerning between good and evil*." (p. 34.) This writer is much more at variance with himself, than with my proposition.

I shall not trouble myself nor the reader with any remark on the long lecture that follows the last quotation on *publication*, intermingled with a superabundance of mirth and ridicule, *sui generis*, which he has given "for the satisfaction of all candid persons," in which he "impugns" these same sentiments which he so clearly concedes here.

Prop. V. It is the *duty* of the parties intending marriage, to publish their purpose a sufficient time before, to allow all concerned to bring forward their objections. With this he has not interfered, farther than to say, "It differs but little from the former." But now here, as well as in the preceding, is the *foundation* of publication. One would have expected that, instead of spending his force in demolishing what none were building, he would (so *willing* as he seems to be) have endeavored his utmost to erase *this*. But in the very face of consistency, he *could* not. For, as has been shown, he would *prohibit* marriage "without the knowledge of Church and State." There must, therefore, be an obligation resting somewhere, to *give them* this knowledge, I have ventured above to say, that it rests on the parties, who alone know it. If this does not suit J. A., he will be so good as to state, *who* is bound to inform them—to call in "a competent number of witnesses"—an officer of the Church, and another from the State—all who, "of *divine right*," ought to be at the celebration. While he sneers at publication, he has laid a solid foundation for it; and if he admits the legitimate consequence of his own principle, he *cannot* be opposed to it. And he has indeed given us to understand, that his difficulty is with the *manner* in which *the Associate Church* and some others make it public.

First, he holds it to be not *necessary* in *ordinary* cases. "In such cases," he says, "the persons to be married are known, and their parents' consent, if they be under age, or *non sui juris*, not at their own

just disposal, without publication. This objection has not a foundation sufficient to bear it. He might as well object to the swearing of witnesses in ordinary cases, or to administer an oath of office to good and faithful citizens, every time they are elected; or to making all parents vow to their profession, every time they have a child to baptize. He must know, that it is impossible to administer a discriminating rule with fairness and impartiality; and that, although the law is not made for the righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient, yet it is perfectly congenial to the righteous man to keep it, and that instead of being an unnecessary exaction of him, it is that alone by means of which he sustains his righteous character. But I may here put him upon his own rule. What necessity in "ordinary cases" for any of his precautions to prevent illegal marriages? Suppose the children of neighbors are to be married, who have never been out of the domestic circle since their birth; what necessity for *them* going to some county officer, who knows nothing about them till he is told, to obtain a certificate that they are *single*, &c., which is perfectly well known before. Why "prohibit such marriages from taking place till Church and State have knowledge of it?" Why a legal number of witnesses? Why an officer of both these bodies present? Would not the marriage in *ordinary* cases be just as free of illegalities, without, as with all these rules? "Does not his insisting on these rules in *all* cases, without exception, look like "a congress *always* declaring war, and parents always correcting their children!"

Second: "The necessity of any thing as a means, implies its *sufficiency*, either by itself, or in connection with other means." (p. 36.) But publication, he holds to be not *sufficient*; ergo, not necessary. Preaching is a means for converting sinners; but there are many hearers never converted; therefore, according to this maxim, it is not *necessary*, and ought to be set aside. Church government and discipline are a means for preserving order and purity in the Church, but these are not sufficient. There have always been impurity and disorders in the Church. Therefore, set them aside. The laws of the land, and officers of justice, and courts altogether, are not *sufficient* to prevent crimes; therefore, they must be set aside. "Congress declaring war," is not always sufficient, in connection with other means, to keep off a foreign foe. Nor "parents correcting" their children, to keep them orderly; therefore, they may cease. It is obvious, therefore, that this maxim is sophistical, and, therefore, makes nothing against the necessity of publication. He has stated a different test of the necessity of a means, in the preceding page, and, I think, a more correct one than the *sufficiency* of it, to meet all cases successfully. A means, "when by *law* required, is *necessary*." (p. 35.)

Third: He objects, because "all these particulars" (in which a marriage may be illegal) are, in ordinary cases, with more ease, *accuracy*, and despatch determined by *certificate* than by publication; "and in cases which are not ordinary, and where the requisite information cannot be obtained by certificate, it is less satisfactorily obtained by publication." (37.) That is to say, publication is *less* than no information at all.

He has not told us what steps are necessary to the certificate on which he has his eye. And as there are different steps necessary in different places; if I should specify, he may probably say, that is not what he intended. But if the parties privy to this certificate of his, be only some state or county officer, together with "the one or two individuals from whom he receives all his information in the case, then his assertion is as absurd as it would be to say, two or three persons are better acquainted with the character and actions of parties to a marriage, than a whole town or neighborhood, including the *same* two or three.

He admits of only three things which would authorise Church and State to prohibit a marriage as illegal: "Birth producing consanguinity;

some previous marriage; or, the want of parents' consent." (p. 37.) Must I infer, then, that J. A. would marry the parties together, although one or both were idiots?

"A previous promise of one person to marry another will not, (he says,) authorise either Church or State to *compel* the marriage, or to prohibit the delinquent party from marrying to another than the one promised." *Ibid.*

It may be so, but that is not precisely the question; but, whether or not has the other party to the first promise the *right* to know of the second promise so soon as it is made? Is it not an injury to them? Does it not release *them* from the first promise so that in equity they *may* contract with another? Has not the other party to the second promise a *right also* to know of the first promise? Would it not be undecieving them as to the true character of the person to whom they are about to be joined? May it not serve also to acquaint them with circumstances which may have an influence on their whole lives? Perhaps a child may be to bring up, or a heavy fine to be paid, or both. These things must be admitted. But has not the officiating officer a right also to know of the previous promise before proceeding? I am supposing that he ought to have a conscience, the statute book notwithstanding, and that the case may be such as to give just cause for some demur. Suppose this previous promise to be made with the solemnity of an oath, would not a magistrate or minister have a right to hesitate? Now I contend that a certificate, to which perhaps two or three only are knowing, has no *design* to bring this knowledge to them; whereas publication, "as practised by the Associate Church, and some others," expressly contemplates such a case, is well adapted to bring it to light, and has to my knowledge done so.

It is thought a good argument by those on J. A.'s side, to reply that those who are guilty of such things *will not publish*, then what use is publication? But I ask, *why* they will not publish, if their circumstances are *less* likely to be known by it than by certificate? It is because they perceive the reverse of J. A.'s assertion to be true, and that they have a much greater chance to escape detection in any other way than this. They unwittingly testify that publication is a mean well adapted to answer the end, and much better than a certificate.

The author makes merry with the idea, that "the whole fabric of the *divine right* of publication is based on a fallacy." p. 37. Such a fabric must of course fall, and he who beats it down is of course entitled to shout. But if I build it on his own admissions, surely it must stand. I would call the attention of the reader to the following. "Now all the impediment which can render a marriage *illegal* which can *authorise* either Church or State to *prohibit* it must arise," &c. (p. 36.) He admits then, that they *have authority to prohibit* an illegal marriage. He will not deny that they have it from God, nor that it is a trust. In *receiving* it they come under *moral* obligation to exercise it. And they expressly acknowledge this by their oaths and vows of office. In the first place, these bodies are under moral obligation to God for *the full* and *proper* exercise of this *preventing* authority. Second, Those men who are set apart by these bodies to exercise this authority, upon accepting their office come under precisely the same moral obligation to God. Their receiving it through a medium can neither alter nor impair it. And I think it is impossible for them to *be* bound to a *defect* any more than to a *transgression*, for both are sin; the peculiar respect which an oath of office may have to a defective constitution notwithstanding. The reader will perceive that I do not say that this moral obligation arises from a *right* to previous knowledge, but from God's putting them in trust. But I say that this authority to "*prevent*," gives them a title to *all* the means of

preventing, of which a previous knowledge of the purpose is a *principal one*. For without *it* they cannot exercise this authority at all. I also have said that they are bound to exercise this authority so far, *in all cases without exception*, as to demand this previous knowledge of the purpose, in order to see whether it is legal or not. J. A. inadvertently admits this when he says, "The question is not, whether marriage formed without the *knowledge* of either of these powers, Church and State ought to be prohibited. (p. 35.) There is no exception made here to any case—every marriage, in ordinary as well as extraordinary circumstances, he would prohibit taking place until these two bodies *knew* of it. The object of this of course must be to ascertain whether the parties may lawfully marry.

I leave him to adjust at his leisure to this *admission*, the case of a "congress always declaring war and parents always correcting their children." That these powers have a right to *know* is admitted. And I presume he admits that their right to know *before* and *after* the marriage is one and the same; consequently, a "*divine right*,"—"and that it ought of *divine right* immediately upon celebration to be *confessed before Church and State, &c.*" (Ibid.) This "*divine right*" must be answered by a *divine obligation*, resting *some where* to make the confession before as well as after. I have said it rests on the parties to be married, because they alone can be supposed to know it. They are bound to it by the fifth commandment. That is a *divine obligation*. I have objected to telling an officer simply, unless he is officially bound to tell it to the public, so that the information may be put in a fair way to reach all who have business. This he also concedes, when he says of the "confession after the celebration before Church and State," that it "is sufficiently done by the *report* of such officer." (Ibid.) From which it follows that it would not be sufficiently done before this officer only, unless he makes a *report* of it to the public body to which he belongs. It would be extremely senseless after this to object to this mode of telling these same two bodies before the celebration; in other words, to object to the purpose being published. "Marriage is in its own nature public"—"of *divine right* it ought to be celebrated before a competent number of witnesses," that is publicly. Let then the civil and religious public be informed by their public officers' report of what is about to take place, and our dispute is at an end. His giving out that I have abandoned the ground by saying that the parties are bound by the fifth commandment to publish their purpose is surely nothing but a wild freak of fancy, attempting to lay hold upon her own shadow. He asserts that I admit it to be a thing indifferent, and then builds on the assertion. My words are, "Although the previous publication of the purpose of marriage were 'matter and form,' a thing indifferent, (which I have shown it is NOT.) Some of my readers must have observed that either tacitly or expressly he *admits* the first six propositions. Of the first he says, "this is true, taking the words in their native import and detached from what follows. This truth has been stated expressly in Church and State." (p. 15.) I have no objections whatever to express the second in his words, as follows: "Nothing, therefore, which is essential to a marriage, and nothing which is necessary to render the deed of contract, considered in itself and abstracted from times and circumstances, pleasing to God, is left to human legislation." (p. 19.) He asserts all that is contained in the third and more. "It is a truth that God has committed to Church and State and *heads of families*, authority to administer and execute his law *on all subjects and in all cases*. (p. 33. If it be "loaded with errors," as he has said, it is yet all his own. In agreement with the fourth, he says: "The civil and ecclesiastical powers have, it is true, authority to judge of

every purpose of marriage, whether it is legal or not"—"the question is not whether marriage formed without the knowledge of either of these powers, Church and State, ought to be prohibited." p. 34. 35. "Prop. 5," he says, "differs little from the former," (p. 39)—consequently he cannot be opposed to it. He does not make any remark on the sixth,—consequently does not object to it. Prop. 7 was this: "When the Church censures her member, being a magistrate, for the offence aforesaid, (countenancing persons in the breach of the fifth commandment, which obliges them to publish their purpose of marriage,) or upon his refusing to submit, suspends him from sealing ordinances, she does not go beyond her own line of things, or intrude into the peculiar province of the civil authority." Against this he *tries* to say a great many things, which depend altogether upon assumptions not granted. He assumes that he has overthrown the preceding six propositions, which indeed he establishes—that I have abandoned every other plea for publication as untenable but the fifth commandment—that this is the only command for violation of which censure is in this case to be inflicted—that the magistrate in *countenancing* parties in a breach of it is not *directly* guilty but by *implication*—that if the State do not expressly *require* the obedience due to them according to the law of God; or, to use his own very learned phrase, if it do not interpose "a medium," then God's commandment is not violated—that I have undesignedly admitted publication to be a thing indifferent—that it is, just as he has shown, a church rule and may be dispensed with to those who are not our members, &c. &c. Take these things away and there is no bottom to his remarks. He has offered no proof for one of them—and if it devolves on me I am ready to disprove them. There are besides these, other two fallacies, which lie at the foundation of his remarks. The first is, that the church member is lost in the magistrate, and consequently when a man takes that office, the statute book releases him from the duties, which as a christian he owes to the moral law of God, simply because it sets up no statute for them. Will it indeed agree with christian obligation, or even that of a good citizen, to countenance a breach of the fifth commandment simply because some State statute book is defective? This is the question at issue here. Although he has said much, he has said not a word to answer this. I have shown that the parties are bound by the fifth commandment to publish, and that it follows clearly from his own admissions. Their neglect, if it is a breach of that precept, and when a magistrate countenances them in this, he is also guilty of a breach of it. Church and State are as much bound by their high station and official trust, to exercise *authority* to prevent illegal marriages, of which a previous knowledge of the purpose is an indispensable means, as the parties are to honor them with that knowledge. "Of divine right" they ought to know it. Are they at liberty to dispense with this divine right when and how they please?

The second fallacy is this: that if a magistrate would refuse to marry without publication he would be refusing the parties "their natural rights:" whereas the truth is, he would only be refusing to grant natural rights until he had ascertained that they are *their natural rights*. I deny that it is ascertained to be *their* rights until the public have been duly notified of their purpose "by the report of their officer."

"Can the refusal," says he, "of marriage to any whose natural right to it is otherwise good and sure, merely for the neglect of a church rule in a thing indifferent, be argued for and defended from natural principles? If it can, let us have the argument distinctly written. And further, let the duty, the universal moral obligation of being published, be argued for and defended from natural principles, *without begging the question, without arguing in a circle*, independent of ecclesiastical canons, (*nad why not*

also state canons ?) and we will all agree that it is the duty of the magistrate to enforce it." (p. 41.)

Well then, here it is again. "The question is not whether marriage formed without the knowledge of these powers, (Church and State,) ought to be prohibited. For we also assert that in an organized state of society, every marriage ought of *divine right* to be celebrated before a competent number of witnesses," &c. &c. Here J. A. is no *begging the question*; here is a *straight line* of argument, short but very conclusive for publishing. Shortly it is, of divine right a marriage must not take place till it be published. For beyond doubt, when these two bodies know it it is published. Here then is a principle admitted by him perfectly sufficient to sustain all which he demands in order to surrender. I have already shown how "the whole fabric" stands here very securely. It is needless to repeat. It is in substance the same with the 7th proposition.

There are in his papers many strange and unintelligible things, which I cannot detain the reader with. Take this as an instance:—"The marrying a couple whose right is known, is not rendered sinful in its nature by the neglect of publication, were it *even of divine appointment*." (p. 42.)

On the whole, I think the *spirit* manifested through his papers will exert no unfavorable influence on publication. Before parting, I would ask what mean those scornful italics which I have met with in several places, pointing at the *Associate Church*? Do they "grow on Seceder soil, or are they an exotic plant?"

ART. IV. Gutzlaff's Voyages.

Mr. JOHN P. HAVEN of New-York has in press, and will publish in the course of a few weeks in a duodecimo volume of 400 pages, Gutzlaff's Journal of his first two voyages along the coast of China. We have here in detail the evidence of those important facts which have been recently announced in general terms, that the great body of the people on the coast of China are strongly in favor of a free intercourse with foreigners, and that the government are deeply conscious of their inability to prevent this intercourse whenever it shall be resolutely demanded. We are indebted to the publisher for permission to give the few extracts from the sheets before us which we have inserted below.

OBJECT OF THE EXPEDITION.—The object of the expedition is thus stated in the introductory paragraph.

The expedition of which I am to give an outline originated in the desire of the factory of the Hon. East India Company in China to facilitate mercantile enterprise, and to acquire information respecting those ports where commerce might be established. We were instructed to use no force, except for self-defence: but by every means so to conciliate the natives, as to establish trade on a basis which would be permanent. We were to visit the coasts of China, Corea, Japan, and the Loo-Choo islands. Mr. Lindsay, our chief and supercargo, a man of the most humane disposition, refined manners, and enthusiastic in such an enterprise, was conversant with the Chinese language. Capt. Rees, the commander, an able seaman and surveyor, was anxious to make accurate charts of the different harbors. We had also a draughtsman among the officers. There was also a learned Chinese on board. I was charged with the office of interpreter and surgeon. Our ship, "The Lord Amherst," was in very good condition, and commanded by able officers.

CHARACTER OF THE CHINESE EMIGRANTS.—The expedition left Macao on the 27th of February, 1832, and was occupied for more than two months in the voyage along the coast of

the province of Canton, and the province of Fuh-keen, which joins that of Canton on the N. E. These provinces it would seem are more populous in proportion to their fertility, than any other parts of China, and the Chinese emigrants found in such numbers throughout the Asiatic isles are chiefly from this region. Mr. G. thus describes the character of these emigrants.

All the districts belonging to Fuh-chow Foo, to which Ting-hae likewise appertains, send forth a great number of colonists, who spare neither danger or toil to gain a scanty livelihood in their foreign homes. A part of their hard earnings is annually remitted to their kindred who are left in their native land; and it is astonishing to see what hardships they will suffer, to procure and send home this pittance. A man of tried honesty is appointed to collect the individual subscriptions of the emigrants, who also engages to go home with them, and there make an equitable distribution to the donees. The subscriptions are regularly noted down, and a certain per centage paid to this commissioner. Before he goes on board, a banquet is given by the subscribers, and then he embarks with all the wishes which human voices can utter, for his prosperous passage. On arriving at his native shores, he is welcomed by all those who are anxiously waiting for this supply. The amount of these remittances is often large, and there are instances where junks have taken on board more than sixty thousand dollars for this purpose. Notwithstanding the great precaution taken to find a proper man for so important a trust, it often happens that he runs away with the money entrusted to him, and the poor families whose sole dependence it was, are reduced to starvation. Good faith is surely not a virtue of which the Chinese can generally boast, though there are honorable individual exceptions; at the same time it must be admitted, that their affection towards their kindred is very strong: neither time nor distance can withdraw their attention from the beloved objects they left behind in their native land. If an emigrant can send but a dollar he will send it; he will himself fast in order to save it; indeed, he will never send home a letter, unless accompanied with some present; he will rather entirely cease writing than send nothing more substantial than paper. There are also swindlers among the colonists, who, on their arrival from China, engage in extensive mercantile speculations, and having acquired credit, and got much property in their hands, either run away or abide the consequences in a jail.

The condition of the emigrants in general, on their arrival in a foreign country, is most miserable; without clothing, or money for one day's subsistence. Sometimes they have not money enough to pay their passage from home, (six or twelve dollars,) and they become bondmen to any body who pays this sum for them, or fall a prey to extortioners, who claim their services for more than a year. The junks which transport them in great numbers, remind one of an African slaver. The deck is filled with them, and there the poor wretches are exposed to the inclemency of the weather and without any shelter, for the cargo fills the junk below. Their food consists of dry rice and an allowance of water; but when the passages are very long, there is often a want of both, and many of them actually starve to death. As soon as they arrive, they fall with a ravenous appetite upon the fruits of India, and many die by dysentery and fever. The climate also has often an enervating effect upon them, but they very soon recover from it and resume their industrious habits. But disappointed hopes render them languid in their pursuits; they came to amass dollars, and can scarcely get cents; they expected to live in plenty, but can earn a bare subsistence. Many therefore become thieves and gamblers to gratify their covetous desires. This is not strange, for it is generally the degraded and vicious of the people who leave their country for foreign parts, and there they rather advance than recede in vice. The propagation of the Gospel among such a class of

men, is therefore attended with numerous difficulties, from the prevailing corruptions.

CITY OF AMOY—INFANTICIDE AND TRAFFIC IN FEMALES.—The city of Amoy is on an island upon the coast of Fuh-keen province, about 400 or 500 miles N. E. of Macao. From Mr. G.'s description it would seem that the inhabitants are the Yankees of China.

After many delays we finally arrived at Amoy. This place is situated on a very large island, on the left side of a bay, which deeply indents the country, and forms numerous islands. The city is very extensive, and contains at least two hundred thousand inhabitants. All its streets are narrow, the temples numerous, and a few large houses owned by wealthy merchants. Its excellent harbor has made it, from time immemorial, one of the greatest emporiums of the empire, and one of the most important markets of Asia. Vessels can sail up close to the houses, load and unload with the greatest facility, have shelter from all winds, and in entering or leaving the port, experience no danger of getting ashore. The whole adjacent country being sterile, forced the inhabitants to seek some means of subsistence. Endowed with an enterprising spirit, and unwearied in the pursuit of gain, they visited all parts of the Chinese empire, gradually became bold sailors, and settled as merchants all along the coast. Thus they colonized Formosa, which, from that period to this, has been their granary; visited and settled in the Indian Archipelago, Cochin-China, and Siam. A population constantly overflowing demanded constant resources for their subsistence, and this they found in colonization. Thus they have promoted all along the coast of China, up to Mantchou Tartary. As soon as the colonists amass sufficient money they return home, which they leave again when all is spent.

This constant emigration of the male part of the people contributes very much to the destruction of domestic happiness. It is a general custom among them to drown a large proportion of the new-born female children. This unnatural crime is so common among them, that it is perpetrated without any feeling, and even in a laughing mood; and to ask a man of any distinction whether he has daughters, is a mark of great rudeness. Neither the government nor the moral sayings of their sages have put a stop to this nefarious custom. The father has authority over the lives of his children, and disposes of them according to his pleasure. The boys enjoy the greater share of parental affection. Their birth is considered one of the greatest and most fortunate events in a family. They are cherished and indulged to a high degree; and if the father dies, the son assumes a certain authority over his mother. There is also carried on a regular traffic in females. These facts are as revolting to humanity as disgusting to detail.

It is pleasing to observe that there is now a benevolent association in England for the express purpose of instructing Chinese females at Malacca. If this institution can ever exert any influence upon China in this way, for which we sincerely pray, we are persuaded that the degradation and oppression under which the nation now groans will be much alleviated.

* * * * At the beach we were shocked at the spectacle of a pretty new-born babe, which shortly before had been killed. We asked some of the bystanders what this meant. They answered with indifference, "it is only a girl." It is a general custom in this district to drown female infants immediately after their birth. Respectable families seldom take the trouble, as they express themselves, to rear these useless girls. They consider themselves the arbiters of their children's lives, and entitled to take them away when they can foresee that their prolongation would only entail misery. As the numerous emigration of the male population

renders it probable that their daughters, if permitted to live, would not be married, they choose this shorter way to rid themselves of the encumbrance of supporting them.

Thus are the pledges of conjugal love, the most precious gift of the Most High, the most important trust confided to men by the Supreme Being, deliberately murdered. Brutes love their young, and cherish and defend them; but man can divest himself of natural affection, and degrade himself far below the brute creation.

* * * April 7. To-day we got under way. I cannot omit to notice a few more particulars respecting this most celebrated emporium of Fuh-keen, and one of the greatest in Asia. Its harbor is excellent, and accessible to the largest men of war. The natives of this district seem to be born traders and sailors. Their barren country, which furnishes employment for only a few hands, but far more their inclination, prompts them to leave their home, either for Formosa, or the principal emporium of the Chinese empire, or the Indian Archipelago, or for the fisheries along their native shores. Wherever they go, they are rarely found in a state of abject poverty; on the contrary, they are often wealthy, and command the trade of whole islands and provinces, as well by their capital as by their superior enterprize and industry. Strongly attached to their early home, they either return as soon as they have acquired a small property, or they make large remittances. Many of the merchants, settled in the north part of China, return annually with their profits. It is not surprising, therefore, that a large amount of Chinese shipping belongs to Amoy merchants, and that the greater part of capital employed in the coasting trade is their property. Hence this barren tract is one of the richest in China, from the enterprize of the inhabitants. Here is doubtless one of the best harbors for European mercantile enterprize, both for its situation, its wealth, and the stores of all Chinese exports. At an early period the Portuguese traded here; the Dutch followed them; the English, for a long time, had a factory here; and the Spanish have to this day a nominal right to come hither. The cause of the cessation of trade has not been so much the prohibition of the Emperor, as the great extortion to which it was subject. The renewal of commerce will have the most beneficial influence both upon the nation engaging in it, and upon the Chinese.

It is highly desirable that a Christian mission should be established here. The facilities for disseminating the divine word are greater in this place than in any other part of China. The Spanish have a mission in the environs; but it seems to be almost unknown. Though I have had intercourse with thousands of Amoy men, I have never met with one Christian among them.

Boldness, pride, and generosity, are characteristics of the natives. They have always been obstinate against governmental encroachments. They were the last who kept up resistance to the Tartar usurpation; and many of them preferred a voluntary exile in Formosa, or India, to compliance with the customs of their conquerors, and submission to barbarians. They defended themselves bravely at Formosa, and became notorious for piracy. Successful in resisting the attacks of the imperial fleet, they established a maritime government; and were never entirely subdued by force, but finally yielded to persuasion and bribery.

Literary fame is no object of their ambition; but they generally learn to count and to make up bills. Their language differs widely from the mandarin dialect, and they are obliged to learn this with the same labor as we acquire Latin. In their dealings they have a name for honesty above all other Chinese. Though incessantly hunting for gain, they are not mean, and they are anxious to establish a fair character. Solicitous

to cultivate friendship with strangers, they have always associated with them freely, whenever beyond the reach of government. They have been frequently entrusted with high offices, by those foreign states where they have resided as colonists. One of their descendents, as late as the middle of the last century, ascended the throne of Siam. I am acquainted with his son, who became a physician instead of a king, but who, notwithstanding this degradation, possesses royal virtues, and too much sagacity, to be an usurper. He is wise enough to prefer a quiet, humble life, to the pageantry of royalty, with the disaffection of a nation, indignant at seeing a foreigner on the throne.

TIMIDITY OF THE CHINESE.—From Mr. G.'s descriptions, we should think that a single English or American sloop of war would be more than a match for the whole Chinese navy. The following incident which occurred on the passage from Amoy to Fuh-chow, will serve to illustrate the courage of Chinese warriors :

While advancing towards Fuh-chow, the capital of Fuh-keen province, we met several war-junks, despatched, doubtless, in quest of us. We happened to direct our spy-glass towards one of them, which so intimidated the crew, that they ran below decks, and did not re-appear till they were sure of having escaped the danger. We could only ascribe their panic to mistaking the glass for a gun, which they supposed pointed at them.

ARRIVAL AT FUH-CHOW—CHRISTIAN BOOKS ORDERED FOR THE EMPEROR.—On the 22d of April, the Lord Amherst anchored in the harbor of Fuh-chow, the capital of the province of Fuh-keen, about 600 miles N. E. of Macao. A few days after his arrival at this port, Mr G. received an order for Christian books to be sent to the Emperor. He says :

We were visited by the mandarin of this district, a civil and sagacious old man. He had received orders from the deputy-governor of Fuh-keen province to procure a certain number of our Christian books for the inspection of the emperor. I gave him, accordingly, one copy of "Scripture Lessons," a tract on gambling, "Heaven's Mirror," a full delineation of Christianity, besides a few other books of which he had copies before. I was highly delighted that God, in his wisdom, was sending his glorious Gospel to Peking, that it might be fully examined and known in the palace. Taou Kwang has never shown himself an enemy to popery. In all his edicts against the sects and heresies in his dominions, he does not even mention the name of Christian. Though I know nothing of his character, except that he delights more in pleasure than in business, I humbly hope that the perusal of the word of God will impress his mind favorably towards the Gospel. It is the first time that the Chinese government has taken the trouble to examine the oracles of God. The depravity of the human heart, which is as great in the rulers of China as anywhere, I fear will not permit them to perceive the glory of God in a crucified Savior. Yet it is the cause of God. The mighty God and Savior will advocate his own cause, and defend it by his omnipotent arm. His mercy embraces China as well as enlightened Europe. The Chinese are his creatures as well as ourselves, and the Gospel is given for their salvation likewise. His wisdom will find ways to convey it to their minds. Though we are unable to fathom his purposes, we wait for the glorious day when the door will be thrown open, and the Gospel ride triumphantly through the land.

HEALING THE SICK—DISTRIBUTION OF CHRISTIAN BOOKS.—Wherever he went, Mr. G. employed himself on every proper occasion in healing the sick, and distributing Christian books. While at Fuh-chow, he says :

I was fully employed in healing the sick, who came in crowds from all quarters. They were afflicted with cutaneous diseases and ophthalmic

complaints. A great many complained of the "heart-ache," others of the asthma, and not a few of coughs. I was highly rejoiced that they came and afforded so good opportunities of proving our friendly intentions. Some among them were suffering intensely, and after being relieved, showed themselves very grateful. Their presents were very numerous, and their letters of thanks very hearty: I had often more than a hundred a day, and might have had triple the number, if I had had time to attend to all the applicants.

I praise God for the grace bestowed upon me, to be a distributor of his holy word. Here was ample opportunity to communicate these holy treasures; for the people were anxious to see and study the books which the emperor was to examine. Often when I came upon deck all hands were stretched out to receive them; a scuffle would ensue, and loud complaints were vented by them whose wishes were not satisfied.

ART. V. *A Fact.*

THE following is from a brother, whose piety and veracity are a pledge to us of the truth of the following Narrative, and whose labors in the ministry have been accompanied by so many tokens of the power of Divine Grace, as to entitle his opinion relative to a certain kind of revivals, and revival preaching, to some consideration. We are sure, at any rate, that his views, briefly hinted in the conclusion of the article, arise neither from ignorance of the nature of true revivals, nor from opposition to them.—*Cincinnati Standard.*

SOME time since, when I was travelling at no great distance from home, I was overtaken by a man whose appearance was in some measure prepossessing, and whose ready address convinced me, that he was not reluctant to communicate his thoughts. It was only a few seconds after our conversation commenced, that he let me know how highly he had lately been gratified in hearing a controversial sermon on baptism, and requested me to give him my sense of the Greek word *Baptizo*. From this, I understood that he knew me; and on enquiry I found him to be one, of whom I had frequently heard, and whose influence was all thrown into the opposite scale to religion. On ascertaining who he was, I observed to him that there were many words in the original Scriptures more important than *baptizo*, and more interesting both to him and me. Upon this the conversation took rather a different turn, and was substantially as follows.

At first, he was not unwilling to be ranked among atheists. But on being a little pressed, he gave way, and without a blush took his stand on the mound of infidelity. He said, he had not always been an infidel. So far from this, he had for some time held a prominent office in an evangelical church; but was obliged to give up his office, and renounce his religious profession that he might thus be consistent with former engagements, and act agreeably to the decisions of his judgment. He had received his first religious impressions under powerful preaching. The preacher assured him of his entire ability to serve God; and that the measure of his accountability was in exact correspondence with the degree of his ability; and, in his view, confuted those who represent God to be so unjust as to punish man for not doing the things which he is unable to do, without the assistance of a higher power. There was, very soon, a change in the whole train of his feelings, and he concluded that he had "got religion." He joined the church; and from his strong attachment to the doctrines of his favorite preacher, he made the decla-

ration, that if ever he should find a statement in Scripture, plainly indicating that men cannot perform any or all religious duties, without divine assistance, he would then abandon the inconsistent book, and leave the church. He would consider it derogatory to the Deity to ascribe such a book to him. However, after being about six years in the church, and holding office between four and five years, his attention was powerfully arrested by John vi. 44, "No man can come unto me, except the Father who hath sent me, draw him." Now, said he to himself, here is a plain declaration that cannot be got rid of, by any mode of reasoning, coming, too, from the pretended Saviour himself, when adapting himself to the capacities of an unlettered people. "I could as soon believe," said he, "that the book had no existence, as believe that these words were not spoken to teach us that man has not ability to serve God, till he be assisted by divine grace.—This," added he, "destroyed my confidence in religion, and since that time I have been guided by my own mind, and have served God as well as I know how."

He then showed me the views he had of God, and to what extent he reckoned himself under obligations to Him. At length I succeeded in convincing him that he must be condemned by his own rule of judgment. I next endeavored to convince him farther, that his great preacher was likely a conceited metaphysician, and needed himself to be instructed in the elements of the Gospel; and that he, the person with whom I was conversing, had likely never been at a throne of grace yet; that he had all along been rejecting the doctrine of Scripture respecting our fallen state and nature; and that if he had not been under the influence of fancy and prejudice, he never would have had what he esteemed his religious consolations. I then attempted to show him that we really are in the helpless state, which he had been taught to deny, and that the Gospel is entirely adapted to our condition.—Before we parted, he shed tears, and assured me he would on that day commence secret prayer on a principle very different from that on which he had ever previously performed it. I left the neighborhood a few weeks afterwards, and have not had an opportunity of knowing what has been his course of conduct subsequent to this interview.

Now, Sir, was not this man awakened from his slumbers by what is popularly denominated "revival preaching?" Is he not a specimen of a great portion of what are styled, revival Christians? I have reason to believe that he was deficient in neither gifts nor zeal, though void of that humble faith, which comes to a throne of grace empty handed, and embraces the promises in all their number and extent, that the soul may be made willing and obedient, and that "God may be all in all."—Is it not to be dreaded, that if our new doctrine and new measure Christians were only as intelligent, considerate, and decided, as this man, they would follow on in the same tract, till they arrived at the same mournful point in their progress?—And is it true, as reported, that a wise man has come from the East, with the avowed purpose of "indoctrinating the rising ministry in the West," in these specious, but delusive and destructive views in theology?

A COUNTRY PASTOR.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.—"Prayer for the Prosperity of Zion," and one or two other articles have been received, which will be inserted soon after the Minutes of Synod. The November number may be looked for in about three weeks after the adjournment of Synod, that is, soon after the first of the month.

ART. VI. *Summary Statistical Report of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, for 1833.*

THIS portion of the Catholic Church of Christ in the world, under one General Assembly of Bishops and Ruling elders styled *Commissioners*, which, with the *Delegates* from Corresponding Bodies, in May last, consisted of two hundred and seventy-four persons, comprehends, according to the returns now in my possession, twenty-two *Synods*; one hundred and eleven *Presbyteries*; eighteen hundred and fifty-five ordained *Bishops*; two hundred and fifteen *Licentiates*, ten; in *Candidates*, nine; in ordained and licensed *Preachers*, one hundred and thirty-five; and twenty-nine *Candidates* in a state of preparation for the ministry; twenty-five hundred *churches*; and two hundred and thirty-three thousand five hundred and eighty *Communicants*. Our INCREASE during the last year has been, in *Bishops*, one hundred and twenty-five; in *Licentiates*, ten; in *Candidates*, nine; in ordained and licensed *Preachers*, one hundred and thirty-five; in *Churches*, one hundred and nineteen; and in *Communicants*, sixteen thousand two hundred and forty-two. The Communicants added, on examination, last year, were twenty-three thousand five hundred and forty-six; being ten thousand six hundred and fourteen LESS than were reported in 1832, as added in the same way. Seven thousand two hundred and fifty-two were added last year by certificates from other churches, or passed from one of our congregations to another, being three hundred and sixty-six MORE than were received in the same manner the year previous. The total of additions now reported is thirty thousand seven hundred and ninety-eight. Of these, fourteen thousand five hundred and fifty-six must be considered as equal to the number of persons who have deceased, or been dismissed or suspended, or who were at the time of making the reports in a state of transition from the care of one session to another, or who for some reason have not been reported as members: leaving as above stated the net gain in communicants of 1833 over the whole number of 1832 at sixteen thousand two hundred and forty-two. The baptisms now returned amount to twenty-one thousand eight hundred and twenty; of which six thousand nine hundred and fifty were *adults*, fourteen thousand and thirty-five of *infants*, and eight hundred and thirty-five of persons *not distinguished*. The baptisms of 1832 exceeded those of 1833 by two thousand eight hundred and eighty-three. The funds reported as having been collected in the year preceding the meeting of the last General Assembly were for *missionary purposes*, seventy-six thousand four hundred and twenty dollars and thirty-nine cents; for defraying the expenses of *Commissioners* to the Assembly, four thousand six hundred and eighty-nine dollars and fifty-eight cents; for different *Theological Seminaries* six thousand three hundred and eleven dollars and twenty-three cents; for the *Education* of poor and pious youth, principally with reference to their becoming ministers of the Gospel, forty-seven thousand one hundred and fifty-three dollars and sixty-five cents; and for the *Contingent expenses* of the Assembly, eight hundred and ninety-two dollars and eighty-seven cents; which give a total of one hundred and thirty-five thousand four hundred and sixty-seven dollars and seventy-two cents, collected for charitable uses. This sum is less than the total for the same objects in 1832 by two thousand three hundred and fifty-one dollars and sixty-seven cents. Eleven Presbyteries have made no returns of any collections; and four have reported only on the Commissioners' Fund. In all the Presbyteries there are several churches which have made no reports on any subject, for some time past; and some which have never returned so much as the number of their communicants, since I have been Stated Clerk. Our statistics, however, are much more complete than they formerly were; and must be regarded as a near approximation to an exact statement of the numbers and operations of our whole body.

The following names of deceased Presbyterian ministers of our connexion should have been given last year, viz:

Rev. Duncan McIntyre, of the Presbytery of Fayetteville, and Rev. John T. Hamilton, of the Presbytery of West Lexington.

Since the last publication on this subject the subscriber has ascertained the death of the following twenty-six brethren; viz.

Rev. Ebenezer Fitch, D. D. and Jeremiah Stow, of the Presbytery of Ontario; Talcot Bates, Onondaga; Joseph Brackett, Geneva; William Lyman, D. D. Genessee; Simon Hosack, D. D. Albany; Griffith H. Griffith, Bedford; Nathaniel Reeve, Long Island; Herman Daggett, North River; Robert Bryson, Northumberland; John Glendy, D. D. and Samuel Knox, Baltimore; Joseph W. Barr, Philadelphia; Robert H. Chapman, D. D.* Western District; James H. Brookes and William Hume, West Tennessee; Robert Marshall, West Lexington; Robert L. Caldwell and Thomas Espy, Concord; William M'Millan, D. D. Steubenville; John R. Moreland, Indianapolis; Samuel Stanford, Fayetteville; Murdock Murphy, South Alabama; Alexander Kirkpatrick, South Carolina; John M'Ewen, Harmony; Joseph Stockton, Ohio.

With lamentation that it should be necessary, we state the fact of the suspension of three of our ministers during the last year; two of them for intemperance in drink; and one for heresy in doctrine.

The foregoing is a true summary, (E. E.) prepared by me this 31st day of July, 1833.

EZRA STILES ELY,
Stated Clerk of the General Assembly.

* Dr. Chapman attended the Assembly of May, 1833, in excellent health, and died at Winchester, Va. on his journey home, after a very short illness.

THE
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,

AND

EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

NOVEMBER, 1833.

MINUTES

Of the Associate Synod of North America, at their Meeting in Canonsburgh, October 2, 1833, and continued by Adjournment; being their Thirty-Second Annual Meeting.

The Associate Synod of North America met according to adjournment, and in the absence of the Moderator, was constituted with prayer by the Rev. WILLIAM WILSON, the senior minister present.

MEMBERS PRESENT.

Of the Presbytery of Cambridge.

MINISTER.

James P. Miller.

Of the Presbytery of Albany.

MINISTER.

John Russell.*

RULING ELDER.

Chauncey Webster.

Of the Presbytery of Philadelphia.

MINISTER.

Thomas Beveridge.

RULING ELDER.

James Auld.

Of the Presbytery of the Carolinas.

(None.)

Of the Presbytery of Miami.

MINISTERS.

A. Heron,

James Adams,

D. Carson,

N. Ingles,

James Templeton,

S. Wilson,

James Wallace,

James C. Bruce.*

RULING ELDERS.

John Duncan,

Joseph Kyle,

Thomas Bigger,

Hugh Andrew.

Of the Presbytery of Muskingum.

MINISTERS.

John Walker,

A. Isaac,

Thomas Hanna,

Joseph Clokey,

Samuel Hindman,

D. McLane jun.*

RULING ELDERS.

Samuel McNary,

Joseph Dawson,

John Auld,*

John Trimble,*

Robert Taggart.*

Of the Presbytery of Ohio.

MINISTERS.

D. McLane sen.,

D. Imbrie,

John Donaldson,

E. N. Scroggs,

D. Goodwillie,

William Douthet,

A. Boyd,*

M. Snodgrass.*

RULING ELDERS.

Robert George,

James Boyle,

Isaac Cowden,

Nicholas McConnel.

Of the Presbytery of Chartiers.

MINISTERS.

William Wilson,
James Ramsay, D. D.,
D. French,
A. Wilson,
A. Donnan,
William M. McElwee,
James Rodgers,
Thomas Allison.*

RULING ELDERS.

William Morrison,
John Templeton,
James Moore,
James Brownlee,
James Brown,
Robert Leiper,
John Boyd,
Hugh McClellan.*

Of the Presbytery of Alleghany.

MINISTERS.

John France,
Joseph Scroggs,
J. McCarrell,*
Robert Bruce, D. D.*

RULING ELDERS.

Bernard Gilieland,
Hugh Hamill,
A. Sheriff*
William Calhoun.*

MINISTERS WITHOUT CHARGE.

Joseph Banks,*
John Wallace.*

Those members whose names are marked thus, * were not present at opening of Synod.

In the absence of the Moderator, Mr. Beveridge was appointed to preach the Synodical sermon.

On motion,—*Resolved*, That the reading of the Minutes of last year be dispensed with, as they were read and approved previous to publication.

On motion, proceeded to the appointment of standing committees, and the following were appointed, viz :

Of Arrangements—Messrs. Clokey, Donnan, Heron.

Of Supplies—Messrs. Miller, Beveridge, McElwee, Adams, Hanna, Murray, Dr. Ramsay, J. Scroggs, and J. C. Brown.

On the Funds—Messrs. Webster and Kyle.

Of Bills and Overtures—Messrs. Clokey, A. Wilson and McElwee.

On the Theological Seminary—Dr. Ramsay, and Messrs. Heron and Rodgers.

To Transcribe the Minutes for the Press—Messrs. Hanna and Webster.

Papers being called for, the following were given in and read, viz :

A call for Mr. Horatio Thompson from the congregations of Ebenezer, Timber Ridge and Old Providence, in Virginia, which was sustained, and ordered to be transmitted to the Presbytery of the Carolinas for presentation, as soon as practicable.

Mr. Jas. P. Miller was chosen Moderator.

A petition and representation from the members of the congregation of Xenia, against enforcing the rule, respecting the publication of the banns of marriage, was read, and, on motion, laid on the table.

The Synod agreed to have a recess of 20 minutes.

After the recess, Mr. Beveridge preached from Mal. iii. 17, "And they shall be mine," &c.,

The Report of the Treasurer at Philadelphia was then given in, and read, and, on motion, referred to the committee on the funds.

The Report of the Presbytery of Philadelphia was read, as follows, and, on motion, referred to the committee of bills and overtures.

Report of the Presbytery of Philadelphia.

The proportion of supplies allowed us by the Synod, and the Commission, has been small, compared with our vacancies; and for several years past we have suffered much from the failure of those appointed, who have generally either not appeared in our bounds, or have spent with us but a small part of the time allotted us. The entire or partial failure of some during the past year, we have reason to believe, has not been owing to the fault of the supplies; but we hope the Synod will consider our past losses, and that they will send us, for the ensuing year, a due proportion of such preachers as there is good reason to believe will be able to fulfil their appointments. The existence of some of our oldest congregations, and attention to some favorable openings for preaching the gospel, must depend, so far as human instrumentality is concerned, on the liberality of Synod in granting us supplies.

We have particular reason to acknowledge the kindness of our brethren of the Presbytery of Albany, who, considering the suffering state of our vacancies, sent us, of their own accord, Mr. John Adams, a probationer from Scotland, who has been with us a great part of the year. A call for him to the congregations of Guinston and Lower Chanceford, was sustained, and being accepted, he was ordained as their pastor at our last meeting, Sept, 11, 1833. While this congregation, so long destitute, has been again favored with a settled ministry, we are sorry to add, that another of our congregations has been added to the list of our vacancies. The Rev. A. Whyte having offered the resignation of the associate congregation of Baltimore, it was accepted. A call being at the same time presented to him from the associate congregations of Steel

Creek, and Bethany, N. C., was accepted; and he is accordingly transferred to the Presbytery of the Carolinas.

A petition for supply of sermon has been presented to us from about twenty families in Wheatfield, township Perry county, near Carlisle. But unless a more liberal portion of supplies be granted us, this and other favorable openings must of necessity be neglected.

With the advice of some brethren of other presbyteries, Mr. H. Thompson underwent the usual trials for ordination, at our last meeting. These trials were provisionally sustained, on the condition that the Synod shall appoint him for ordination, and will allow these trials to pass as sufficient. The Synod are no doubt aware that the Presbytery of the Carolinas, being reduced to a single member in the ministry, has been virtually extinct during the past season. This unusual state of things, we hope, will be regarded as a sufficient apology for some departure from the usual order.

The Presbytery have also examined and admitted, as a student of theology, Mr. Robert Forrester, on the condition of his completing some parts of his preparatory course during the vacations of the Hall.

By order of Presbytery.

T. BEVERIDGE.

The Report of the Treasurer of the Bible Society was read, as follows, and, on motion, laid on the table.

Report of the Treasurer of the Bible Society of the Associate Synod.

Subsequent to the last meeting of the Synod, there was no meeting of the committee of the Bible society in season to give any instruction to the treasurer. In the mean time, several orders having been sent for Bibles, and some of them specifying the particular editions which would be preferred, with the concurrence of some individuals of the committee, these orders were answered. Some of the first copies of the Scriptures sent, were bound up with plates. This happened through oversight, and has been carefully avoided in all subsequent purchases. Some of the orders exceeded the proportion allowed by Synod, it being understood that the surplus money was retained in the hands of the treasurers of sessions or presbyteries for the use of Synod. The balance at present in the hands of the treasurer is \$36.72, with the addition of what has been retained, it would be about \$100.31½. It is impossible, however, to arrive at exactness in purchasing articles of a fixed price, so that they will always reach the precise amount designated. In most instances, they will either exceed or fall short, by a few cents. The latest purchases have been something cheaper than the first; and it is very doubtful whether the Synod could adopt any plan by which they could afford Bibles any cheaper than they can now purchase them.

The following is an account of the individuals, congregations and presbyteries which have contributed, the amount of their contributions, the amount returned in Bibles, and the balance remaining in the treasurer's hands.

CONTRIBUTORS.	Amount contrib- ed.	Amount returned in Bibles.	Amount in Treasur- er's hands.
Massies Creek congregation,.....	\$21.50	\$15.19	\$5.52
Albany congregation,.....	30.00	22.56	7.44
Salem congregation,.....	20.00	15.27	4.73
William Morris, Esq., Baltimore,.....	25.00	18.91	6.09
Cambridge presbytery,.....	96.00	84.26	11.74
Rev. Francis Pringle,.....	5.00	3.80	1.20
Cambridge presbytery,.....	130.00	130.00	0.00
	\$327.50	\$290.78	\$36.72

T. BEVERIDGE, *Treasurer B. S. A. S.*

On motion, *Resolved*, That the usual hour of meeting in the morning be 9 o'clock, and of adjournment half past 12; and that the usual hour of meeting in the afternoon be 2 o'clock.

Adjourned to meet in the Hall of Jefferson College, at 9 o'clock to-morrow morning.—Closed with prayer.

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 3d.

The Synod met, and was opened with prayer.

Members present as above, with the addition of the Rev. Jas. C. Bruce, of the Presbytery of Miami, Rev. John Russell, of the Presbytery of Albany, and Messrs. John Auld and John Trimble, ruling elders, from the Presbytery of Muskingum; and Hugh, McClelland, ruling elder, from the Presbytery of Chartiers; and Robert Ramsay, ruling elder, from the Presbytery of Ohio.

Mr. Robert Taggart, ruling elder, from the Congregation of Wooster, being present, was invited to a seat.

The minutes of the last sitting were read and approved.

The committee of arrangements reported in part; and their report was, on motion, adopted.

Papers being called for, the following were given in and read, viz: a remonstrance and petition from Messrs. Donnan and others, against the decision of last year, de-

elaring ourselves in communion with the Associate Synod of Original Seceders in Scotland.

This paper was, on motion, referred to a select committee, with instructions to report to-morrow afternoon. Messrs. Adams, Donaldson and Templeton, were appointed the committee.

The Rev. John Russell was, on motion, added to the committee of supplies.

A letter from the Rev. A. Anderson was read, containing a representation of the state and necessities of our churches in the Carolinas. On motion, it was

Resolved, That so much of the said paper as relates to the supply of the Carolina Presbytery be referred to the committee of supplies, and the rest to the committee of bills and overtures, to report thereon.

The Report of the Presbytery of Miami was read, and, on motion, referred to the committee of bills and overtures.

Report of the Presbytery of Miami.

In presenting our report, we have much to record of the loving kindness of the Lord to that portion of the church committed to our care; but not unmingled with dispensations of an afflictive nature. The Rev. John Wallace, who had accepted the pastoral charge of Carmel and its associated branches, departed this life in March last near Memphis, whither he had gone for the benefit of his health; and not only have we to mourn his loss as a promising fellow laborer in the vineyard, but the congregations composing his pastoral charge have been again cast destitute upon our care.

At a late meeting we sustained a call from these congregations for Mr. James M. Henderson, which is herewith transmitted, with accompanying documents, that it may be presented, along with other calls, which we understand will be forwarded for the same candidate.

On the 25th of October last, Mr. James Wallace was ordained to the office of the holy ministry and installed pastor of the united congregations of Darby and Bellefontaine.

On the 8th of January, the Rev. A. Heron was installed pastor of the congregation of Caesar Creek, whose call had been presented and accepted at the last meeting of Synod.

On the 11th of May last, the Rev. James C. Bruce having had a call from the congregation of Henderson River, presented by a commission of Presbytery, and by him accepted, was installed pastor of said congregation.

At a meeting of this Presbytery, held in April last, the pastoral relation between the Rev. N. Ingles and the congregation of Racoon was, at his request, dissolved, and at a late meeting, a petition for the whole of his labors at Bennett's Creek, the other branch of his charge, was granted. The congregation of Racoon is consequently added to the list of our vacancies.

The following questions have been, at different meetings of Presbytery, laid on our table, and are now referred to Synod simpliciter with a request that the Synod would, at its present meeting, give them an answer, viz :

1. "Is it proper to ordain ruling elders with the imposition of hands?"

2. "Is the church authorised, or is it her duty, to enact or enforce a thing which is in its own nature indifferent, where it is not necessary for the orderly and scriptural administration of ecclesiastical ordinances?"

The subject of the publication of the banns of marriage has for some time past been a topic of considerable excitement in some of our congregations, and we beg leave respectfully to suggest, that the Synod is loudly called to a speedy decision of this matter, as lying on their table. Connected with this subject, an appeal has been taken from a late decision of the Presbytery, in the case of a complaint preferred by James Morrow against the session of Massies Creek, which appeal, with accompanying documents, will be laid upon your table in due time.

The Presbytery have to report further, that they have examined Mr. Alexander Tedford, and admitted him to the study of theology.

An appeal was taken some time ago, by Alexander Turnbull, a member of Massies Creek congregation, from a decision of Presbytery in his case, which, with accompanying documents, will be laid on the Synod's table in due time.

A call for the Rev. S. McLane from a congregation within our bounds is known to be in progress and we have therefore to request the appointment of Mr. McLane into our bounds some time at an early period, that an opportunity may be afforded for its presentation and acceptance.

We trust that the Synod will extend to us their usual kindness and afford us as much supply of gospel ordinances as will be compatible with the interest of other sections of the church.

All which is respectfully submitted.

By order of Presbytery.

SAMUEL WILSON, *Moderator.*

ANDREW HERON, *Clerk.*

The Report of the Presbytery of Cambridge was read as follows: and on motion, laid on the table.

Report of the Associate Presbytery of Cambridge.

To the Associate Synod of North America, the report of the Presbytery of Cambridge respectfully sheweth:—

That since the Presbytery's last communication to Synod, the principal events which have transpired, connected with the Presbytery, and which appear proper to be communicated to Synod, are briefly summed up in the following particulars, viz:

In September 1832, a unanimous call was given by the Congregation of Hebron, to the Rev. A. Anderson of the Presbytery of the Carolinas, which has issued in his settlement as pastor of that Congregation. Consequently he is now a member of this Presbytery.

The Rev. T. Goodwillie, who has been absent from his charge, on account of ill health for about three years, has returned, and it is hoped, that he will now be able to resume his labors.

Mr. David Strang, was admitted as a Student of Theology, during the last winter; but owing to some peculiar circumstances, he was unable to go to the Divinity Hall. He has however, been pursuing his studies under the direction of Presbytery, and has evinced commendable diligence, in his attention to all the exercises assigned him.

In the month of June, of the present year, the duty of public covenanting was observed in the Congregation of South Argyle. And considering the length of time which the duty had been neglected in this particular section of the Church, the number of those, who willingly offered themselves to engage, was encouraging; 92 of South Argyle, and 12 of other congregations engaging for the first time, 18 assenting who had before engaged. Among the number were Mr. John Easton and Mr. D. Strang the only students of Theology in the bounds of the Presbytery at the time.

The Commission appointed by Synod at its last meeting, to settle the difficulties existing in this Presbytery, met in Salem, June 1832. Their minutes will show the result of their labors. From the patience, calmness and faithfulness, with which the matters submitted were investigated, it was hoped, that their labors would leave but little occasion for the exercise of discipline in the Presbytery for a long time to come. But unhappily this is not the case. Although Presbytery then understood and it is presumed the Commission, believed, that all barriers to a regular intercourse among all the members, were then removed; yet much of the time and attention of Presbytery, since, has been occupied with similar troubles.

Mr. H. Thompson fulfilled his appointment to this Presbytery, for the time allotted by Synod. The Rev. John Wallace who was appointed some time in the bounds of this Presbytery did not appear, nor forward any reason for his failure.

Respecting an appointment made at a previous meeting of Synod, directing this Presbytery to send a mission through the New England states, Presbytery can only again report, that the measure has not yet been attempted. The scarcity of help, the pressing calls of the vacancies heretofore under the care of Presbytery, and the distracting troubles, with which this Presbytery has been so long harrassed, have been the chief causes of failure.

At the meeting of Presbytery, September 3d of the present year, Messrs. Samuel M'Arthur and Edward Small were admitted as Students of Theology, Mr. Small to attend the Theological Hall the ensuing term. But owing to some peculiar circumstances in Mr. M'Arthur's case, Presbytery has not directed his attendance the ensuing term.

In consequence of the settlement of Hebron and the return of Mr. Goodwillie, there is at present no organized vacancy under the care of Presbytery.

Respecting the state of religion in the congregations under the immediate inspection of Presbytery, no very material change can be reported since last year. It is hoped however, that the calling of the attention of the people to the duty of covenanting, has not been without some apparent evidences of awakening in some a desire of making themselves better acquainted with the profession which they have been making; while it must be confessed, that it has also been the occasion of opposition to that profession, from some, from whom it could not reasonably have been expected, considering the plainness with which the duty has been set forth in the most eminently reforming periods of the Church; and considering, also, the prominent place, which that duty has occupied in the Standards of the Associate Church.

The same opposition to a testimony for the particular truths of God's word, which has so long prevailed in the professing community around, is still apparent in all its wonted activity. If Presbytery should particularize any sin, against which, a judicial warning and special condemnation would be proper at this time, it would be a want of regard to the authority of God speaking in his word. Many will readily admit certain breaches of the second table of the law to be sins, who can, however, easily overlook the most if not all the duties required in the first and second precepts of the first table. And when they condemn violations of the relative duties due from man to man, when they condemn murder, uncleanness, dishonesty, and false speaking, and even swearing, these sins, are not so much viewed as breaches of God's law and rebellion against his authority, as transgressions of the laws, usages and order of human society. This argues a want of a practical regard to the authority of God speaking to us in his word. And especially when these are considered great sins, in comparison with the sin of neglecting "to know and acknowledge God to be the only true God and to worship and glorify him accordingly." or the neglecting to endeavor "to keep pure and entire all such religious worship and ordinances as God hath appointed in his word." And Presbytery may justly complain, that the practical operation of this principle, is apparent on the world around us, in the rapid increase of that immorality in practice which is the native fruit, and uniform consequent of unsoundness in doctrine. All of which is respectfully submitted.

Signed for Presbytery,

D. GORDON, Moderator.

The Report of the Presbytery of Albany was read as follows: and on motion, referred to the Committee of bills and overtures.

Report of the Associate Presbytery of Albany.

The state of religion, and the situation of our congregations generally, continue much the same as when we last reported to Synod.

At a meeting in August, 1832, Mr. James Strang a preacher from the United Associate Synod in Scotland, having preached before Presbytery, and given in his adherence to the subordinate standards of our church, was admitted a preacher in the fellowship of the church, and immediately sent on to Canada.

At a meeting of Presbytery, in September, 1832, Mr. John Adams, a preacher from the Original Burgher Synod, in Scotland, was, upon his preaching before the Presbytery, and giving in

his adherence to the subordinate standards of the church, admitted a preacher in the fellowship of the Associate Church.

The call for Mr. John Graham, mentioned in our last report, having been accepted, he was ordained and installed pastor of the Associate Congregation of Bovina, on the 31st of October, 1832.

At the same meeting Mr. Chauncey Webster was admitted a student of divinity, and has since been pursuing his studies under the direction of Presbytery.

At a meeting, May 1st, 1833, two calls, one from the Associate Congregation of Dumfries, U. C., and the other from the Associate Congregation of York, Livingston Co., N. Y., for Mr. James Strang, preacher, were sustained and presented; that from Dumfries was accepted, and at a special meeting on the first Wednesday of July, Mr. Strang was ordained and installed to the pastoral office in that congregation.

Mr. Ferrier has also been labouring this summer in Upper Canada, principally between London and Harwick, and Presbytery feeling unable to defray his expenses, hope the Synod will make provision for this purpose at its ensuing meeting.

Thus, by the kindness of the Head of the church our hands have been greatly strengthened, still we stand in need of a liberal portion of supply, and would suggest to Synod the propriety of appropriating a portion of its funds to the more vigorous carrying on of Missionary operations in our bounds, especially in the Upper Province.

Presbytery feel bound again to call the attention of Synod to the irregularity with which their appointments are fulfilled; neither Mr. Thompson, nor Mr. Wallace appeared in our bounds. This is a growing evil, and one by which both our own vacancies, and those in sister Presbyteries suffer much.

Inasmuch as the Rule of Publication of Marriage rests entirely on human authority, and inasmuch as the enforcement of the Rule would lead to many difficulties in this section of the church, we deem it expedient that the Synod leave the determination of this matter to the sessions of the several congregations.

The Rev. Peter Bullions having laboured during the last winter and the present season in preaching in the city of Troy, a petition from several individuals has been laid before this Presbytery, and one of our number has been appointed to organize a congregation in that city.

All which is respectfully submitted,

P. CAMPBELL, Moderator.

J. G. SMART, Clerk.

The report of the Western Missionary Presbytery was read, and, on motion, returned to the Presbytery.

Memorials from the congregations of Massies Creek and Cæsar's Creek, in opposition to the enforcement of the Rule respecting the publication of the purpose of marriage, were read, and, on motion, laid on the table.

A remonstrance of the session of Massies Creek, against the decision of Synod last year, refusing to sustain the appeal of Messrs. Adams, Galloway and Kyle, in the case of Thos. Mealy, was read, also a memorial from James Morrow, a member of said session, in opposition to the aforesaid remonstrance. These papers were, on motion, laid on the table.

Adjourned till 2 o'clock.—Closed with prayer.

2 o'clock P. M.

The Synod met and was opened with prayer.

Members present as above, together with Messrs. A. Boyd and M. Snodgrass, ministers, from the Presbytery of Ohio; James Auld, ruling elder, from the Presbytery of Philadelphia; D. Blair, minister, and Adam Sheriff, ruling elder, from the Presbytery of Alleghany.

As Mr. Murray is absent, Mr. Imbrie was, on motion, appointed on the committee of supplies in his room.

On motion, Mr. Beveridge was appointed an additional member of the committee appointed last year; to draught a summary statement of our views on the topics in controversy between us and our brethren of the Reformed Presbyterian Synod.

Answers to reasons of protest by the Rev. James Adams, against the decision of Synod last year, refusing to sustain the appeal in the case of Thomas Mealy, were read and, on motion, accepted, and referred to a select committee, with instructions to report as soon as practicable. Messrs. Carson and Hanna were appointed said committee.

The subject of electing an additional Professor, was, on motion, made the order of the day for Tuesday morning next week.

On motion, it was resolved to proceed now to a nomination, with a view to the election of said Professor, and the following candidates were nominated, viz: Messrs. A. Anderson, James Martin, D. Carson, James Rodgers, and Thomas Beveridge.

On motion, Resolved, That in the event of an election being made, such election shall require a majority of all the votes given.

Mr. Allison appeared and took his seat.

A petition from John Sterrett, praying the Synod to consider his case decided at a former meeting, and to grant him relief, was read, and on motion, referred to a select committee, with instructions to report thereon. Messrs. J. Scroggs and Isaac, were appointed said committee.

A paper was handed in, and on motion referred to the committee on bills and overtures, with orders to report whether it should be read in Synod.

The Rev. Joseph Banks appeared and took his seat.

The committee appointed at last meeting to revise the Book of Discipline, not being prepared to report, were, on motion, continued, with instructions to report as soon as practicable.

The committee appointed last meeting to devise ways and means to carry into effect the Synod's Act on Slavery, not being prepared, were continued, with instructions to report during the present meeting.

The following committees were appointed to review the records of Presbyteries, viz :

Messrs. Hanna and Adams to review the records of Chartiers Presbytery.

Messrs. Clokey and E. N. Scroggs to review those of Miami.

Messrs. Blair and S. Wilson, those of Muskingum.

Enquiry being made respecting the observance of the Synod's fast, it was found that it had been generally observed. The Synod agreed to express their dissatisfaction with Messrs. Blair and Beveridge for neglecting its observance.

On motion, *Resolved*, That a meeting be held to-morrow evening, for the exercises of praise and prayer; and Messrs. E. N. Scroggs and Russell were appointed to lead in the exercises.

Adjourned till 9 o'clock to-morrow morning.—Closed with prayer.

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 4TH.

The Synod met and was opened with prayer.

Members present as above, together with Mr. James M'Carrell minister, and William Calhoun, ruling elder, from the Presbytery of Alleghany.

Read the minutes of last sitting.

Papers being called for the report of the Presbytery of Chartiers was read as follows, and on motion laid on the table.

Report of the Presbytery of Chartiers.

OCTOBER 1, 1833.

The supply allotted to this Presbytery was received in due time, and a very acceptable addition was made to it through Mr. Joseph Banks, who came into our bounds early in October last. A call for the Rev. Wm. M. M'Elwee from the united congregations of service and Kings Creek, was sustained at a meeting of Presbytery in March, and on presentation, accepted.

According to appointment of the commission, Messrs. Bankhead Boyd and John P. Dickey were put on trials and licensed at Mount Pleasant on the 22d of May last; Mr. James P. Ramsay was licensed at Noblesburgh on the 27th of August; Mr. Thompson, who was also ordered to be put on trials for licensure, has given in his trials in part. By order of Presbytery, Mr. W. Wilson was directed to organize the S. W. Branch of Montieurs as a distinct Branch of his charge by the name of Robison. Other things continue as they were.

WILLIAM M. M'ELWEE, *Moderator.*

The Report of the Western Mission was given in, and, on motion, referred to the committee on the funds.

Report of the Western Mission.

The number of admissions to our communion in the western borders of our church, has this year been unusually large. The cause of the Secession, notwithstanding great opposition, is gradually prospering, and the congregations, generally, manifest a commendable diligence in their researches after truth, and in their spirited exertions to obtain a pure dispensation of gospel ordinances. Although these vacancies are separated from the body of our church, by a distance of several hundred miles and have but few sources of spiritual knowledge, and are subject to much discouragement, yet they continue in an extraordinary manner to adhere steadfastly to our principles. There is, therefore, great reason to acknowledge the goodness of God, in gradually accomplishing his promise by extending the gospel progressively toward "earth's utmost line," and in making "the wilderness and solitary place to rejoice."

When your Missionary made his last report to Synod, he was employed in the congregation of Henderson, having been detained longer in that place than was expected, on account of the impracticability of crossing the Mississippi. As soon as this difficulty was removed, he proceeded to the De Moine's rapids of the Mississippi, a station formerly occupied by your Missionaries. The persons in our communion who formerly resided at this place, with the exception of one family, have removed to Henderson, and it is expected that this family will also shortly remove to the same place. From thence he crossed the Mississippi to Buffalo, Pike County, Missouri, where he spent two sabbaths. This station is considered one of the most important in the mission, as the field of usefulness is large and extensive. There are here several families attached to secession principles, who earnestly desire an opportunity of manifesting that attachment by giving in their accession to the principles of the church. If this place could be supplied for a time with gospel ordinances, there is much prospect of success. From thence he proceeded to Mount Prairie, Monroe county, where he remained one Sabbath. From thence he passed on to Auxvasse, Callaway county, where he spent one Sabbath, and from thence to Sharon, Lincoln county, where he preached two Sabbaths. From Sharon, your Missionary returned to Apple Creek, where he organized a congregation and dispensed the Lord's Supper. The large accession here was the ground of much encouragement, as in addition to those formerly in communion, about twenty persons were admitted to the enjoyment of the privileges of the

church. While employed in this congregation, the term of the first appointment of your Missionary expired. It was, however, considered expedient not to leave the Missionary field, but to await further appointments from the Synod. These arrived about the 14th of July, when it appeared that your Missionary was ordered to itinerate four months longer on the mission. He accordingly entered upon the fulfilment of the appointment, and returned from Apple Creek to Buffalo, Missouri, where he spent three Sabbaths. It was intended at this time to reorganize this congregation and administer the Lord's Supper; but this was omitted, as it was supposed that Mr. McLean would punctually attend to the appointment of the Synod, and would arrive in time to dispense to the people in this congregation that seal of the covenant. From thence your Missionary crossed over to the forks of Wood River, Illinois, at which place he preached one Sabbath. The few individuals in our communion, who resided here, have since removed to Henderson. Leaving Wood River, he visited Sugar Creek, where he preached one Sabbath. From thence he proceeded to Unity, and from thence to Apple Creek, having spent two Sabbaths in each of these vacancies. From thence he passed on to Henderson, at which place having preached two Sabbaths, the Synodical appointment expired.

The vacancies in the West are urgent in their solicitations for more abundant supply of preaching. The prospect of large accessions appears sufficient to warrant a continuation of the attention of the Synod to the wants of these people, who are earnestly entreating you to come over and help them. Within the last two Missionary years, thirteen months of which, your Missionary has been itinerating in the West, one congregation has been organized—the Lord's Supper dispensed in three congregations, viz. Unity, Apple Creek and Henderson. Upwards of one hundred persons have been admitted to the privileges of the church in these vacancies, nearly one half of which number was admitted for the first time; the remainder were emigrants belonging to the church. Seven adults and forty one children were baptized. In this statement, the admissions which may have been made by any other of the Synod's Missionaries during that time, are not intended. Respectfully submitted,

JAMES C. BRUCE.

ACCOUNT OF THE MISSIONARY.

Associate Synod to James C. Bruce, Dr.

For Missionary services from the 1st Sabbath of March, 1832, to the 2nd Sabbath of October, 1832,—33 Sabbaths.....	\$198 00
Balance due by the last Report.....	15 00
	<hr/>
	\$213 00
Received from Buffalo congregation, Missouri.....	\$14 25
“ “ Mount Prairie do do.....	6 00
“ “ Auxvasse do do.....	5 00
“ “ Sharon do do.....	6 00
“ “ Sugar Creek do Illinois.....	1 00
“ “ Unity do do.....	16 50
“ “ Apple Creek do do.....	12 66
“ “ Henderson do do.....	12 00
	<hr/>
	\$73 41
Balance.....	\$139 59.

The committee of bills and overtures, to whom was referred the report of the Presbytery of Albany, presented a report, which was, on motion, accepted and laid on the table.

The same committee reported on the report of the Presbytery of Philadelphia, and their report was, on motion, received and adopted.

The report of the Committee of Bills and Overtures, to whom was referred so much of the report of the Presbytery of Philadelphia as respects the case of H. Thompson, report that the conduct of Presbytery, in receiving from Mr. Thompson trials for ordination, be approved of under the extraordinary circumstances of the case, and that the Presbytery of Philadelphia be ordered to certify to the Carolina Presbytery, that Mr. H. Thompson gave before them such particular trials, which were sustained, and that the latter Presbytery be directed to proceed to his ordination, as though these trials had been received and sustained by themselves.

JOSEPH CLOKEY,
ALEX. WILSON,
WM. M. M'ELWEE.

The Rev. D. McLane, jr., appeared and took his seat.

The draught of reasons for fasting was given in and read, and while this paper was under consideration, Mr. George asked and obtained leave of absence, and the Synod adjourned till 2 o'clock.

Closed with prayer.

2 o'clock P. M.

The Synod met and was opened with prayer.

Members present as above.

Read the minutes of last sitting.

Papers being called for, the report of the Presbytery of Muskingum was read as follows, and, on motion, referred to the committee on the funds.

Report of the Presbytery of Muskingum.

With respect to that portion of the Church under our more immediate inspection, we have but little of general interest to report. The difficulties attending the maintenance of a scriptural profession of religion, do not appear to be in the least diminished, and the opposition to a faithful testimony for the truth is doubtless becoming more and more formidable. Whilst discord and division, arising from disaffection to the truth, is pervading many of the churches of the reformation, it is gratifying to observe the harmony and unanimity which prevails amongst us in the support of the great cause of the reformation for which our fathers suffered even to bonds and imprisonment.

The congregations under our charge, are generally on the increase, and the call for ministerial labor throughout our numerous and scattered vacancies is loud and urgent. Many who were heretofore opposed to the public profession espoused by us, are becoming alarmed at the fearful progress of ruinous errors, and a subtle metaphysical species of divinity, which tends to beguile the unwary, and harden the wicked; and are applying to us for a supply of ordinances.

According to appointment, Messrs. David Lindsay, James Henderson and Wm. C. Pollock, having given in the usual trials with acceptance, were licensed to preach the gospel on the 18th of April last.

Messrs. John M. Scroggs and Joseph M'Kee were admitted to the study of Theology last fall, and at present, Mr. Wm. H. Walker is an applicant for admission.

We have further to report, that there are now two calls in our hands for Mr. James M. Henderson, one from the united congregations of Jonathan's creek, Goshen, and Truro, and the other from Carmel, Sandy and North Union. They are herewith transmitted to Synod with a request that they may be presented as early as practicable.

The Presbytery have also to report, that in obedience to the order of Synod, (1832) they endeavored to supply Mr. Hindman's congregations, for the whole time ordered, which was four months, but owing to the sickness and death of Mr. M'Clelland, and Mr. Boyd's acceptance of a call in the bounds of Ohio Presbytery, and the failure of that Presbytery to comply with the rule, in such cases, in the book of discipline, we were able to supply said congregations only eleven days; eight of these were by probationers, and three by members of Presbytery. Respectfully submitted.

By order of Presbytery,
THOMAS HANNA, Presbytery's Clerk.

Muskingum Presbytery in account with the Associate Synod,

To supplying Mr. Hindman's Pulpit eleven Sabbaths, at 6 dollars, \$66.00.

Resumed the consideration of the subject left unfinished in the forenoon sitting, viz; the draught of an act for a fast, which, after some further discussion, was, on motion, recommitted.

While the above subject was under discussion, the Rev. Dr. Bruce appeared and took his seat. His excuse for absence from the former sittings was sustained. The excuses of D. McLane, jr., and J. M'Carrell, for absence, were also sustained.

Reasons of protest by Dr. Bruce against the Synod's decision of last year, declaring this Synod in ecclesiastical fellowship with the Associate Synod of Original Seceders in Scotland, were read, and, on motion, laid on the table.

Mr. Blair craved and obtained the privilege of protesting also, reasons to be given in.

The committee on bills and overtures, to whom were referred the questions contained in the report of the Presbytery of Miami, presented a report, which was read, and, on motion, laid on the table.

The select committee on the remonstrance and petition of Messrs. Donnan and others, reported progress, and requested further time, which was granted, till to-morrow morning.

The Synod proceeded to the order of the day, viz: the subject of the Publication of the Banns of Marriage.

The Reports of the committee on the subject, lying on the Synod's table, were read, and a motion was made that the report of the majority of said committee be adopted.

While this motion was under discussion, the Synod adjourned till 9 o'clock to-morrow morning.

Closed with prayer.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 5TH.

The Synod met and was opened with prayer.

Members present as above.

Read the minutes of last sitting.

Papers being called for the committee of bills and overtures, to whom was referred a paper to ascertain whether it should be read, reported that as said paper contains nothing on which this Synod could with propriety act, therefore it should be dismissed without a reading. This report was, on motion, received and adopted.

A majority of the committee of bills and overtures, reported on the letter of the Rev. A. Anderson, relative to the Presbytery of the Carolinas.

The minority of said committee presented a counter report. These reports, were, on motion, laid on the table.

A majority of the select committee, to whom was referred the Synod's Act on Slavery, for the purpose of devising ways and means for carrying said act into full effect, presented a report. Mr. Miller, a member of said committee, craved to have it marked, that he could not concur in this report. The report was, on motion, laid on the table.

A majority of the select committee appointed on the remonstrance and petition of Messrs. Donnan and others, presented a report. The minority of said committee, also presented a report, and both reports were, on motion, laid on the table.

The Report of the Presbytery of Ohio, delayed in consequence of the absence of their clerk, was given in, and although out of the prescribed time, leave was granted to read it. The report was, on motion, laid on the table, and is as follows :

Report of the Presbytery of Ohio.

The state of things in our congregations is much the same as mentioned in our report of last year. Mr. Douthet, a call to whom was given from the congregations of Windham, Palmyra and Milton, as stated in that report, has been ordained and settled in said congregations. Mr. Alexander Boyd has obtained a call from the congregations of New Castle (formerly a part of Mr. Murray's charge) New Wilmington and Mount Prospect, and has been ordained and settled in these congregations. The Rev. David Goodwillie has been loosed from the Congregation of Deer Creek, his stated labors being now confined to Poland and Liberty, so that the former is now added to the list of our vacancies and is desirous of a speedy settlement. As our vacancies are increasing and two or three of them are already ripe for settlement, we have to request a liberal proportion of supply for the ensuing year. The Presbytery have further to report, that steps are taking towards going about the duty of public religious covenanting in some of their congregations.

DANIEL M'LANE, *Moderator.*

DAVID GOODWILLIE, *Clerk pro tem.*

The Presbytery of Alleghany requested time till Monday to give in their report, on account of the absence of their clerk. The request was granted.

On motion, the order of the day was dispensed with, in order to make way for disposing of the calls for Mr. James M. Henderson, noticed in the reports of Presbyteries.

On motion, it was resolved to suspend the rule, in the present case, requiring probationers to supply one year before the acceptance of a call; and the calls were, on motion, presented to Mr. Henderson, who declared that he was not prepared to accept, and requested a delay until Wednesday next. The request was granted.

The Moderator asked and obtained leave of absence until Monday afternoon, and Mr. Hanna was called to the chair *pro tem.*

Dr. Ramsay and Mr. Sterling asked and obtained leave of absence till Monday.

On motion, the Synod proceeded to appoint the time and place of next meeting, and, on motion, it was

Resolved, That the Synod meet at Baltimore, on the 1st Wednesday of October, 1834, at 4 o'clock, P. M. Sermon at 7.

On motion, the Rev. James Irvine was appointed the Moderator's alternate, to preach the Synodical sermon, in case of his absence.

On motion, *Resolved*, That the congregations formerly belonging to the Western Mission, be included in the bounds of the Miami Presbytery, and placed under its care.

Mr. Brown asked and obtained leave of absence.

Adjourned till 2 o'clock.—Closed with prayer.

2 o'clock, P. M.

The Synod met and was opened with prayer.

Members present as above, with the exception of Messrs. Isaac, S. Wilson and Rogers, ministers; and Messrs. Templeton, John Boyd, Gilleland and Hamill, ruling elders, absent without leave.

The minutes of the last sitting being read and corrected, the draught of an act for a fast was again presented and read, as corrected, and after discussion and amendment was adopted, as follows: Messrs. Walker, Donaldson, Templeton, Carson, E. N. Scroggs, Hindman and Wallace, ministers; and Messrs. Webster, John Auld and Dawson, elders, craved their dissent to be marked from this decision.

The committee appointed to prepare an act for a fast, humbly submit the following, viz:

That grounds of fasting and humiliation before God, are at present numerous and great, must be obvious to the most superficial observer. The corruption and wickedness of men have furnished us with so many reasons, that little more than the bare mention of them would fill volumes instead of a few pages only. The chief business and difficulty, therefore, in an exercise of this kind, is, to make a proper selection, and bring forth to the view those evils that are more particularly our own, and that most urgently call for our godly sorrow.

We certainly live in an eventful time. Political changes, internal broils, insurrections and revolutions, adopting new and various means of reformation, and a prevailing and invincible spirit of independence are common amongst the nations; yet we do not observe the doings of the Lord, nor notice the operations of Him who judgeth in the earth.

As to our land, it is full of sin against the Holy One of Israel. Regarding our civil rulers, though we have no privileged class of men, who, as in many other countries, come to rule by what is termed hereditary right, but all are of our own choosing, yet we are not careful to choose those who fear God and hate covetousness. Selfishness, ambition, falsehood, backbiting and slandering, party spirit, malice, wrath and strife, are things too commonly in operation, at the times of electing into office our civil rulers. It too plainly appears, at such times, that we are more concerned that those of our political party prevail, than that our officers be peace, and our exacters righteousness.

Farther, though God in his providence has favored us with a high degree of civil liberty, and, by a happy contrivance of human ingenuity has confederated our various states together, under one general government, for the good of the whole, yet our abuse of these our distinguishing privileges, has appeared in our discontentment, insubordination, and threatenings of revolt and civil war.

Slavery is another evil in our land, which calls for deep mourning before God. Though slavery is contrary to the natural rights of man, opposed to the whole tenor of Scripture, condemned by the divine law, and most injurious to those themselves who hold their fellow men in captivity, yet it is still continued in our land. Though there is a cry against this evil in almost all the Christian world, as being unjust, unscriptural and unholy, the vilest traffic that disgraces any nation, involving the violation of all the tenderest sympathies, and all the most endearing relations of human life, making a mock of the marriage state, separating husband and wife at pleasure, tearing parents and children asunder, disregarding their tears and being deaf to their cries, surrounding the habitations of their oppressors with the fruits of adultery and the evidences of complicated crime; notwithstanding all this, and much more than this, many of our states, yea, many of the members of the church, still hold fast slavery.

The abomination of freemasonry is also continued in our land, and though providence hath broken it to pieces, yet thousands still cling to the wreck, and use all their efforts to save it. It is to be lamented, that even many of those who never belonged to the craft, yet lend a helping hand to save it from perishing.

The theatre, that school of wickedness and nursery for hell, is set up and numerously attended, in many parts of our land. And though God has of late been doing his strange work amongst us, sending the pestilence, that walketh in darkness and wasteth at noonday, yet, we fear, few have thereby been excited to consider their ways, or turn to the hand that smote them; and though God has seen it meet to remove, in a great measure, this token of his anger, and in deserved wrath is remembering mercy, yet we are unmindful of his favor and going on in sin.

The Lord's day is greatly profaned in all parts of our land. This is done by the national government, allowing the public mail to be carried on that day, and opened, and letters and papers delivered. It is also profaned in many parts of our land by the driving of cattle to market, by wagons with merchandize travelling on the highways, by steamboats plying on the rivers, by ships leaving port, by multitudes absenting themselves from the house of God, when they have opportunities of attending, indulging themselves in sloth, or following amusements, or worldly business, or paying unnecessary visits, engaging in idle discourse, feasting and dissipation.

The murderous practice of duelling is continued amongst us, and there has been an unusual number of atrocious murders of another character committed in the United States, within the last year. May it not be said, as in the language of the prophet, "The Lord hath a controversy with the inhabitants of the land, because there is no truth, nor mercy, nor knowledge of God, in the land. By swearing, and lying, and stealing, and committing adultery, they break out, and blood toucheth blood."

Many in the land have no knowledge of God. They neglect the means of religious instruction, and moral darkness covers them. In these circumstances they are very ready to be led astray by any deceiving imposter or false teacher that may go amongst them. Any thing that is new, that strikes the senses, or stirs the passions, or seems to render the way to heaven more easy, is received with avidity by them.

It is a common and prevailing evil amongst us also, that the ministerial office is dishonored by men assuming the functions thereof without knowledge, or education, or soundness in the faith, without being at all qualified or called regularly thereunto.

Infidelity still prevails amongst us, and though it does not now appear commonly with the same openness as formerly, yet it is operating in a manner no less dangerous. It bears the name of Christianity, and takes the pulpit, and under the assumed character of new and enlightened theology, it is propagated. Into the visible church amongst

us, a flood of error has found its way. The Arian heresy prevails, and Hopkinsian, and Arminian, and Pelagian doctrines are very generally taught. Human invention, in many parts of the visible church, contaminate our Christian worship. The government and discipline of the church are very much neglected. Censuring for erroneous doctrine, in many churches where it is taught, contrary to the standards thereof, is rarely practiced. Unions are formed amongst different branches of the church, apparently without any regard to revealed truth, and under the influence of political motives. Religious creeds and confessions of faith, are, in many instances, the subjects of laughter and ridicule. Latitudinarian views, and notions about catholic love, tending to the levelling of all distinctions amongst the churches, as if they were things of nought, and unworthy of being contended for, are diligently propagated; promiscuous communion at the Lord's table, amongst different denominations of Christians, is recommended and practiced, and great inattention to the character and fitness of persons for being admitted to sealing ordinances is frequent.

Church members have much need to be revived. This is a thing for which we should daily and constantly pray; but our revivals should have a scriptural character, and be distinguished for the knowledge, the love and the practice of the truth.

We have also to confess, as a sin of our land, the alarming increase of popery. Though God, in his providence, by debates between Roman Catholics and Protestants, is exposing to the gaze of the world the vileness of the Babylonish whore, yet multitudes are "wondering after the beast."

Immoralities of almost every description prevail in our land. Intemperance is destroying its thousands and tens of thousands, and such evils as horse racing, abusing the ordinance of the lot, and gambling, are very common. Our Gospel privileges, which are great, are sadly misimproved. With us as a people, when spiritually considered, the whole head is sick, and the whole heart is faint. Well may it be said of us, as in God's language by the prophet, "Ah! sinful nation, a people laden with iniquity, a seed of evil doers, children that are corrupters, they have forsaken the Lord, they have provoked the Holy One of Israel to anger, they are gone away backward."

But with us, even with us, there are grievous sins against the Lord our God. These are to be found both amongst ministers and people, in our courts, superior and subordinate, in our congregations and amongst all our members. There is much reason to complain of our lukewarmness, and backsliding. There is not that animation, fervor, or zeal in the service of God, that once characterised us. Cold formality and hypocrisy, unfruitfulness and barrenness under the means of grace, spiritual pride and self-sufficiency, are things much too common amongst us. While we believe that our cause is really good, and while we are assured that the principles of our public profession are according to the law and the testimony, and while for a long time past there has been no public breach or division amongst us, yet nevertheless the seeds of contention, strife and schism are too much cherished by us. It is possible, that in many instances, we feel pleasure in contemplating the faults and exposing the blemishes of other denominations of Christians, while faults and blemishes equally great are to be found with us. It is to be feared that some among us are too ready to say, "Stand by thyself, I am holier than thou." Amongst us there is too little of moral principle, and of the fear of God, and brotherly love, and of that charity which thinketh no evil. There is too little unanimity and cordial striving together for the faith of the Gospel, and too much self-importance, and of a disposition Diotrephes like, to have the pre-eminence. Party spirit, suspicion, jealousy, distrust, as respects our conduct, intercourse or fellowship with one another, too often operate amongst us. It is too frequent with us also to strain at a gnat and swallow a camel; to contend about matters comparatively small, while we may be guilty of things that affect the very vitals of our profession. A concern about bringing up our children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, and about personal as well as family religion, and a public spirit operating to the advancement of the public interests of the church, both at home and abroad, by our prayers, endeavors, and contributing liberally of our worldly substance, are much upon the decline amongst us, and greatly need to be revived.

On account of these things, and many such as these, it becomes us to humble ourselves, under the mighty hand of God, and to pray that glory may yet have her habitation in our land. That the Lord may arise and have mercy upon Zion; that he may revive his work in the midst of the years, and that in the midst of the years he may make known, and in wrath remember mercy.

ALEX. DONNAN,
WM. WILSON.

The first Thursday of December was appointed to be observed as a day of fasting. Adjourned till 10 o'clock Monday morning.—Closed with prayer.

MONDAY, OCTOBER 7th.

The Synod met and was opened with prayer by the Rev. Mr. Hanna, Moderator *pro tem.*

Members present as above, with the addition of the Rev. John Wallace, whose reasons of absence were sustained; Mr. Dickson attended in the room of John Boyd, D. Wallace in the room of John Templeton, John Callahan in the room of Mr. McClellan, James Patterson in the room of James Brownlee, Thomas Lee in the room of S. Mc Nary, George Shelletto in the room of James Sterling, Robert George, sen. in the room of Robert George, and Lodowick McCarrell in the room of James Brown.

Read the minutes of last sitting.

Papers being called for, the Report of the Presbytery of Alleghany was given in, and read, and, on motion, referred to the committee of bills and overtures, to report, as soon as practicable, on the case of Mr. Kirkland, alluded to in said report.

Report of the Presbytery of Alleghany.

The congregations under the care of Alleghany Presbytery, have, during the past year, enjoyed, in the good providence of God, a regular dispensation of gospel ordinances, and we hope have profited by them. One evidence of this is the great harmony which has prevailed in all our settled congregations. Under the prince of peace the blessing of harmony has remained among them and also among their ministers.

There is one exception to this congregational and ministerial tranquility. The congregations of Bethel and Freeport, were, at the last meeting of Synod, in a disturbed state. Several of the members of Bethel congregation had entirely withdrawn from the dispensation of ordinances by their pastor. This led ultimately to the resignation of their pastor Mr. Kirkland.

After his resignation, however, a part of the congregation, perhaps the majority of it, considered themselves aggrieved by the influence which they conceived the other part of the congregation had in leading him to resign, and in inducing the Presbytery to accept his resignation. This part of the congregation, through dissatisfaction, have almost all left the secession.

At a subsequent meeting of Presbytery to that at which he resigned his congregation, Mr. Kirkland gave in to Presbytery his declinature to the secession church. Mr. Kirkland is some way dissatisfied; and as he is present in Synod, and many members of his former congregations, by a fair hearing of his case by Synod, might be yet reclaimed to the secession. Presbytery would refer to Synod the hearing of what he has to say. He does not now belong to Alleghany Presbytery; his name is not on our list; though it is on that of Synod, where he may enter any complaint he thinks he is bound in duty to prefer to the supreme judicature of that church of which he was a member.

Our Statistical Table has undergone little alteration since last season.—By the removal of Mr. Kirkland the number of our vacancies are increased. Several of our vacancies have complained that several preachers were, by the commission of Synod, sent through the entire bounds of Alleghany Presbytery without a single congregation getting a hearing of them. They wish to have a hearing of all our new preachers, who pass through their bounds; and wish the Synod to remember this fact when the scale of appointments is under consideration.

SIGNED,

DAVID BLAIR, *Clerk pro tem.*

A petition from the session of the Associate Congregation of New Lebanon, in Virginia, was read, and, on motion, referred to the committee of supplies.

A motion was made to reconsider the decision of Synod referring the report of the Presbytery of Alleghany to the committee of bills and overtures.

While this motion was under consideration, a paper was handed in by Mr. Kirkland, and read, and the above motion carried in the affirmative, and the previous decision was reversed; and, on motion,

Resolved, That the report of the Presbytery of Alleghany, together with the paper handed in by Mr. Kirkland, be referred to a special committee, with orders to report. Messrs. Carson, Walker and Russell were appointed said committee.

Mr. J. Scroggs asked and obtained leave of absence for the remainder of the present sitting.

On motion, it was resolved to postpone the order of the day till 2 o'clock.

On motion, Messrs. Martin and Miller were appointed a committee to draught an act for a fast, to be laid before the Synod at its next meeting.

On motion, took up the report of the committee on bills and overtures, on the report of the Presbytery of Albany, and on motion,

Resolved, That Synod concur in that part of the committee's report which considers it injudicious, at this time, to appropriate any definite sum for the more vigorous carrying on of missionary operations in the bounds of the Presbytery of Albany.

It was farther *Resolved*, That the Synod call upon Messrs. Thompson and John Wallace to give their reasons for the non-fulfilment of their appointments.

Mr. Wallace being present, offered his excuse for the non-fulfilment of his appointment in the Presbyteries of Albany and Cambridge. His excuse was sustained.

On motion, *Resolved*, That Mr. Thompson be required to give in to the Synod at its next meeting, his reasons for the non-fulfilment of his appointments.

The Rev. Mr. Boyd asked and obtained leave of absence for the afternoon sederunt. Adjourned till 2 o'clock.—Closed with prayer.

2 o'clock, P. M.

The Synod met, and was opened with prayer.

Members present as above.

Read the minutes of last sitting.

Papers being called for, certain resolutions relative to the administration and taking of oaths were read, and, on motion, laid on the table.

Answers to reasons of protest given in at the last meeting of Synod against the late enactment on the subject of slavery, were given in, and read, and, on motion, recommended for correction.

On motion, *Resolved*, That Synod have an evening *sederunt* on every evening from this date till the time of our final adjournment.

Adjourned till 9 o'clock to-morrow morning.—Closed with prayer.

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 8th.

The Synod met, and was opened with prayer.

Members present as before.

Read the minutes of last sitting.

Papers being called for, the committee appointed yesterday in the case of Mr. Kirkland, presented a report, which was, on motion, laid on the table.

The Report of S. Hindman, Missionary to Upper Canada, was given in, and read, as follows: and, on motion, referred to the committee on the funds.

Report of Samuel Hindman, Missionary to Upper Canada, 1832.

To the Associate Synod, to meet at Canonsburgh on the 2d of October, 1833.

In obedience to the order of Synod, your Missionary, appointed for five months to Upper Canada, after returning from the meeting of Synod, left home on the 11th day of July; judging it more expedient to enter the missionary ground at the Western extremity, I went this way to Detroit, in Michigan Territory, as far as the head of Sandusky Bay. On arriving at this place I learned, certainly, that the cholera had broken out at Detroit, and that the quarantine regulations on the Canada side of the river were so strict, that no person, from this side was permitted to go over. I therefore, turned, and went to Portland on the Sandusky Bay, intending to take the Steamboat to Buffalo; but in this also, I was unsuccessful; because the Steamboat had ceased running, on account of the cholera. The only remaining way of entering Canada was, by a journey, by land of 300 miles, and that at a mere peradventure whether I would be permitted to cross the Niagara or not. I therefore judged it best to return home, and wait till the Lord would open the way.

Having learned that the way was open, I again left home on the 27th of August, intending to go by the vacancy in York township, Livingston county, New York. On the first Sabbath of September, I preached at Cherry Run in Venango county, Pennsylvania, one of Mr. Snodgrass' places. On my arrival at York, on the following Thursday, I met with Mr. James Strang, a preacher from the United Secession Church, in Scotland. He had been admitted to the fellowship of our church, by the Albany Presbytery. It being near the close of the week, I stayed at York, and preached in company with Mr. Strang on the 2d Sabbath of September, and at night preached at Fowlersville, 8 miles from York meeting-house. On Monday resumed my journey toward Canada, and arrived at Galt in Dumfries township, on Grand river, U. C., on Friday following; having left Mr. Strang to preach another Sabbath at York, and then to proceed also to Dumfries; 3d and 4th Sabbaths of September, I preached at Galt, (Dumfries.)

Having understood that the Lord's Supper had been administered at Dumfries and London, in the latter part of the summer, by Mr. Campbell, and at Esquising in September, by Mr. Russell, I had not occasion to attend to that branch of ministerial service; and having made arrangements for Mr. Strang to preach at Dumfries, and, if time and opportunity would favor, at Esquising, until my return, I thought best to visit the smaller vacancies, and travel for the purpose of exploring other parts of the Province, during the fall months, or while traveling in that region might be practicable.

From Dumfries, I went Westward 75 miles to London, where I preached on the 5th Sabbath of September. Then I went 75 miles West, to Harwich, (where lives Neil M'Quarie, mentioned in the report of Mr. Gordon, 1831,) where I arrived on Wednesday morning. On Thursday I went in company with Mr. M'Quarie, to Lake Erie, and preached on Friday in Raleigh township, on Talbot-street, on the bank of the Lake; and at night preached again, 2 miles further down the Lake. On Saturday preached in a settlement between the Lake and Chatham, in Harwich, called Fraymore. In these places a goodly number attended sermon, and some expressed earnest desires to be visited again.

On the first Sabbath of October I preached at the village of Chatham, in Harwich township. Thence Mr. M'Quarie accompanied me to Bear creek, (30 miles) where, on Tuesday night I preached at Thomas's mills, and on Wednesday 3 miles down the creek, at the house of J. Tiffin. In this place and the neighborhood above, there are a good many families of different sorts of Presbyterians. They had never before been visited by any of our missionaries. The meeting on Wednesday, was called with the design of trying what encouragement would be given, in this place, to the mission. But the day being exceedingly wet, but few attended. These few subscribed about 16 dollars, and expressed their opinion that enough could be raised in this place to pay for six Sabbaths in the year. At night preached 2 miles further down the creek at Balton's. Thursday night I preached at the forks of Bear creek, 15 miles below Balton's, and left Mr. Henderson, (Schoolmaster,) to take up a subscription for the mission.

From Bear creek I returned to Harwich; on Sabbath examined Neil M'Quarie, and on his accession to our principles, admitted him to Church fellowship, and baptized 8 of his children. His wife was a member. These are all the persons in communion with our church in this district; but there are a number favorable.

On the 2d Sabbath of October, I preached at Chatham; the audience in this place was respectably numerous. Mr. M'Quarie thought considerable money might be raised to pay for supplies. Monday I preached at night, on Talbot-street, 20 miles from Chatham, in Howard township, near Beasley's. A good number attended; and some desired to be visited again. Wednesday I preached at Thames, 4 miles above Chatham. Thence I returned to London, where I preached on the 3d and 4th Sabbaths of October. In the intervening week I catechised in this congregation. Several besides

our own people attended. In this place the enemies of our principles have made great exertions, and done us some mischief. Twelve members, with rising families, remain in our communion—a princely willing people. I visited Lobo, and found but little encouragement; an unauthorised man was preaching to them, and well liked. Most of them esteemed the New Lights, or Dippers; one man said that he and a few more would like to be visited; but the wetness of the weather, and the shortness of my stay forbade it. I promised to endeavor to send the next missionary to them.

From London I returned to Dumfries; where Mr. Strang arrived, from Stamford, on the same evening. I left him there and went 60 miles to Esquising, where I preached the four Sabbaths in November, but in the meantime I visited Norville and Chinquacousic, where I preached on week days. When I was at Norville, the second time, I examined and admitted James Curry and his wife, and baptized a child for them, and one for James M'Laren. In this place are six members in communion, and some other persons friendly to our church. Here I took up some subscriptions to pay for supplies; and left the paper with James M'Laren.

In Esquising congregation I catechised two days. Here meetings were well attended.

From Esquising, I returned to Dumfries; on my way passed Nanagaway township; where I was to have preached, at the house of Mr. Hutcheson, on the road to Guelph; but was disappointed, because he who was to give word failed. In this township are a good many Presbyterians, to whom Mr. M'Auley, of the A. R. Church of the U. S., preached for some time, but he is gone.

On my arrival at Dumfries, found that Mr. Strang, according to appointment was gone to London; intending, if practicable to proceed as far as Harwich, Bear Creek, &c. I remained at Dumfries all the month of December, (five Sabbaths.) In this time I had four days of catechising in different places in the congregation and preached once on a week day; and spent, with good success, some days in making arrangements for making their meeting-house comfortable. This people have had their troubles, and I hope have been benefited by them. When I left them, they were expecting the moderation of a call, which has since come out for Mr. Strang, who is now settled among them.

From Dumfries, I returned, in the beginning of January, 1833, to Esquising; where I preached on the first Sabbath of January, and the following Thursday at a school house, some 6 miles distant from the common place of preaching in Esquising. On the 2d Sabbath of January, I preached at Norville, to a respectably numerous congregation. Monday (14th of Jan.) I preached at the house of John Sprawl, two miles S. W. of the common place of preaching in Esquising. Admitted to church fellowship said Sprawl, on his accession to our principles; and restored his wife to communion, baptized their child.

This people, for a great length of time have been in a very unsettled state. They were once sufficiently numerous to have employed a minister, the whole of his time, but by the revolts of a majority to what is called the Canada Presbytery, they were reduced to a very few: were for a time held in much derision, and about the time that I was there, they were finally turned out of the meeting house, which they, while with them, had helped the other party to build. These tossings have been profitable to toss out the lighter, looser part. What remains, seems now to be firm, settled, united and determined. When I left them, there were 39 members in full communion, and a good many others friendly. They have since had some increase. Tuesday (15th of Jan) I had allotted for commencing my journey homeward; but was detained two days by sickness.

On the third Sabbath of January, I was at Stamford, with Mr. Russell, on my way home. On the fourth Sabbath I preached in Springfield township, Erie county, Pa., at the house of Robert M'Kee, and at night in a neighboring school house; at both places a good many attended. On the first Sabbath of February, I had hoped to be at home, but being hindered by the badness of the roads and sickness, I preached in Palmyra township, Trumbull county, W. Reserve, one of Mr. Douthet's places, and on the following Thursday arrived at home.

By the above brief statement, it will be seen that I performed my missionary tour under some disadvantageous circumstances; and that, owing to the lateness of the season, in which, it was possible for me to be at the missionary ground, and the badness of the roads in the new settlements, in the latter part of the fall and in the winter season, it was not practicable to me to do much more than visit and supply those places which others had formed or visited. Some new places, however, were visited, and partially formed. Many places which once might have been occupied by us have, by our neglect, or by other causes, become occupied by the ministers of other, less pure denominations of Presbyterians. By the settlement of Mr. Strang in Dumfries, a less quantity of supply will be needed than heretofore. The labors of one minister would be sufficient to supply all the other places which are already under our care, and as some of these are new and small, it would, perhaps, be necessary for the Synod to bear part of the expense.

It is the opinion of your missionary, that if the Synod have, at all, men, and money to spare, that much, with the blessing of God, might yet be done in Upper Canada, in the way of disseminating the word of God, and establishing a testimony for the "truth as it is in Jesus."

Books containing our principles, viz: Confessions and Testimonies are very much needed in the Province; especially Testimonies.

SAMUEL HINDMAN.

Mansfield Sep. 25th, 1833.

Dr. The Associate Synod in account with Samuel Hindman Missionary to U. C. Cr

To preaching from the 27th of Aug. 1832, to the 7th of Feb. 1833, twenty-three Sabbaths,	\$138 00	By monies received when on mission, Cherry Run congregation,	\$2 56½
	94 12½	York.....do.....	4 00
Balance due from Synod,	48 87½	Dumfries.....do.....	42 00
		London.....do.....	12 75
		Chatbam (Harwich)	5 75
		Esquising congregation.....	18 00
		Norville.....do.....	6 00
		Palmyra.....do.....	2 00
			94 12½

All which is respectfully submitted.

S. H.

The committee appointed last year to draught a digest of our views on the subjects embraced in our correspondence with our brethren of the Reformed Synod, presented a draught, which was read, and, after some discussion, laid on the table.

The Report of D. Houston treasurer, was read, and, on motion, referred to the committee on the funds.

Notice was given of a legacy of \$120, left by Sarah Fullerton, late of Carlisle, to the Synod's funds. Also, of a legacy of \$500, left to the Synod by Robert Scott, late of Sugar Creek, Green county, Ohio.

Proceeded to the order of the day, viz : the subject of electing a Professor of Biblical Literature and Ecclesiastical History. Mr. Hanna and the Clerk were appointed tellers, and the votes being taken and counted, Mr. Carson was declared duly elected.

The result of the election being announced from the chair, Mr. Carson requested time for deliberation, which was granted, and Dr. Ramsay and Mr. Walker were appointed a committee to confer with Mr. Carson relative to his acceptance.

Proceeded to the subject of the publication of the purpose of marriage, as being the order of the day, the question being on the motion to adopt the report of the majority of the Synod's committee. After some discussion the Synod

Adjourned till 2 o'clock.—Closed with prayer.

2 o'clock, P. M.

The Synod met and was opened with prayer.

Members present as above.

Read the minutes of last sitting.

Resumed the consideration of the subject under discussion in the forenoon, viz : the publication of the banns of marriage, the question being on the motion to adopt the report of the majority of the Synod's committee.

During the discussion, Messrs. James Boyd and Taggart asked and obtained leave of absence during the remaining sittings of Synod.

After considerable discussion of the motion, but before going round the roll, the Synod

Adjourned till 7 o'clock in the evening.—Closed with prayer.

7 o'clock, P. M.

The Synod met and was opened with prayer.

Members present as above.

Read the minutes of last sitting.

Papers being called for, an additional report of D. Houston treasurer, was read, and, on motion, referred to the committee on the funds.

Resumed the consideration of the subject left under discussion at the former sitting, viz : the motion to adopt the report of the majority of the Synod's committee on the publication of banns. After making some progress through the roll, the Synod

Adjourned till 9 o'clock to-morrow morning.—Closed with prayer.

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 9th.

The Synod met and was opened with prayer.

Members Present as above.

Read the minutes of last sitting.

The act incorporating the Board of Managers of the Theological Seminary was read, and, on motion, it was

Resolved, That Synod accept the act, and proceed to fill any vacancy that may exist in the board of trustees.

In pursuance of the above resolution, the Synod proceeded to fill the vacancy in the board, occasioned by the emigration of Robert Steel from the state of Pennsylvania, and D. Houston was elected in his room.

On motion, *Resolved*, That this Synod appoint the aforesaid board to hold a meet ing this evening after the adjournment of Synod, to be convened at the call of the chairman, Mr. Beveridge.

The committee to whom was referred the petition of John Sterrett, reported ; and their report, being amended, was adopted as follows, viz :

The Report of the committee to whom was committed the petition of John Sterrett, a member of Massies Creek Session, praying for a restoration to the enjoyment of his former privileges.

Your committee consider the conduct of the petitioner disorderly in withdrawing from his seat in the session, in the then circumstances of the matter about which he was aggrieved; but as he explicitly acknowledges the disorderliness of his conduct, and disavows the design of contemning the authority of session, they would recommend that he be released from censure, and restored to the church.

ANDREW ISAAC,
J. SCROGGS.

The committee appointed to confer with Mr. Carson relative to his acceptance of the professorship to which he was yesterday elected, reported, that he agrees to ac-

cept, but is apprehensive that he cannot enter on the duties of the office sooner than the fall of 1834.

Pursuant to the order of the day, the Synod proceeded to present the calls on their table, to Mr. James M. Henderson. The call from Carmel and Clark, Indiana, was accepted.

Resumed the consideration of the subject left under discussion last evening, viz: the motion to adopt the report of the majority of the Synod's committee. Before going round the roll the Synod

Adjourned till 2 o'clock.—Closed with prayer.

2 o'clock, P. M.

The Synod met, and was opened with prayer.

Members present as above.

Read the minutes of last sitting.

Resumed the consideration of the business left under discussion in the forenoon, and after going through the roll, certain resolutions were offered as a substitute for the report now under consideration.

The Synod, on motion, proceeded to the consideration of those resolutions as a substitute for the report.

The order of the day was, at this stage of the business, suspended, for the purpose of hearing the report of the committee of supplies, which was read, and, on motion, recommitted.

Adjourned till 7 o'clock this evening.—Closed with prayer.

7 o'clock, P. M.

The Synod met and was opened with prayer.

Members present as above.

Read the minutes of last sitting.

Papers being called for, a communication was read from the Rev. F. Pringle, relative to the legacy left to Synod by P. Fenton, late of New-York, which legacy Mr. Pringle had been appointed Synod's agent to receive. This paper was, on motion, referred to the committee on the funds.

An additional report of the treasurer at Canonsburgh was given in, and read, and, on motion, referred to the committee on the funds.

Papers connected with the protest and appeal of A. Turnbull, mentioned in the report of the Presbytery of Miami, were offered, and, on motion, laid on the table.

The select committee appointed on the answers to reasons of protest, by Mr. Adams, reported, and their report, as amended, was, on motion, adopted.

Protest and Reasons for it against the decision of Synod affirming the decision of Presbytery, and reversing that of the Session of Massies creek, by the latter of which Thomas Mealy's case, in which he stood charged for the marrying of a couple, without previous publication of banns, was dismissed as *irrelevant*.

Reason first. The decision, and train of arguments leading to it were founded on a misapprehension of the Sessions' views of the Church's power, as presented by their moderator. The apprehension of Synod appears to have been, that session and their moderator, denied the church to have power over magistrates when acting in their office, or over any of those causes which are civil. The principle held up by the moderator of that Session, before Synod is: That the church has no power over those deeds of magistrates, which are *purely* civil, and no power over civil causes *as such*. My representation and argument were generally declared, both by the Presbytery and the speakers in Synod, to be *ingenious*; yet, were they obviously misapprehended by every speaker of the majority, on the subject, except one. The members, therefore, must either have been mistaken concerning the honest and *ingenious* statement given of my views, or else I must have been ingeniously dishonest. The latter, I am conscious, is not the case. Therefore, the former is true.

Second. The time taken by Synod on the case was not sufficient for attaining an adequate knowledge of the case and arguments upon it. Only a part of less than a two hours sederunt by night was spent on the case, after parties were removed. The papers, most of them, were never but once read, and that when first given in; and although the reading of them was not insisted on by either party; yet it was the duty of Synod to have made sure that they understood the subject, at least the views of the parties, before they resolved to decline so important a part of any regular trial.

Third. Several of the members of Synod, most of whom were ministers, and one a ruling elder and magistrate, either confessed themselves guilty, or were admitted guilty, on the floor of Synod, of the very crime for which Mealy is charged; and no disposition to censure them has been manifested by Synod; this is preposterous. The circumstance that many members of Synod have been habitually in the disuse of publication up to the date of Synod's present meeting, was known to session and the protesting members of Presbytery; but had not been established by legal proof, and was, therefore, not mentioned. We may now take it as a valid reason, the fact being admitted.

Fourth. The above decision anticipates two very important questions on abstract principles, now lying on Synod's table, among unfinished business. The one relates to the magistrate's power *circa sacra*, as involved in the question on the Testimony of the original Seceders. The other relates to the intrinsical, primary, and perpetual obligation of the rule of publication itself, upon which question the application of the rule to magistrates, with all who are sound upon the doctrine of magistracy, must necessarily turn.

Fifth. The decision, so far as it respects all who are sound on the doctrine of magistracy, makes not only the practice as heretofore, but even the principle of publication, to be a term of communion. This never has been done by any of the Reformed Churches, and this is an irregular method of

making terms of communion. By the principle of publication, is here to be understood its *intrinsic*, primary and perpetual obligation.

Sixth. The decision so far as respects those who do not believe in the principle of publication, makes it a term of communion to acknowledge the church to have power and jurisdiction over causes purely civil, or over civil causes *as such*. If neither of the two precautionary rules for marriage authorized by the laws of Ohio, viz: license and publication, has a preference given it by the moral law, as delivered to men and magistrates by God, creator and governor of the universe, then the magistrate's application of either rule is a deed purely civil; and that the rule of publication has any special preference given it, has never before been assumed by any judicial deed of this church.

Seventh. The decision favors the idea, that marriage is not only a divine institution of a very serious and important nature, which we admit; but also, that it is more than a civil, and is an ecclesiastical institution; else why should the church control the magistrates official administration of it?

JAMES ADAMS.

Your committee, to whom was referred a paper containing a protest by Mr. Adams, against a decision of Synod, in the case of Thomas Mealy, Esq., beg leave to lay before Synod the following answers.

The *first* reason is founded on a mistake, charging Synod with founding their decision on a misapprehension of the views of Massies' Creek session, presented by their Moderator. The decision of Synod was founded on their rule requiring publication of banns, and on the facts presented and admitted in the case. It was not the *direct* object of Synod to justify, or censure, the *views* of the session as exhibited in their defence, but the original deed in question, and the decisions of session and Presbytery upon it. Now the decision of Synod might be correct, even though the *views* of the session were misunderstood, since the decision of session was clearly ascertained. Arguments are useful in elucidating facts and the bearing of the rules of the church upon them, but the rules and facts themselves are the grounds of decision.

The *second* reason is not relevant, it is a charge against the Synod for rashness, but not a proof of inaccuracy. If the decision was correct, the less time and labour they expended to attain it, the better. It was not necessary to spend time in ascertaining the views of parties, which were not the subject of investigation nor decision; but in applying the standing rule to admitted facts.

The *third* reason is irrelevant, being a charge against Synod, of inconsistency and partiality, but not against the rectitude of their decision. If Synod overlooked other cases, this neglect did not render their decision incorrect. It should be remembered, however, that the cases, to which the protester refers, were not laid before Synod for decision, they were but incidentally mentioned. The additional argument of the protestor, under this reason, is also irrelevant, as it is only pleading the default of others as an excuse, not only for Thomas Mealy, but for the session of Massies' Creek,—on the principles of Synod, it was pleading the sins of others as an excuse for their disobedience.

To the *fourth* reason, it is replied, That if this decision of Synod were an anticipation of either, or both the questions pending before Synod, yet it was made on a previous, standing rule; and if this standing rule were an anticipation of these questions, it was so much preparation for the decision of them. Synod, therefore, was not faulty in having a rule which would favour a particular decision of a new question; nor should a standing rule be either declaratively, or practically annulled, or suspended, because a new question, on which it would bear, was to be decided. Even an overture for a new rule, or for the repeal or modification of an old one, does not suspend the operation of the old one; it stands in its practical authority till repealed. Nevertheless the decision of Synod in question was made on a standing rule, which Thomas Mealy had plainly broken, and did not involve any new question on magistracy, nor yet the question of the "intrinsic, primary and perpetual obligation of the rule of publication." This is also an answer to the *fifth* reason. The recognition of the *intrinsic, primary and perpetual* obligation of the rule of publication of banns is neither asserted in the decision of Synod, nor necessarily involved in it; since the authority of a standing rule was a sufficient foundation.

The *sixth* reason must be met by a direct denial. The decision of Synod does not "make it a term of communion to acknowledge the church to have power and jurisdiction over causes purely civil, or over civil causes *as such*;" because the decision was made on a standing rule, of which the deed of Thomas Mealy was considered a breach. In answer to the latter part of this *sixth* reason, it is sufficient to say, the church has given the preference to the rule of publication. The grounds of misunderstanding between the Synod and the protester seem, by some of his reasons to be, that he had thought the Synod's rule of publication of banns, was suspended by pending questions, while Synod judged otherwise; and that the protester thought the case should turn on the *merits* of the rule, while Synod did not admit them into question in the case. To drag the merit of a rule into trial in every, or in any case brought into court under it, is to destroy all the utility of rules, since they are intended to stand as points settled by previous argument and investigation, for future reference and application; for diminishing labour, saving time and preventing confusion in courts, as well as to be rules to regulate the conduct in the common walks of life.

Though the above remarks might be sufficient as an answer to both the *sixth* and *seventh* reasons in connection, yet as the protester thinks that the Synod, by their decision, have given the church an undue cognizance of civil matters, it may be proper to add, that the distinction between civil and ecclesiastical subjects of cognizance seems to be employed often, and particularly by the protestor, in the present case, to the embarrassing of the subject of inquiry. It is true the state has cognizance of civil causes, (and in some cases of things that are moral, for civil purposes,) and that the church has cognizance of moral and religious matters. But it cannot escape observation that the same thing may have both a civil and moral aspect, and therefore, that in its civil aspect it falls under the cognizance of the state, and in its moral aspect under that of the church. A mercantile transaction is clearly a civil matter, and belongs

to the cognizance of the state; but it may so clearly involve an immorality that the church should take cognizance of it. That marriage, as well as mercantile transactions, is a subject of cognizance for both church and state, need not be argued; and, according to the above distinction, both do take cognizance of it. And as the state is not bound to avail itself of the enactments of the church, or to account them sufficient for civil purposes; so the church is not bound to count civil enactments sufficient for moral and religious purposes, and may therefore superadd her requisitions on her members, even though they were civil officers. It is well known also that the Associate Church even forbids her members to engage in a sinful act, though authorized, yea though required by civil government; how then is it contrary to her admitted principles to require obedience to her enactments, when these, as in the requisition of publication, do not interfere with, nor run counter to civil laws?

In a word, the *first* reason of the protester is based on a mistake; the *second* and *third* are irrelevant, and the last *four* have no relevancy but on the false supposition that the Synod decided the case on the principles of their rule and not on the rule itself.

A. ANDERSON,
J. WALKER.

Resumed the discussion of the subject left unfinished at the close of the former sitting, viz: the consideration of the resolutions offered as a substitute for the report of the committee formerly under consideration, and the following resolution was offered, viz:

On motion, *Resolved*, That a committee be appointed to whom the resolutions under consideration shall be referred, to prepare an overture on the subject, to be transmitted to the Presbyteries, to report thereon, with orders to report to-morrow morning.

While this motion was under discussion, Mr. Wm. Wilson asked and obtained leave of absence.

After some discussion, the above motion was withdrawn.

Mr. George, and Jas. Auld asked and obtained leave of absence.

The question then returned on the resolutions formerly under consideration. Before coming to a decision, the Synod

Adjourned till 9 o'clock to-morrow morning.—Closed with prayer.

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 10th.

The Synod met and was opened with prayer.

Members present as above.

Read the minutes of last sitting.

On motion, *Resolved*, That Synod now authorize the board of managers, with the professors, at their meeting in the spring, to appoint such students as shall have completed their course of study, to the different Presbyteries, to be taken on trials for license.

Resolved, farther, That the board be authorised to give appointments to such young men as they may thus order for license, until next meeting of Synod.

On motion, proceeded to the election of a board of managers for the ensuing year, and the same board was appointed that officiated last year.

The committee of supplies presented their report as amended, and said report, being farther amended, was adopted, as follows:

SCALE OF APPOINTMENTS.

F. Pringle, R. Laing, P. Bullions, Thomas Ferrier, Albany, till next meeting.

Joseph Banks, Ohio, October, November; Alleghany, December, January; Philadelphia, February, March; Alleghany, April, May; Canada, June, July, August, September.

John Wallace, Alleghany, October; Albany, November, December; Alleghany, January, February; Philadelphia, March, April; Alleghany, May; Miami, June, July, August, September.

S. McLane, Muskingum, October; Miami, till next meeting.

Thomas Wilson, Ohio, October; Carolina, November, December, January, February; Miami, March, April, May; Muskingum, June, July; Ohio, August, September.

Bankhead Boyd, Alleghany, October; Philadelphia, November, December, January; Muskingum, February, March; Alleghany, April, May; Ohio, June; Muskingum, July, August; Alleghany, September.

James P. Ramsay, Muskingum, October; Philadelphia, November, December, January, February; Ohio, March, April; Muskingum, May, June; Ohio, July; Carolina, August, September.

John P. Dickey, Allegany, October, two sabbaths in November; Muskingum, third and fourth sabbaths in November, December; Ohio, January, February; Alleghany, March; Albany, April, May; Philadelphia, June, July, August, September.

David Lindsay, Muskingum, October; Ohio, November; Muskingum, December, January; Ohio, February; Philadelphia, March, April; Alleghany, May; Muskingum, June; Miami, July, August, September.

Wm. C. Pollock, Miami, October, November, December, January; Muskingum, February, March; Ohio, April, May; Alleghany, June, July; Philadelphia, August, September.

A communication from James Morrow, containing an account of money advanced by him for the use of the Western Mission, was read, and, on motion, referred to the committee on the funds.

A claim for missionary services in the Presbyteries of Alleghany, Ohio, and Philadelphia, not paid, was presented by the Rev. A. Boyd; and, on motion,

Resolved, That said Presbyteries be ordered to pay to Mr. Boyd the usual compensation for the time spent in each.

Resumed the consideration of the unfinished business of last evening, viz: the adoption of the resolutions on the publication of banns, which had been under consideration.

A substitute for the resolutions was offered and taken into consideration.

After amendment and some discussion, it was, on motion, agreed to consider said substitute section by section. While this consideration was progressing, the Synod

Adjourned till 2 o'clock.—Closed with prayer.

2 o'clock P. M.

The Synod met and was opened with prayer.

Members present as above.

Read the minutes of last sitting.

Papers being called for, a file of papers referred to in the report of the Presbytery of Miami, relative to a protest and appeal by Mr. Adams and others against a decision of said Presbytery, on a complaint by James Morrow, were presented, and, on motion, laid on the table.

Resumed the consideration of the subject left under discussion in the forenoon sitting, viz: the adoption of the substitute for the resolutions.

After discussing the substitute, section by section, and making some amendments, the question was taken on the adoption of the whole. Before taking the question, a brother was employed in prayer, and the question being taken, adopt or not, it carried adopt.

From the decision as adopting the last resolution, Mr. Heron protested, for reasons to be given in.

From the decision adopting the whole, Dr. Ramsay protested, for reasons to be given in. In this he was joined by Messrs. Allison, Walker, Donaldson, French, Carson, Imbrie, E. N. Scroggs, Ingles, Hindman, Templeton, Isaac, Hawthorn and John Auld.

An Act respecting Marriage.

In order to carry out and more effectually enforce the requirements of the moral law in relation to marriage, this Synod do hereby enact the following rules, and declare them to be binding on her subordinate judicatories, and on all the members of this church.

1. That clandestine marriages are censurable, because they have a tendency to open the door for adulterous and incestuous connections, contrary to the seventh precept of the moral law.

2. That the joining in marriage of minors, by any of our ministers or magistrates, without the presence or consent of their parents, guardians or masters, is censurable, because such conjunctions are contrary to the fifth precept of the moral law.

3. That it is censurable for ministers or magistrates to join persons in marriage without good and sufficient evidence of their moral and legal right to it, because this would be contrary to both the fifth and seventh precepts of the moral law.

4. That persons intending marriage be required to have their purpose proclaimed two or three Sabbaths in the congregation, or to give notice of their intention to the session ten days beforehand, and that the celebration be before a competent number of witnesses. But this fourth rule shall not be construed to prohibit magistrates from the full exercise of their civil office, or from marrying persons not belonging to our communion, who yield obedience to the requirements of the civil law and the first three rules of this act.

Messrs Isaacs and Shelletto asked and obtained leave of absence.

The report of the select committee in the case of Mr. Kirkland was, on motion, taken up.

In the progress of the discussion, it appeared that Mr. Kirkland is detaining the minutes and papers of the Presbytery of Alleghany.

On motion, it was *Resolved*, That Mr. Kirkland be called upon to give up these documents into the hands of Synod.

The Moderator, Messrs. A. Boyd, Allison, John Auld and Dickson, asked and obtained leave of absence.

Adjourned till 7 o'clock this evening.—Closed with prayer.

7 o'clock P. M.

The Synod met and was opened with prayer.

Mr. Hanna Moderator, *pro tem*.

Members present as above.

Read the minutes of last sitting.

On motion, *Ordered*, that the clerk draught orders on the treasurer in favor of Messrs. Bruce, Hindman, and Morrow, for the amount of their claims.

On motion, *Resolved*, That the copies of the Declaration and Testimony, in the hands of Mr. Russell, be put under his care, to sell at the wholesale prices, or distribute gratis, according to his discretion.

On motion, *Resolved*, That the copies of the Declaration and Testimony, now in the hands of A. Roseburgh, be deposited with Adam Sheriff, of Pittsburgh, as Mr. Roseburgh has removed from the city, and that Mr. Sheriff be the Synod's agent to dispose of said copies.

A motion was made to take up the report of the select committee on the remonstrance and petition of Messrs. Donnan and others.

This motion being put to the vote, was negatived.

Against this decision, in connection with the original act on the Scotch Testimony, Mr. Donnan gave notice that he protested in his own name and that of the other remonstrants, for reasons to be given in, and declared that they withdraw the remonstrance; and he was joined by Messrs. Wm. Wilson, A. Wilson, France, Clokey, Rodgers and D. McLane, sen.

Dr. Bruce craved his dissent to be marked from the decision.

On motion, proceeded to the consideration of the protest and appeal from the session of Massies Creek, against a late decision of the Presbytery of Miami, sustaining as relevant, a complaint against said session by James Morrow.

Papers relative to the case were read, and the parties heard and removed.

Messrs. Russell and Ramsay asked and obtained leave of absence.

After a free discussion of the subject, the question was put, sustain the appeal, or not; and carried, sustain.

Adjourned till 9 o'clock to-morrow morning.—Closed with prayer.

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 11th.

The Synod met, and was opened with prayer.

Members present as above, except Messrs. Imbrie, Donaldson, Goodwillie, and McCarrell, ministers; and Messrs. Cowdon, Gilleland, Hamill, and Trimble, ruling elders, absent without leave.

Mr. Jas. Wilson attended in the room of Mr. Morrison.

Read the minutes of last sitting.

Dr. Bruce and Messrs. Snodgrass and D. Wallace asked and obtained leave of absence.

Papers being called for, the committee appointed to review the records of the Presbyteries of Chartiers, Muskingum and Miami, reported that they had examined and found them correct. The reports were accepted.

Reasons of protest, by Messrs. Donnan and others, against the Synod's deed of last year, declaring us to be in communion with the Associate Synod of Original Seceders, as also against the decision of last evening in regard to the remonstrance and petition, were given in and read, and Dr. Ramsay and Messrs. Allison and Beveridge were appointed a committee to answer said reasons.

A paper signed H. Kirkland, in reference to his case, already noticed, was read, and, an motion, laid on the table.

The Report of the committee on the funds was presented and read, and, on motion, adopted.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE FUNDS.

The committee on the funds report, that they have carefully examined the treasurer's accounts, and find them correct.

There is now in the treasury a balance, as follows:

Synod's Fund,.....	\$1,001 23½
Seminary Fund,	737 2¼
Missionary Fund has a balance against it of \$23 19.	
Students' Fund,	216 42
Bible Fund,	36 72

Total of all the Funds,..... \$1,991 59½

Your committee recommend the payment of Mr. Hindman's account of \$43.87, for missionary services in Canada, but report against the account of the Presbytery of Muskingum for supplying his pulpit.

Your committee suggest the propriety of incorporating the several funds of Synod into two in order to prevent confusion in accounts, to be denominated Synod's Fund, and Seminary Fund.

They also recommend that legal steps be taken by Synod to collect the several legacies to their funds, in those cases where there is not a reasonable prospect that they will be paid without such steps.

They also recommend the transfer of all funds on hand, not otherwise appropriated, to the Theological Hall Fund.

JOSEPH KYLE,
C. WEBSTER.

To cash from Alex. Roseburgh for Test. sold by Rev. J. Banks, ..	75 00
To cash from Deer Creek cong. . .	4 98
Cadiz cong.	16 00
Burgetstown cong.	9 00
Slippery Rock do.	6 00
Darlington do.	5 00
Liberty do.	2 83
Poland do.	12 73
Massies Creek do.	20 00
Xenia do.	20 00
Sugar Creek do.	10 00
C. Webster for Test.	6 00
Piney Fork cong.	7 00
Ligonier do.	10 00
Shenango do.	10 00
King's Creek do.	5 00
Miami Presb. as per order of Synod on H. Thompson,	6 00
To cash from individuals Salini cong. Tenn.	2 25
Pistol Creek cong.	2 12½
Noblestown and Ohio cong.	10 00
Henderson cong. by Rev. J. C. Bruce,	10 00
A friend, by Rev. J. P. Miller,	1 00
Oct. 8. To cash from S. Argyle con. by Rev. J. P. Miller,	21 00
To cash from Hebron cong. by do.	10 37
W. Beaver, W. Union & Four Mile con.	15 00
Monteur cong.	9 00
Petters Creek cong.	8 00
Pigeon Creek cong.	10 00
	1173 15½
Contra Cr, By cash paid	250 00
Oct. 8, 1833. Balance in hands of Treasurer,	923 15½
	Cr.
The accountant claims credit for the following disbursements:	
1832. June 12th. By cash paid James Ramsay, D. D., per receipt,	\$100 00
1833. May 2d. By cash paid James Ramsay, D. D., per receipt,	100 00
Oct. 3 By cash paid Rev. A. Heron, Synod's clerk, per receipt,	50 00
	250 00
<i>Daniel Houston to Ass. Synod in Student's fund,</i>	<i>Dr.</i>
May 11th, 1832. To balance in hands of Treasurer,	\$104 92
1833, June 12. To cash interest on J. Paxton's legacy,	27 00
Oct. 4. To cash from Wm. Barcroft,	2 00
Balance in Treasurer's hands, October 8, 1833,	133 92
	DANIEL HOUSTON.
	RECAPITULATION.
Oct. 8th 1833. D. Houston, Treasurer, Dr. in Synod's funds,	\$923 15½
Do. in Seminary's funds,	667 99½
Do. Student's funds,	133 92
	1725 07½
Missionary Fund to D. Houston, Dr.	92 68
	1632 39½

The accompanying reports are a true statement of accounts of Synod's funds in my hands this day.

DANIEL HOUSTON

Dnl. Houston to Associate Synod's funds, Dr.
 October 8, 1833, to balance in hands of Treasurer as per report this morning, \$923 15½
 " From Indiana cong., 19 00
 " From Mount Pleasant cong., 15 00
 " From Robinson cong., 10 00
 " From Mr. Wilson, Treasurer, 10 00
 " From Service cong., 4 08
 " From South Buffalo cong., 10 00
 " From North Buffalo Cong., 10 00

By the addition of the above, balance due Synod is now (on Synod's fund,) \$1001 23½

DANIEL HOUSTON.

Daniel Houston to Associate Synod's Missionary Fund,
Dr.
 October 3, to cash from Henderson cong., \$12 00
 October 8, From Mr. A. Bachop, S. Argyle, 30 00
 " From Mr. John Bishop, 5 00
 " From Stamford cong., 10 00
 " From Rev. John Wallace, 5 00

\$62 00

Contra,
 By balance due Treasurer as per report, May 13, 1832, \$154 68

Balance due Treasurer, October 8, 1833, \$92 68

DANIEL HOUSTON.

Daniel Houston to Associate Synod in Seminary fund,
Dr.
 October 8, 1833, to balance due Synod as per report this morning \$667 99½
 " From Xenia cong., 67 22
 " From Ligonier cong., 2 00

By the addition of the above sums, balance in Treasury is now, \$737 21½

DANIEL HOUSTON, Treasurer.

I might state to the Rev. Synod, that there has been about two hundred dollars of the subscription of Chartiers congregation, paid to the congregation treasurer, the most of which is paid out on brick for Seminary.

D. H.

D. Houston to Ass. Synod in Missionary fund,
Dr.
 Oct. 9, 1833. To cash received from the Rev. F. Pringle, per A. Heron, . . . \$20 00
 In addition to my report of yesterday I acknowledge the receipt of the aforesaid amount.

DANIEL HOUSTON.

Daniel Murphy in account with Synod in Synod's fund,
Dr.
 To cash in treasury as per report of May, 1832, \$1054 69½

Cr.

June 1, 1832. To cash transmitted to Canonsburgh as per order of Synod \$1054 69½

<i>Daniel Murphy in account with Synod in Theological Hall fund,</i>	<i>Dr.</i>	1833, Jan. 1. To cash from dividend on 22 shares Com. bank stock,....	38 50
To cash in treasury, as per report of May, 1832,.....	\$853 88	May 21. To cash from do. do.	44 00
			168 12½
	<i>Cr.</i>		<i>Cr.</i>
June 1, 1832. By cash transmitted to Canonsburgh, as per order of Synod,	\$853 88	1832, June 1, By cash transmitted to Canonsburgh, as per order of Synod	\$85 62½
<i>Daniel Murphy in account with Synod in Missionary fund,</i>	<i>Dr.</i>	By balance,	82 50
To balance in treasury as per report of May, 1833,.....	\$49 49		168 12½
<i>Daniel Murphy in account with Synod in Students' fund,</i>	<i>Dr.</i>	1833, Sept. 24. To balance in treasury,	\$82 50
To cash in treasury as per report of May, 1832,.....	\$85 62½	The above is a correct report of the state of Synod's Theological Hall, Missionary and Student's funds.	

DANIEL MURPHY, *Treas.*
Philadelphia, Sept. 24, 1833.

The Presbytery of Alleghany requested a copy of their report on the subject of the Testimony of the Original Seceders in Scotland, laid on the table at a former meeting, which was ordered.

On motion, *Resolved*, that the Rev. S. McLane be directed to present his account for services on the Western Mission, to the Presbytery of Muskingum, and that the clerk of said Presbytery be authorised to draw an order on the treasurer of Synod, in favor of Mr. McLane, for whatever may appear to be justly due.

The protesters against the enactment of yesterday on the subject of marriage, requested that a committee be now appointed to receive and answer the reasons of protest when given in; and pledging themselves to have their reasons ready in three months. The prayer of the petition was, on motion, granted. Messrs. Adams, S. Wilson and James Wallace, were appointed said committee.

The following question was proposed for discussion, and an answer requested, viz :

When a minister of the gospel has been suspended by a Presbytery, and his protest and appeal against the act have been admitted, has he a right to exercise his ministry, and sit as a member of the Presbytery in virtue of the admission of his protest and appeal?

This question was, on motion, referred to the committee appointed to revise the Book of Discipline.

Mr. J. Scroggs tendered his resignation as a member of the board of trustees of the Theological Seminary. His resignation was accepted, and Dr. D. Stevenson of Canonsburgh was elected in his room.

On motion, it was agreed to take up the protest and appeal of A. Turnbull, from a decision of the Presbytery of Miami in his case. The papers in the case were read; and before hearing the remarks of the Presbytery fully, the Synod

Adjourned till 2 o'clock.—Closed with prayer.

2 o'clock, P. M.

The Synod met and was opened with prayer.

Members present as above, with the exception of Messrs. D. McLane, sen. France, Blair, and Jas. C. Bruce, ministers; and Jas. Boyd, ruling elder, absent without leave.

Read the minutes of last sitting.

Proceeded with the business left unfinished in the forenoon sitting, and heard the Presbytery of Miami in continuation: and the parties being removed, and the minds of the members of Synod expressed, the question was taken, sustain the appeal or not, and carried unanimously, sustain.

Mr. Carson, the professor elect, being asked when he can enter on the duties of his office, replied that he could not remove in time for the duties of the approaching session of the seminary:

On motion, *Resolved*, That Mr. Carson be excused from attendance on the duties of his professorship for the first ensuing session.

On motion, *Resolved*, That Mr. Carson's salary commence with the 1st of May next.

On motion, proceeded to consider the report of the committee of bills and overtures on the letter of Mr. Anderson in reference to the state of our churches in the south, in the form of an unofficial report of the Presbytery of the Carolinas.

On motion, *Resolved*, That said letter be not published.

From this decision Mr. Allison craved his dissent to be marked. In this he was joined by Messrs. Heron, McElwee, Beveridge and Banks.

On motion, *Resolved*, That a Commission be appointed to settle all matters regarding Mr. Kirkland's declination, and his present standing in regard to the Presbytery of Al eghany, and his former congregation.

Messrs. Donnan, Wm. Wilson and Rodgers were appointed said Commission.

On motion, *Resolved*, That Mr. Walker be appointed to supply, in the congregation of Baltimore during the month of May, and that the Presbytery of Muskingum be ordered to supply his pulpit during his absence on said mission.

The report of the committee appointed to draught a digest of our views on the subjects in controversy between us and our brethren of the Reformed Presbyterian Church was called up; and, on motion,

Resolved, That the proposed draught be published, and laid before the Presbyteries for consideration till next meeting.

The draught is as follows :

Report of the committee appointed to prepare the draught of a digest of our principles involved in the correspondence with the Reformed Presbyterian Synod.

The views of the Associate Church respecting the qualifications of political rulers, and their power in matters of religion, as these have been expressed in her subordinate standards, may in substance be stated as follows:

1. The institution of political government, is by the preceptive will of God, the Creator and Ruler of the universe.

2. Every people, whose local situation, together with their essential rights and interests, separates them from every other people, are, in their collective capacity, under moral obligation to erect a government, and to appoint rulers over them.

3. The public good, consisting in the preservation of mutual right and of external order, in all the relations and transactions of men with each other, is, in subordination to the divine glory, the only immediate and proper end of political government. Consequently, it is only those actions of men which have a direct tendency to promote or impede this public good, that can fall under the legitimate cognizance of political rulers and laws; and the nature and extent of the coercion to be by the political ruler employed, in eliciting good actions, or in restraining those which are evil, are to be determined by the tendency and necessity of such coercion, to secure and advance the above described end.

4. The institution and end of political government, the right and moral obligation to constitute and maintain it, and every thing belonging to the essence and validity of the same, either in respect of constitution or administration, being dictated by the law and light of nature, are discoverable by this light, without the help of supernatural revelation. Consequently, there cannot, and ought not, to be any exercise of political office or power, in relation to its proper end, but such as can be argued for, and defended from natural principles.

5. The Holy Scriptures, which comprise in them, besides their supernatural revelations, the entire subject matter of nature's moral light and laws, and which are, to those possessing them, the only rule of duty, do determine, by their doctrines and precepts, expressly or implicitly, the qualifications and duties of political rulers. Consequently it is incumbent upon any people possessing those scriptures, both in the constitution of their government and in the choice of their rulers—as it is incumbent upon the rulers themselves, in the whole of their administrations—to be moved and directed by a single and supreme regard to the authority of God, revealing himself in his word.

6. It is an incumbent duty, enjoined in the Holy Scriptures, upon any people who possess them, to frame their civil constitution, and to conduct the whole of their governmental administration, in a true subserviency to the spiritual kingdom of Jesus Christ, to the interests of his religion, and the reformation of his church; and this same duty, as it respects the administration, is especially incumbent on the rulers themselves, to the utmost extent only of the just authority transmitted to them by the people, through the medium of the constitution, or of the constitution and laws.

7. The church of Christ is a kingdom distinct from all the kingdoms of the world, and independent of them. Consequently, the political ruler, as such, not being an officer in the church, nor having authority to judge in matters of conscience, has nothing to do with religion, as such. He defends the true religion only by defending its professors in the exercise of their natural rights, common to all men, amongst which is that of being unmolested by external violence, in the worshipping of God, according to the dictates of their own conscience. He affords his official support and aid to the external form and profession of true Christianity, only as an excellent expedient for the advancement of that temporal public good, which is the immediate and proper end of his office. He punishes heretics and schismatics, not as such, but only as disturbers, and only in so far as they are disturbers of the public peace. He may neither compel, prohibit, nor in any way control the religious worship of the subject, who is not violating any principle of justice or good order, in relation to his neighbour, or to the community. Nor is it proper that any exclusive benefit or privilege be conferred by the state, or by the political ruler in his official capacity, upon any class of persons, merely on account of their religious sentiments or practices.

8. The investment of any person with political office and power, is by voluntary compact between him and the people, explicit or implied, the preservation of their natural rights being, in every such compact, understood as stipulated in favor of the people. Consequently, habitual tyranny on the part of the ruler, consisting in the wilful violation of any natural and essential right of the subject, and likewise the wilful infraction, on the part of the ruler, of any just and reasonable constitutions or laws, may make void his authority, and absolve the people from their allegiance, by dissolving the relation formerly subsisting between him and them.

9. It is essential to the well-being of political government, among a people enlightened by divine revelation, that it be constituted and administered in conformity to the doctrines and precepts of the Bible, and in true subserviency, in every respect, to the interests of morality and religion; but neither such conformity nor subserviency is essential to the being of political government, provided the proper end of the institution be in substance secured, which is the preservation of mutual right and external order, as above described. Consequently, the infidelity, apostacy, or irreligion of any people, although possessing the light of revelation, does not take away their right or ability to erect and enjoy a political government—such a one as shall sustain the essential character and authority of an ordinance of God. And infidelity or diffidence of religion on the part of the ruler, does not make void his just and legal authority, nor free the people from their due obedience to him.

The views of the Associate Church in relation to the mediatorial kingdom of Christ, and the purchase made by his obedience and death, may be stated as follows:

1. The covenant of works being made with Adam, not only for himself but for all his posterity, this federal representation, necessarily presupposed, and included under it, as representees, a definite number of mankind, fixed by an eternal and sovereign decree of the all-wise God. Consequently, the tenor and parts of that covenant, both on the supposition of its being kept, and in the present event of its being broken, necessarily required the existence, in due time, of each individual thus represented, in order that the reward or punishment stipulated might be rendered to all its subjects; and thus it required the continued standing of the world, with the application and use of all natural and necessary means for the propagation and perpetuation of the human race.

2. The covenant of grace being made with Christ for all the elect, as his spiritual seed, included in it a definite number of mankind, sinners chosen in him, and given to him by an eternal donation of the Father. Consequently, the standing of the world with the sanctified application and use of all natural and of all divinely instituted and spiritual means, necessary for the carrying of the promise of that covenant into effect, is infallibly secured by the promise itself: and this sanctified application and use of means is a fruit of the covenant, and of the obedience and blood of the blessed surety.

3. It is an essential prerogative of Jesus Christ, belonging to him as the Most High God, the Sovereign Lord of nature, to govern the world which himself hath created, by disposing and directing all the things of the world, in their natural course to their natural ends: that is, by ordinary and common providence. Consequently, it is derogatory to the supreme deity of the Son of God, and calculated to promote a false notion of his spiritual kingdom, to teach or hold that all things belong to his mediatory kingdom, or that they belong to him by right of donation and purchase, even in their worldly character, or as being governed in an earthly, secular, or natural way, toward their natural ends.

4. The whole accomplishment of the eternal purpose and promise of grace, though not the purpose or promise itself, is indeed the proper fruit and effect of Christ's purchase. And our Lord Jesus Christ, as mediator, possesses over all things a dominion, in which he infallibly disposes and directs them, spiritually and supernaturally, in a subserviency to this eternal purpose, and to the great work of grace by which it is accomplished.

5. The proper enjoyment of any of the fruits of Christ's purchase, or of his mediatorial kingdom, can be obtained only in a state of union and communion with himself, by the effectual operation of the Holy Spirit; and, in ordinary cases, by means of the saving grace of faith. Consequently the sanctified application and use of outward, material or common benefits, but not those benefits themselves, considered in their earthly, perishing nature, as governed, or directed toward their earthly, natural end, can, only in their application to believers, be properly termed the fruits and effects of Christ's purchase, and mediatory kingdom. And nothing can be properly termed a fruit of that purchase and kingdom, which the vindictive justice of God, and the curse of the covenant of works will admit without a satisfaction—nothing which is common to all men, and received by means of our natural organs and faculties only, without the gift or instrumentality of faith, or which is received by those who are separate from Christ, and destitute of communion with him.

JAMES ADAMS,
THOMAS BEVERIDGE.

The answers to reasons of protest against the Synod's enactment on the subject of slavery were again called up, and as amended, were, on motion, accepted; and

Resolved, farther, That the editor of the Monitor be requested to publish the reasons of protest and the answers, if it can be done without expense to Synod.*

The report of the committee appointed to devise means for carrying into effect the Synod's act on slavery was called up, and, on motion, laid on the table.

Reasons of protest by Mr. Blair, against the deed of Synod respecting the Testimony of the Associate Synod of Original Seceders, were read, and, on motion, those reasons, together with those of Dr. Bruce, were referred to the same committee to which were referred the reasons of protest by Messrs. Donnan and others.

Adjourned till 7 o'clock in the evening.—Closed with prayer.

* The great length of these papers precludes their insertion in the present number; but we shall endeavor to comply with the request of Synod, and give them to our readers as soon as a few valuable favors of correspondents shall have been disposed of, either by crowding them into some of our regular numbers in a small type, or by issuing an extra number.

7 o'clock, P. M.

The Synod met and was opened with prayer.

Members present as above.

Read the minutes of last sitting.

Reasons of dissent from the decision of Synod refusing to publish Mr. Anderson's letter were read, and on motion, Messrs. A. Wilson and Clokey were appointed a committee to draft answers.

The report of the committee of bills and overtures on the questions referred to Synod by the Presbytery of Miami, was taken up, and on motion, referred to the committee appointed to revise the Book of Discipline.

The following resolution was offered, by Messrs. Beveridge and Adams, and on motion laid on the table.

Resolved, That a committee be appointed to prepare a draught of a more explicit exhibition of our principles, upon the magistrate's power in relation to matters of religion, and upon the nature of national covenanting, than is contained in our Testimony.

On motion, *Resolved*, That the Rev. A. Wilson be added to the Commission in the case of Mr. Kirkland.

The resolutions on the subject of administering and taking oaths were called up, and, on motion, referred to the committee on the Book of Discipline.

On motion, *Resolved*, That the sum of \$5 be appropriated to compensate Titus Basfeld for his services in attending on the Synod during its present sittings, and that the Clerk be directed to give him an order on the Treasurer for that sum.

On motion, *Resolved*, That the Treasurer be ordered to audit the accounts of the Janitor for his attendance and services, and pay him a reasonable compensation.

On motion, *Resolved*, That the thanks of this Synod be tendered to the trustees of Jefferson College for the use of their Hall during the present sittings of Synod.

On motion, *Resolved*, That it be recommended to every minister of this Synod to use all proper and practicable means to raise contributions to liquidate the debts of Synod, arising from the erection of the Seminary buildings, and forward said contributions as soon as possible to the Treasurer.

The minutes of the present sitting were then read, and after prayer and singing part of the 122d Psalm, and the Apostolical benediction pronounced by the Moderator, the Synod adjourned to meet in Baltimore on the first Wednesday of October, 1834, at 4 o'clock P. M. Sermon at 7 o'clock.

ANDREW HERON, Synod's Clerk.

STATISTICAL TABLE OF THE PRESBYTERY OF PHILADELPHIA.

Ministers.	Congregations.	Nearest P. O.	Counties.	States.	Fam.	Com.
T. Beveridge,	Philadelphia,	Philadelphia,	Philadelphia, ..	Penn.	86	173
F. W. McNaughton, ..	{ Mercersburgh,	Mercersburgh, ..	Franklin,	do	102
	{ McConnellsburgh, ..	do	do	do		
W. Easton,	{ Octarara,	Georgetown,	Lancaster,	do		
	{ Muddy Run,	do	do	do	50	150
John Adams,	{ E. Nottingham,	N. Lond. x rds.	Chester,	do		
	{ Guinston,	do	York,	do	42	118
<i>Without charge</i> ,	{ Lower Chancetord, ..	do	do	do	20	64
	{ Baltimore,	Baltimore,	Baltimore,	Md.	68
Tho. B. Clarkson, ...	{ Carlisle,	Carlisle,	Cumberland, ..	Penn.	16	45
	{ Dickinson,	do	do	do		
Vacancies,	{ Wheatfield,	Wilford,	Perry,	do	20	100
	{ Huntingdon,	Huntingdon,	Huntingdon, ..	do	21	38
Vacancies,	{ Stone Creek,	do	do	do	21	46
	{ Lewistown,	Lewistown,	Mifflin,	do	8	5
Vacancies,	{ East and West Kish- acoquilla,	do	do	do	7	17
	{ Juniata,	Perry,	do	do		

STATISTICAL TABLE OF THE PRESBYTERY OF CHARTIERS.

Ministers.	Congregations.	Nearest P. O.	Counties.	States.	Fam.	Com.
Wm. Wilson	Monteur's Run	Clinton	Alleghany	Penn.	67	157
J. Rodgers	{ Noblesburgh,	do	do	do	35	80
	{ Mt. Hope,	W. Middletown	Washington ..	do	46	114
Thomas Allison	{ Cross Creek,	do	Brooke	Va.	26	61
	{ Charters,	Cannonsburgh, ..	Washington ..	Penn.	122	330
David French,	N. & S. Buffalo	Washington	do	do	110	240
Alex. Wilson	{ Peter's Creek,	do	do	do		
	{ Pigeon Creek,	do	do	do		
Alex. Donnan	{ Mt. Pleasant,	Hickory	do	do	106	230
	{ Burgetstown,	do	do	do	86	180
Wm. M. McElwee,	{ Service & King's Creek	do	Beaver	do	116	264
	{ Congregation of Ohio	do	do	do		
Vacancies,	{ Washington,	do	Washington, ..	do		

STATISTICAL TABLE OF THE PRESBYTERY OF MIAMI.

Ministers.	Congregations.	Nearest P. O.	Counties.	States.	Fam.	Com.	
James Adams,.....	Massies Creek,.....	Xenia.....	Green.....	Ohio.....	125	270	
David Carson,.....	Pistol Creek,.....	Maryville.....	Blount.....	Ten. } do } do }	70	158	
	Big Spring,.....		Monroe.....	do	27	48	
	Fork Creek,.....		Carrol.....	do	16	40	
Nath. Ingles,.....	Burnets Creek,.....	Tiptonsprt.....	do.....	Ind. } do }	19	40	
James Templeton,.....	Pleasant Run,.....	Delphi.....	do.....	do	50	175	
Samuel Wilson,.....	Sugar Creek,.....	Centreville.....	Green.....	Ohio	73	44	
James Wallace,.....	Xenia,.....	Xenia.....	do.....	do	23	39	
A. Heron,.....	Bellefontaine,.....	Bellefontaine.....	Logan.....	do	19	72	
	Darby,.....	do.....	do.....	do	33	98	
James C. Bruce,.....	Caesar,.....	Jamestown.....	Green.....	Illin's	44	128	
James M. Henderson,	Henderson,.....	Monmouth.....	Warren,.....	Ind. } do } do }	50	20	
	Carmel,.....	Gallatin.....	Jefferson.....	do			
	Madison,.....	Madison.....	do.....	do			
	Vacancies,.....	Big Creek,.....	do.....	do.....	do	20	88
		Clarke,.....	do.....	Clarke.....	do	14	
		Raccoon,.....	Russelville.....	Park.....	India.	37	50
		Salem,.....	Knoxville.....	Knox.....	Tenn.	20	40
		Limestone,.....	do.....	Washington.....	do	17	36
		Cincinnati,.....	do.....	Hamilton.....	Ohio.		
		Otter Creek,.....	do.....	Jennings.....	India.		
		Wild Cat,.....	do.....	do.....	do		
		Salt River,.....	do.....	do.....	Ky.	9	20
		Rocky Spring,.....	Abingdon.....	Washington.....	Va.		
Apple Creek,.....	Carrelton.....	Green.....	Illin's	12	28		
Sugar Creek,.....	Prospect Hill.....	Madison.....	do				
Unity,.....	Shanon's Store,.....	Randolph.....	do				
Buffalo,.....	Louisiana.....	Pike.....	Miss.	14			
Mount Prairie,.....	Mount Prairie.....	Monroc.....	do				
Sharon,.....	do.....	Lincoln.....	do				
Auxvasse,.....	do.....	Callaway.....	do				

STATISTICAL TABLE OF THE PRESBYTERY OF CAMBRIDGE.

Ministers.	Congregations.	Nearest P. O.	Counties.	States.	Fam.	Com.
Alex. Bullions.....	Cambridge.....	Cambridge.....	Washington.....	N. Y.	131	337
James P. Miller.....	Argyle.....	Argyle.....	do.....	do	140	343
A. Gordon.....	Putnam.....	Putnam.....	do.....	do	66	162
T. Goodwillie.....	Barnet.....	Barnet.....	Caledonia.....	Vert.	80	200
Wm. Pringle.....	Ryegate.....	Ryegate.....	do.....	do	46	89
D. Gordon.....	Salem.....	Salem.....	Washington.....	N. Y.	50	110
D. Stalker.....	North Argyle.....	North Argyle.....	do.....	do		85
A. Anderson.....	Hebron.....	West Hebron.....	do.....	do	60	170
<i>Without charge.</i>						
A. White, sen.						

STATISTICAL TABLE OF THE PRESBYTERY OF ALBANY.

Ministers.	Congregations.	Nearest P. O.	Counties.	States.	Fam.	Com.
Andrew Stark.....	New-York 1st.....	New-York.....	New-York.....	N. Y.	160	275
James Irvine.....	New-York 2d.....	New-York.....	New-York.....	do	60	140
James Martin.....	Albany.....	Albany.....	Albany.....	do	96	153
Peter Campbell.....	Florida.....	Florida.....	Montgomery.....	do	42	100
John G. Smart.....	Johnstown.....	Johnstown.....	do.....	do	19	40
John Russell.....	Stamford.....	Queenston.....	do.....	U. Ca.	35	70
John Graham.....	Bovina.....	do.....	Delaware.....	N. Y.	82	158
James Strang.....	Dumfries.....	do.....	do.....	U. Ca.		170
Vacancies.....	York.....	do.....	Livingston.....	N. Y.		45
<i>Without charge.</i>	Esquising.....	do.....	do.....	U. Ca.		50
Robert Laing.....	London.....	do.....	do.....	do		12
F. Pringle.....	do.....	do.....	do.....	do		
P. Bullions.....	do.....	do.....	do.....	do		
Thomas Ferrier.....	do.....	do.....	do.....	do		

STATISTICAL TABLE OF THE PRESBYTERY OF ALLEGHANY.

Ministers.	Congregations.	Nearest P. O.	Counties.	States.	Fam.	Com.
Robert Bruce.....	Pittsburgh.....	Pittsburgh.....	Alleghany.....	Penn.	150	320
John France.....	Glade-Run.....	Bakerstown.....	Butler.....	do	60	200
John Dickie.....	Rich-Hill.....	Kittanning.....	Armstrong.....	do	100	150
Joseph Scroggs.....	Fairfield.....	Ligonier.....	Westmoreland.....	do		300
David Blair.....	Indiana, &c.....	Indiana.....	Indiana.....	do		350
James M'Carrell.....	Cherry-Run.....	do.....	Armstrong.....	do		
	Upper Piney.....	do.....	do.....	do		65
John Hindman.....	Mahoning.....	do.....	do.....	do	25	60
	Berachah.....	do.....	do.....	do		
	Concord.....	do.....	Indiana.....	do	8	80
Vacancies.....	Lower Piney.....	do.....	do.....	do	15	50
	Blairsville.....	do.....	do.....	do		
	Jefferson.....	do.....	Jefferson.....	do		
	Bethel, &c.....	Freeport.....	Allegheny.....	do	140	250

STATISTICAL TABLE OF THE PRESBYTERY OF THE CAROLINAS.

Ministers.	Congregations.	Nearest P. O.	Counties.	States.	Fam.	Com.
A. Whyte jr.	Steel Creek	Charlotte	Mecklenburg	N. C.	27	60
	Bethany	Chester	Chester	S. C.	28	68
James Lyle	Savanna	Youngs	Fairfield	do		
	Little River	Winsborough	do	do		
H. Thompson	Bethel	Lexington	do	do		
	Ebenezer	do	Rockbridge	Va.	62	
	Timber Ridge	Fancy Hill	do	do		
	Broad Creek	Wilson's	Lincoln	N. C.		
	Nob Creek	do	do	do		
	Pisgah	Yorkville	York	S. C.		
	Bethany	do	Union	do		
	Sardis	do	Iredel	N. C.		
	Virgin Spring	Saatsville	do	do		
	New Stirling	do	do	do		
Vacancies	Cambridge	do	do	do		
	Gilead	Mount Mourne	do	do		
	— Creek	Morgantown	Burke	do		
	Cochran's Vale	Old Fort	do	do		
	Piedmont	Franklin	Macon	do		
	New Lebanon	Union	Monroe	Va.	187	
	Sharon	do	York	S. C.	28	102
	Tirzah	Yorkville	do	do	48	69

STATISTICAL TABLE OF THE PRESBYTERY OF OHIO.

Ministers.	Congregations.	Nearest P. O.	Counties.	States.	Fam.	Com.
Daniel McLean	Venango	Hart's roads	Crawford	Penn.		
	Salem	Venango	Venango	do	200	450
David Imbrie	Darlington	Darlington	Beaver	do	60	140
	Bethel	do	do	do	70	150
A. Boyd	Newcastle	do	do	do	82	70
	Mountville	Portersville	do	do	64	125
Alex. Murray	Slippery Rock	do	Butler	do	80	150
	West Beaver	do	Columbiana	Ohio.		
Elijah N. Scroggs	West Union	New Lisbon	do	do	75	280
	4 Mile Square	do	do	do		
John Donaldson	Yellow Creek	Scroggsfield	Columbiana	Ohio.	70	150
	Poland	Poland	Trumbull	do	67	139
Dav. Goodwillie	Liberty	do	do	do	79	115
	Mercer	Mercer	Mercer	Penn.	28	73
Isaac Beggs	Springfield	do	do	do	36	92
	Rocky Spring	do	do	do	34	89
M. Snodgrass	Connaught	do	Crawford	do	20	50
	French Creek	Meadville	do	do	15	80
Wm. Douthet	Cherry-Run	do	Venango	do	25	80
	Neshannock	Mercer	Mercer	do	20	48
Vacancies	Mount Prospect	do	do	do	20	85
	Unity	Harrisville	Venango	do	25	60
	Silver Creek	do	do	do	15	
	Harmony	do	Butler	do	85	200
	Deer Creek	do	Mercer	do	100	205

STATISTICAL TABLE OF THE PRESBYTERY OF MUSKINGUM.

Ministers.	Congregations.	Nearest P. O.	Counties.	States.	Fam.	Com.
John Walker	Unity	New Athens	Harrison	Ohio	90	209
Samuel Irvine	Wooster	do	do	do		
	Salt Creek	Wooster	Wayne	do	75	128
Thomas Hanna	Cadiz	Cadiz	Harrison	do	59	126
	Piney Fork	do	Jefferson	do	45	92
Daniel McLane	Bloomfield	do	Muskingum	do	78	150
	Cambridge	Cambridge	Guernsey	do	18	96
Joseph Clokey	Mount Pleasant	Mt. Pleasant	Jefferson	do	33	60
	McMahon's Creek	do	Belmont	do	27	50
Andrew Isaac	Belmont	do	do	do	26	50
	Londonderry	Londonderry	Guernsey	do	56	120
Samuel Hindman	Sharon	do	Harrison	do	15	80
	Mansfield	Mansfield	Richland	do		
Vacancies	Clear Creek	do	do	do		
	Washington	do	Marion	do		
	Jonathan's Creek	Somerset	Perry	do		
	Licking	Irville	Muskingum	do		
	Truro	Columbus	Franklin	do		
	Goshen	do	Perry	do		
	Millersburgh	Millersburgh	Holmes	do		
	Carmel	Leesburgh	Tuscarawas	do		
	Mohican	do	Wayne	do		
	Newman's Creek	do	do	do		
Paris	Plymouth	Richland	do			
Eden	Bloom	Seneca	do			

SUMMARY OF THE PRECEDING TABLES.

PRESBYTERIES.	Ministers.	Congregations settled and vacant.	Families.	Communicants
Cambridge	9	8	512	1481
Carolinas	3	22	360	764
Ohio	10	25	1220	2736
Chartiers	8	16	590	1656
Miami	9	31	718	1422
Philadelphia	5	17	286	909
Allegheny	7	15	493	1775
Muskingum	7	25	517	1030
Albany	12	11	428	1113
Ministers itinerating	9			
	79	169	5129	12886

THE STANDARD, a weekly religious paper published at Cincinnati, Ohio.—After a temporary suspension, this valuable journal has reappeared under the control of the Rev. JAMES BURT, formerly editor of the *Presbyterian*. We always read this paper with a greater degree of satisfaction, than any other with which we are acquainted; and recommend it to such of our readers as desire to know more of the peculiar state of the General Assembly at the present time.

While we commend many things in the more orthodox party of the General Assembly whose views are expressed by the Standard we should not withhold an expression of regret, that their views of reformation do not extend farther, and that they do not take more efficient steps for a thorough cleansing of the church. The times demand it—the word of God demands it; besides, there is no middle ground in this warfare: and we beg leave with all meekness to express our unalterable conviction, that their present contentings will be comparatively of little value, unless they are led by the word and Spirit of God, to *return back* wholly from a begun course of defection,—to maintain themselves, and enforce upon those “over whom the Holy Ghost hath made them overseers,” the letter and spirit of their scriptural Standards,—to banish human compositions from the public praises of God, and every other invention of man from his pure and spiritual worship, and restore the inspired songs of Zion, to that place in the church, for which they were given by the Holy Spirit; “observing and keeping pure and entire all such religious worship and ordinances as God hath appointed in his word.” If such measures could be witnessed it would furnish ground of hope and confidence that the Lord was about reviving his own cause in the midst of us; but at present, particularly in this section of country, (of other places we cannot speak so confidently) the controversy between the advocates of old and new measures respects not the *principle*, but the *degree* of innovation, which shall be tolerated—a controversy about as profitable as that waged among papists respecting the seat of infallibility in their Anti-Christian church. But our more orthodox brethren in the General Assembly may tell us, that they suffer no unscriptural doctrines or practices among them which it is in the power of church courts to restrain; their new measure brethren will tell *them* the same thing; but we *know* this is not true of either party, their own Standards being the judge.

These brief observations are made with no other view than to call the attention of some in the General Assembly, who see the course of defection pursued by a majority of their church, to a renewed examination of their own avowed principles, to see whether they are not now, and

have not been for a long time, involved, in some degree at least, in the same course of defection which they condemn in their brethren. If they find such to be their case they cannot fail to see the path of duty.

But lest the editor of the *Philadelphian*, who sees every thing, and writes all manner of sentiments respecting almost all subjects, that come within the scope of man's reasoning faculties, should again misunderstand us,* and suppose that we are looking for accessions from the General Assembly, he is informed that the Associate Church grows quite as fast in numbers as in purity: we must, therefore, protest against his construction of our motives, because his views and ours are widely different respecting the permanency and true glory of the Christian Church. He appears to place her glory chiefly in numbers; we place it chiefly in a close adherence to divine institutions. We should greatly prefer twelve ministers conscientiously laboring to maintain the laws and institutions of Christ's house, to twelve hundred, laboring chiefly to increase numbers; because purity in doctrine and worship is a primary consideration with us.

Let no one from this statement charge us with hostility to the increase of the Redeemer's Kingdom, because this is the way and the only way in which his kingdom can be advanced. What would be said of an

* That we may not incur the charge of speaking at random, we extract the subjoined article from the last *Philadelphian* of Oct. 24, 1833, which is given as editorial, and without comment, and we suppose was written by Dr. Ely. Who would have looked for a sermon like the following from the author of the "CONTRAST" and "THEOLOGICAL REVIEW!"

"SELF CONVERSIONISM."—A SHORT SERMON.

Text. "Turn yourselves and live ye." Ezek. xviii. 32.

This passage of Holy Writ expresses the doctrine of "self conversionism." It is a divine injunction upon sinners to repent, to become truly pious, to become new spiritual agents at once. Let us then consider,

I. The *DUTY* of "self conversionism." 1. God commands it; and what God commands a creature to do, it is his duty to perform. 2. It is a reasonable duty, because sinners have all the natural *faculties* of moral agents; and *liberty* to exercise them aright. They are under no necessity of sinning on, and continuing impenitent. They have before their minds in the gospel the most powerful inducements to turn themselves from their transgressions, and to begin to serve the Lord. 3. Multitudes have practiced "self conversion;" and that is proof enough that others may and can turn themselves.

II. The *NATURE* of this duty. Self conversionism is a free, moral, spiritual turning of the soul to God. It consists in the commencement of a new, a right, a holy moral agency. It is nothing but beginning to know, believe, love and serve God; and includes the beginning of sorrow for sin, hatred of it, determination to forsake it, confession of it, and consent of the will to follow Christ. He who begins to believe the gospel and love Christ is the subject of "self conversionism."

III. The *BLESSED CONSEQUENCES* of self conversionism. "Live ye." Iniquity shall not be the ruin of the person who performs this duty of turning to God; but he shall be saved from hell and admitted to heaven. Without self conversionism there is no salvation for actual sinners.

APPLICATION. Let every sinner practice self conversionism without delay. He cannot refuse but at his peril. If he continues to insist upon it, that he *cannot do it, and will not do it*, he must die in his sins.

INFERENCE. 1. Self conversionism is not inconsistent with the doctrine of divine influence; for when a sinner turns to God, God at the same time, by moral means, and through the sinner's own free agency turns him. 2. We see the awful delusion of those who sneer at "self conversionism;" for God tells us to "turn ourselves," which is self conversionism. 3. Divines should preach divine influence in conversion in such a way as not to invalidate the doctrine and duty of self conversionism. 4. It is doubtless one reason why many are not converted, that they are not convinced that self conversionism is a practicable duty."

REMARKS.—To say nothing of the coinage of the barbarous term "*self conversionism*," which seems to be used in a cabalistic sense—a favorite practice with deceivers, we have here regeneration and conversion confounded, or rather regeneration is virtually denied, without which there can be no conversion to God. The whole of this article seems to be based on the monstrous supposition, that man in his fallen state, lying under the curse of a broken law, is "able perfectly to keep the commandments of God." But as our design in quoting this is merely to exhibit some of the peculiarities of the new measure men in the General Assembly, we will dismiss it with a single text of scripture—"Every plant which my heavenly father hath not planted shall be rooted up." Mat. xv. 18. Therefore, if the conversion of persons be *no more* than mere self conversion, they cannot escape destruction.

army not content with enlisting known friends to its cause, but seeking by great pretensions, by bounties and rewards to enlist, not merely the indifferent but those who in the act of their admission refuse submission to some of its laws and regulations? Would not every considerate man say at once, that that army had an enemy in its own bosom more to be dreaded, than its most powerful, open and avowed enemy? Need it look for any thing but treachery in the camp, in the hour of conflict with its enemies? Precisely so with the Christian church. And when none but such as will swear allegiance to the Redeemer, and to maintain his laws and institutions entire, and are in the judgment of charity his true friends, are admitted to the visible privileges of his kingdom, then may we look for the peace and prosperity of Zion; then "How should one chase a thousand, and two put ten thousand to flight!" then, "a little one shall become a thousand and a small one a strong nation: I the Lord will hasten it in its time."

Inquiries concerning Faith.

MA. EDITOR,—Your correspondent* on the parts of the Revelation, that exhibit the Church in our own time, considered, as in the case of the good wine, John 2, has kept, the best till the last. His illustrations of *faith*, are admirable. I most cordially agree with him, that faith is an act of the *will*, as well as of the understanding; for 'with the heart man believeth unto righteousness.' But a difficulty presents itself upon the subject; which I would be glad, would your able correspondent endeavor to solve. In several passages of the New Testament, faith would seem to be only an act of the understanding. As in the following passages—John viii. 24. and xi. 27; Acts iii. 37; 1st John v. 15. On account of these and similar passages, some hold that faith consists of simple credence. This, I believe, is the sentiment of M'Lean, Eeking, Glass, and Sandeman, and their followers. This faith was no doubt exercised by the foolish virgins, and the stony ground hearers; and by those who will say, Lord, Lord, we have prophesied in thy name; and those, who will say, we have eaten and drunk in thy presence; and every nominal professor. Yet to all such, Christ the judge will at last say, depart from me, I never knew you. This is perhaps what James calls faith without works; and generally goes by the name of historical faith. Perhaps the incipient steps of justifying and saving faith may be denominated simple credence: but surely application, trust, reliance, &c., will be an immediate consequence; according to the admirable definition in our Shorter Catechism, 'Faith in Jesus Christ is a saving grace, whereby we receive and rest upon him alone for salvation as he is offered to us in the gospel.'

I would be glad were your correspondent to say a little on the manner, how persons may obtain true and saving faith. In a very excellent sermon, published in the 4th vol. of the Religious Monitor, on the causes and cure of spiritual declension, page 199, line 42. It is said, 'if we would get strength, we must labor to believe.' The question then, is, what must we do to believe aright? This inquiry is the more important, as many represent faith as a thing so very simple and easy, that any one can believe, if he only has the volition to do so. I believe this is pretty much the language of Class-meetings, Camp meetings, Fourdays-meetings, &c. This seems to be very much at variance with such expressions as these? 'To you it is given, in behalf of Christ, to believe on him. By grace are ye saved, through faith; and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God. Jesus is the author and finisher of faith. Faith is also brought to view as one of the graces of the Spirit. All of which clearly show faith is by no means a matter of free-will; or an exercise which man of himself can perform.'

I would also wish your correspondent, who has attended extensively to the subject, to show what kind of faith was that of Simon Magus. Acts viii. 13. He believed and was baptised, while yet he was in the gall of bitterness, and in the bond of iniquity. To ascertain what a person may believe, and yet not be saved, must be an important inquiry: as it is to be feared many professors of religion are admitted to Church privileges upon no better faith than that of Simon Magus.

Were I not to encumber your correspondent too much, I would be glad were he to say something on *free-will* as a collateral subject; whence, I believe, arise the most of the mistaken views of faith and other Arminian and Methodistic errors, now so very prevalent. An exposure of which, in the present religious excitement, might be very beneficial to render professors of religion steadfast and unmovable in their profession, and prevent others from being led away by the errors of the wicked.

D.

FRANKLIN COLLEGE, *New Athens, Ohio*.—The present session of this institution commenced on Monday the 28th of October. Each session is five months long. The months of April and October are seasons of vacation. The Board of Trustees wish to inform the friends and patrons of literature, and the public generally, that Franklin College is now in a flourishing condition, and affords flattering anticipations of progressive prosperity. The Board is at present making laudable efforts to furnish the institution with all necessary accommodations to facilitate the studies of young men who attend upon the instructions of its Professors: and the diligence and distinguished ability of its Professors are a sufficient guaranty to any youth, who attends the institution with a desire to obtain a thorough education, that his expectations shall not be disappointed.

Comfortable boarding in private families can be had at various prices, from \$1 to \$1.50 per week. Tuition is \$3.50 per session, payable in advance.

JACOB COON, *Secretary*.

MA. EDITOR.—As Mormonism is making bold attempts at proselyting in this neighborhood, and in other parts, would some of your correspondents give an account of the rise, progress, and principles of this modern heresy, or direct where information could be got, it would I doubt not favor many of your readers, or perhaps none more than your constant reader, D.

Bovina.

* To prevent circumlocution, I would recommend him, and all correspondents to give a signature.

THE
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,

AND

EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

DECEMBER, 1833.

ART. I. *The Sin of Nadab and Abihu.*

LEV. x. 1—8. "And Nadab and Abihu, the sons of Aaron, took either of them his censer, and put fire therein, and put incense thereon, and offered strange fire before the Lord, which He commanded them not. And there went out a fire from the Lord, and devoured them; and they died before the Lord. Then Moses said unto Aaron, This is it that the Lord spake, saying, I will be sanctified in them that come nigh me, and before all the people I will be glorified. And Aaron held his peace."

FROM the preceding chapters we learn, that Aaron and his sons, after being solemnly consecrated to, and invested with, the priesthood, entered, the next day, upon the execution of their office. Aaron first offers to the God of Heaven, a sin offering, and a burnt offering for himself. Then, "he brought the sin offering for the people, and slew it, and offered it for sin, as the first, and he brought the burnt offering, and offered it according to the manner, and after presenting the other offerings for the people, he blessed them in the name of the Lord." "And Moses and Aaron went into the tabernacle of the congregation, and came out and blessed the people; and the glory of the Lord appeared unto all the people, and there came a fire out from before the Lord, and consumed upon the altar the burnt offering and the fat: which when all the people saw, they shouted, and fell on their faces." And then, in the words of the text we are told of the sin of Nadab and Abihu, and of their fearful doom. Scarcely had "fire from the Lord," testified his acceptance of the sacrifices just offered and his favor to his people, when, with strange fire, which the Lord commanded not, they dare to defile his altar, and with profane hands innovate on, and add to his institutions. The judgment that fell upon them was dreadful, and it is evident that their guilt must have been awfully provoking, which moved the God of heaven to display such fearful indignation. Some suppose they went drunk into the holy service of a holy God; and the advocates of Temperance Societies I observe, have dragged in this passage in aid of a cause to which it has no reference, founding the above supposition on what is said in the ninth and tenth verses of this chapter.* Some again suppose, that these guilty young men burnt incense when it was not their turn; while others, from what is said in chap. xvi. of this book, verses 1 and 2, have imagined, that they had attempted to enter the most holy place, which was forbidden to all but the High Priest, and he only at the times appointed, and in the manner prescribed by God. But why bring opinions so far fetched? and where the necessity of making so many suppositions? when the sin of Nadab and Abihu is plainly

* See Professor Stuart's Essay on the use of distilled liquors.

expressed by the Holy Spirit in the words before us. Their sin was simply this, as the text informs us, they offered *strange fire* before the Lord which He *commanded them not*. Now the meaning of these expressions is obvious from preceding passages. Thus, in the ninth chapter of this book and twenty-fourth verse, we are told that fire came out from before the Lord, either from heaven, or from the most holy place, or from the cloud of glory which covered the tabernacle, and consumed upon the altar the victims which Aaron offered after being consecrated to the priesthood. Now turn to the sixth chapter of this book, at the twelfth and thirteenth verses, where we learn, that by a special command of the God of heaven, this fire of the altar was to be always kept burning. "The fire upon the altar shall be burning in it; it shall not be put out:—The fire shall ever be burning upon the altar; it shall never go out." Now, though there is not a passage of scripture which says in so many words, that the Lord commanded the fire of the altar, and *that alone* to be used, and that every other kind of fire, though apparently as good for burning the sacrifice was *forbidden, and strange fire*, yet this is plainly implied in the text and the passages quoted. Jehovah had sent down fire from before his presence, he had solemnly commanded, we have seen, that this fire thus kindled should be kept constantly burning on the altar of burnt offering for his service; evidently implying, that it was "*his will*, that *his fire* should be used in his service,"* rather than slight that fire and use what the Lord had not commanded. This was the crime of these young men, a trifling with the institutions of the God of heaven, and adding to his worship what he had not prescribed, and slighting a precious gift he had bestowed, and that too, by ministers at the altar:—a fearful crime, and it met with a fearful punishment. The following truth is then evidently deducible from the words of the text, that neither ministers nor people, in any age of the Church, have any right to worship Jehovah, in any way which he has not commanded, and that they who bring in human inventions into his worship, are guilty of offering "*strange fire before the Lord.*" All that we intend is to explain, confirm, and apply this, in a few general remarks.

Some might imagine there was little harm in Nadab and Abihu offering incense to the true Jehovah, with strange, or common fire; but they had no command, no warrant for what they did, therefore a curse was poured upon them instead of a blessing. "In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." The Head of the Church has expressly forbidden every one, to add to, or take from his word, enforcing his command by the the terrible threatening, that, "if any man shall add to his word, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book." Now, the text tells us plainly, that to add to the worship or institutions of the God of heaven, is considered by him as adding to *his word* in a highly insulting and dangerous manner. And God will be "sanctified," either by being worshipped according to the appointed order, or he will sanctify himself on the corrupters of his worship, if not by temporal plagues, by what are infinitely more terrible, spiritual ones. Listen to the language of Jehovah to Moses in reference to the tabernacle. (Exod. xxv. 40.) "Look that thou make all after their pattern, which was showed thee in the mount." It is a solemn admonition, not to deviate in the least from the divinely appointed pattern. He was not to make any addition himself, he was not to allow the workmen to add any invention of their own, nor to gratify the carnal humor of the people, who might think this or that *handsomer*, than

* Burroughs.

what the Lord had appointed; it was at his, and their peril, if he deviated in the least. Now, did not God intend by this to teach us, that he alone is Lord of the conscience, that he alone can point out the way in which he must be worshipped, and that if men will use in *divine worship*, what they have no divine warrant for, thus shewing their carelessness of how or with what they approach the divine presence, that their peril is tremendous. Instead of "glorifying" God, they thus deny him the glory of sovereignty, of his right to do as he will with his own; the glory of his holiness and power, by refusing to bow their wills to his as revealed in his word, or submit to *his* authority; the glory of his wisdom, thus practically asserting, that they are wiser than he, that they can invent a smoother, more pleasing and preferable mode of worship, than what he himself hath ordained. Perhaps some of the people of Israel might think, they had seen handsomer temples in Egypt, and more fashionably constructed, but no matter what their fancies might be, not a *pin* must be placed but as infinite wisdom directed. And is it not so with his institutions still? His command to ministers and people, now, and till time shall be no longer is, to "observe all things whatsoever I have commanded;" and *then*, he promises to be with them always, even to the end of the world. To add to his institutions *now*, is equally, nay, is more guilty under our superior light, and after warnings given us at the expense of others, than it was under the law. To add to, or take from his ordinances and institutions, is to say that "his work is *not* perfect," that his word is not perfect; it is an impious attempt to lord it over men's consciences, to ascend to the very throne of the Eternal. The tabernacle was finished in every respect as the Lord had commanded, "according to all that the Lord commanded Moses, so the children of Israel made all the work;" they added not nor diminished "as the Lord commanded Moses." This is ten times repeated in the course of the 39th chapter of Exodus, nor is it a mere tautology. The Spirit of God intends, that we should solemnly note it and consider its meaning. "And Moses did look upon all the work, and, behold, they had done it as the Lord had commanded, even so had they done it: and Moses blessed them." And the Lord, we have reason to believe, sealed the blessing. Thus, the Lord sanctified his name even on Moses and Aaron, his faithful servants, by condemning them to die in the wilderness, because they sanctified him not at the waters of Meribah. From the 20th chapter of the Book of Numbers, second verse, we learn that the children of Israel gathered themselves together against Moses and against Aaron, and faithlessly murmured at Kadesh, for want of water. Observe here, that this Kadesh in the "desert of Zin," is a different place from the "wilderness of Sin" spoken of in the 17th chapter of Exodus, when the Israelites pitched in Rephidim, and when their march through the wilderness, was just commencing. There, too, they murmured against the Lord for want of water, and *there*, Moses was expressly commanded to "*smite the rock*." (Exd. xvii. 5—8.) But, in this miracle, recorded in the 20th chapter of Numbers, when their wanderings through the wilderness were almost ended, Moses and Aaron were commanded *only to speak to the rock*, (verse 8.) Moses was to take the rod which the Lord had made instrumental in his hand for working amazing miracles in former days, and which might be intended to remind these ungrateful murmurers, of their past deliverances; but observe, Moses had no command to smite this rock with the rod, as he smote the rock in Horeb. "And Moses and Aaron gathered the congregation together before the rock, and he said unto them, hear now, ye rebels; must we fetch you water out of this rock?" He was irritated at their ingratitude and hardness of heart, "because they there, his Spirit meek, provoked bitterly; so that he

uttered with his lips, words unadvisedly." "And Moses lifted up his hand, and with his rod he *smote* the rock twice." Now, here was evidently his sin. He went further, than his instructions warranted. He had a divine command to *spea*k to the rock, but none to smite it. It would seem as if himself and Aaron were not only deeply provoked, but doubted the word of the Lord, doubted whether a *word* would bring water from the flinty rock; seeming to think some addition of their own necessary, ere the miraculous waters would flow forth. "And he lifted up his hand, and with his rod he smote the rock twice," and instantly, out of the cloud of glory, issued the voice which pronounces their doom. (verse 12.) "Because ye believed me not, to *sanctify* me in the eyes of the children of Israel, therefore ye shall not bring this congregation into the land which I have given them." Though some might think this a trifling addition, a small sin, though it was the one only offence registered against Moses in the book of God, though it was committed in a heat, after great provocation, and by one of God's dearest and most devoted servants, yet the Lord would be *sanctified* upon him, and glorify his holiness in his punishment. For, though the Lord "forgave" Moses and Aaron in mercy, though their punishment went no further than death, yet he "would take vengeance on their *inventions*;" thus causing them to die in the wilderness, outcasts from the earthly Canaan. O then "exalt ye the Lord our God, and worship at his footstool; for he is holy. Moses and Aaron among his priests, and Samuel among them that call upon his name: they called upon the Lord and he answered them. Thou answeredst them O Lord our God: thou wast a God that forgavest them, though thou tookest vengeance on their inventions. Exalt then the Lord our God, and worship at his holy hill; for the Lord our God is holy." (See Psalm 99.)

And allow us here to observe, that it is vain to adduce as an argument, in favor of an opinion or set of opinions, that there are ninety-nine out of every hundred, who espouse them,* or that an error in principle or practice, ceases to be dangerous, if it is sanctioned by the multitude. The friends of truth, the witnesses of God, will not follow a multitude to do evil; will not, by any base compliances or connivances, join the multitude, in opposing or burying the truth, and say "is it not a little one," a non-essential truth? No, they will display a banner for the truth, for the *whole truth*, though but one in a thousand, though but two in ten thousand, should stand with them, to aid and animate them, in fighting the battles of their Lord. No man, no set of men, can change error into truth, can make opposition to any *one* truth of God's word, right. The delusions of Popery, cover Spain, Italy, France, Portugal, and the greater part of Germany; it broods over the extensive regions of South America, the southern provinces of North America; its dark and desolating influence, is extensively felt in Asia, but is that a proof, that this Anti-Christian power, this mother of harlots and abominations of the earth, drunken with the blood of the saints, is right, because, she can point to "multitudes and nations," who have received the mark of the beast either in their foreheads or in their hand? does this prove, that the *two witnesses*, who testify against her abominations, are not the friends of Jesus and the truth? Surely not. The deadly delusions of Mahomet, are spread over Turkey, Persia, Egypt, Arabia, Judea, where patriarchs lived, where apostles preached, and the Lord Jesus Christ tabernacled in clay, and died for his people. Men, who worship devils,

* This argument was used as a valid and logical one, in the neighborhood of the writer, in support of a popular but erroneous system of measures and doctrines, and as condemning the few who testified against these errors.

and idols of gold, and silver, and brass, and stone, and wood, are found by myriads, in Asia, in Africa, in the islands of the sea; the dark places of the earth, are full of monsters in the human shape, who burn their children in sacrifice to devils, who torture, and expose the sick, and dying; who slaughter, and devour their captives: do *their multitudes* prove their delusions, and idolatries, to be right and true? does the *number* of the monsters, who commit these horrid cruelties, whose hands are thus dyed in the blood, and their lips stained with the gore of the victims they have butchered, justify their crimes?

“Beloved, believe not then every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God; because many false prophets are gone out into the world. If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine,” the doctrine of Christ “receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed: for he that biddeth him God speed, is partaker of his evil deeds.” Our duty in this wilderness, on our way to Zion, is constantly to keep in mind, and obey the divine injunction, “to lay aside every weight, and the sin which doth so easily beset us, and to run with patience, *the race that is set before us,*” the Christian race, as set before us in the word of God. In the Olympic games, to which the Apostle has a reference in this passage, the race ground for the competitors, was marked out in the most precise manner, and he who deviated from the prescribed course, not only *lost the prize*, but was in imminent danger of wounds, and death, from sharp stakes, and sometimes deep rivers, which formed the boundaries of the race ground. And thus, the Christian in the race to Zion, must walk in the way prescribed, and pointed out, by the God of Zion. The believer is not left to run at random, to chuse any course he pleases, the way is plainly marked out by the great Judge, and the tremendous threatenings of the word, proclaim the danger, of deviating from that way. We must not then, fritter away the truths of the God of heaven, to please carnal and worldly men. We must not break down the boundaries, Jehovah has set up, nor substitute “will worship,” for his directions and commands. We must not act as though we preferred the applause of perishing worms, to the answer of a good conscience, and the approbation of the Judge of all the earth. We must not with “axes and hammers,” cut, and break down the “carved work” of the sanctuary, nor destroy those marks God has made to point out the path of duty. We must *so run, and so believe*, as God has revealed, not making courses and inventions of our own, and then saying of them, as haughty Naaman of old, “are not Abana, and Parphar, rivers of Damascus better than all the waters of Israel?” This is like guilty, backsliding Israel, to set up your “threshold,” against God’s threshold, and your “post,” against Christ’s post; it is an attempt to dispossess him of his right to prescribe laws to the conscience, and rules for his own worship; it is to polute his ordinances, with your own inventions, and to “defile his holy name.” Such attempts to add to God’s institutions, to what infinite wisdom has spoken, and deemed *sufficient*, is both foolish, and dangerous. It is more foolish than to attempt to add by the “smoke of the pit,” to the splendor of the meridian sun, it is infinitely more dangerous, than to rush upon the drawn sword, it is “to stretch out the hand against God,” to sport with the damnation of hell. The plague broke in upon those, who, of old, “provoked him to anger with their inventions,” and he is as jealous of his honor, glory, and institutions still. At the close of his Bible, he has placed a solemn warning, which *encircles every ordinance, every “jot” and “tittle,” of the word of God*, with a barrier, far more terrible than *that death*, which stood to guard the flaming mountain of Sinai; a barrier, which they who break through, though they may not *instantly*, be “put to death,” yet shall they in the end find, that it is a fearful thing

to trifle with the threatenings, to brave the vengeance of the living God, "I testify," is the language of him who is the first and the last, the King of kings, and Lord of lords,—“I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, if any man shall *add unto these things*, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book, and if any man shall *take away* from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book.” “All scripture, is given by inspiration of God,” all, is clothed with a divine warrant, every iota, bear the the stamp of divine authority, and a thus “saith the Lord,” asserts, that *all* is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; and for furnishing the man of God thoroughly unto all good works. There is a spirit of false charity abroad, which dares to sit in judgment on God’s word, and impiously to pronounce certain parts of that word, indifferent, and “*non-essential*,” though infinite wisdom hath proclaimed *all* to be profitable, and necessary. But “he that believeth not God, hath made him a liar.” No Christian, when he reflects aright, who acknowledges the Bible to be the word of God, but will also acknowledge, that every word of that Bible is true, and just, and necessary, and will unite in the prayer of the Psalmist, “O that my ways were directed to keep thy statutes! Then shall I not be ashamed, when I have respect unto *all* thy commandments.” How dangerous the situation of ministers and people, who are “not valiant for the truth, upon the earth,” who instead of lifting up the shield of truth, to oppose, and quench the poisoned arrows of error instead of bearing a testimony for the truth, shrink back, afraid of the sword of the tongue, the reproach of men, while careless of exposing themselves to that fearful threatening, “he that denieth me before men, shall be denied before the angels of God.” He who holds back any one truth, or neglects to testify against any one error, because it is *unpopular*, is a traitor to his trust. His duty is, to preach the truth, the whole truth, leaving the issue with his God. He, and he alone, who acts thus, can appeal with any consistency or *truth*, on a dying bed, when his ministry is closing and his work almost ended, as Paul appealed to the elders of Ephesus, “I take you to record this day, that I am pure from the blood of all men;” and why—“for I have not shunned to declare unto you *all* the counsel of God.” There are few cases more dangerous than his, who is anxious about being on the popular side, anxious to be esteemed *liberal*, and willing to be thought so, at the expense of truth; who preaches only smooth things, who holds back the truth, because it may not be relished by the multitude, who though God has spoken it, and thought it worthy of revealing, presumptuously acts, as if he thought it unworthy of regard, or belief; when, for aught he knows, the Spirit of truth, may be pleased to bless that disregarded portion of his own word, to the comfort and salvation of souls. Ministers and people, are bound to bear a testimony for the truth, for the whole truth, and against the sins and errors abounding around us, if they would not be “partakers of other men’s sins,” and accessory in plunging souls into an eternity of woe. This is clearly the meaning of the Apostle, in that striking passage, “Have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them;” plainly intimating, that we have a fellowship in the guilt, and a participation in the sins, which we do not reprove. Let no man say, *he* cannot be charged with the guilt abounding around us, because he does not expressly teach error, or advocate erroneous opinions. If we do not, as the Apostle enjoins, *reprove* prevailing sins and errors, we partake of the guilt, and cannot expect to escape, a participation in the punishment. “Why *compellest* thou the

Gentiles, to live as do the Jews?" was the *reproof* of Paul to Peter. Now Peter did not compel, did not urge, in his preaching, the Gentiles to live in the observance of the ceremonial law, as if necessary to justification; it was his example, (as you will find by examining the whole passage, Gal. ii. 11—14,) Paul represents, as forcing the Gentiles, to error and sin. Thus, though a man may hold the truth by profession, yet if he goes, and hears the counsel which causeth to err, if he goes and holds communion with those, who are guilty of adding human inventions, or erroneous opinions to the word of God; instead of *reproving*, he is thus encouraging them in their errors, he is "bidding them God speed," he is a partaker of their evil deeds. A passage formerly quoted, shows, that he who rejects the least truth, makes God a liar, and they who countenance an individual, or individuals, a church, or churches who do so, are themselves marked by God as equally guilty, and more careful, about being *popular* with men, than faithful to their God. And what then is gained by this false charity, this indifference to the truth? It leads men to despise the truths of God, encourages men in error, endangers souls, charges God foolishly, and for what? For an unhallowed, *hollow*, outward peace, where there is no peace; for the sake of a Babel mixture of different parties, where there is *no union*, where some perhaps, are found speaking the language of Canaan, some that of Ashdod, some swearing by the Lord, and some by Malcham. There can be no peace in a church, or churches, if this peace is made at the expense of truth. This indifference to the truth, is directly opposed to the language and conduct of our Lord himself. "To this end was I born," said the Great Head of the church, to the unprincipled Pilate, thus bearing himself a pointed testimony for the truth, "for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth." He never showed indifference to the truth. As the great witness for the truth, he not only solemnly reprov'd, and warn'd those, who held the truth in unrighteousness, but thundered the severest threatenings against the Pharisees, who had made void the word of God, by their *human inventions and traditions*. He has also warn'd all his people, to beware of false prophets, who come in sheep's clothing, but inwardly are ravening wolves; to beware, lest they bring poison, and death, to the lambs of the flock; to weigh every thing, in divine worship, in the balances of the sanctuary; to make trial of every spirit, by the standard of the word. If the principles of modern charity, if indifference to the truth be correct, and justifiable, then, the three Hebrew youths, who were cast alive into the "burning fiery furnace" at Babylon, were bigots, in refusing to fall down before the golden image, which Nebuchadnezzar had set up, in the plain of Dura. They knew that an idol was nothing, and according to the mode of reasoning, used by the spirit we are opposing, if they had any scruples of conscience, they might have worshipp'd Jehovah through the idol, as is said now, of some other human inventions; they might have looked on it, as a "help to their devotions," and not have risked their lives, and not have been so illiberal as to pretend, that they *three alone*, were right, and all the princes, the governors, and captains, all the rulers of the provinces, and all the people, nations, and languages, who had fallen down before the image, were wrong. On this principle, that cloud of witnesses spoken of in the eleventh of the Hebrews, who suffered for the truth, who were stoned, sawn asunder, slain with the sword, destitute, afflicted, tormented, exposed themselves to needless sufferings. On this principle, those martyrs of Jesus, who in the primitive ages of the church, refused to cast even a grain of incense on the altar of an idol, or even to "look at the worship of idols," and who, for this, were scourged, and crucified, and thrown to the lions, drew on them-

selves *needless tortures*. On this principle, those faithful servants of Jesus, who suffered for the truth in the land of our fathers, who resisted even unto blood, the contradictions of errorists, and sinners, against the master they loved, died as a fool dieth. And did the God of heaven look on the sufferings of these martyrs, as though they were shedding their blood, for a thing of naught, "Nehushtan," a piece of brass, a non-essential? (And those truths, for which many of our fathers died, are now at our very doors, and alas! even by their degenerate offspring, ridiculed and treated as things indifferent, as "non-essential.") No, the Lord taught their hands to war, and their fingers to fight, he forsook them not in the fiery flame, his love, shed abroad in their hearts, his *peace*, keeping their souls calm and serene amid the most exquisite torments, enabled them to call a bed of flames, "a bed of roses;" and even amid the pangs that were terminating their existence, to shout the song of triumph and praise, "O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory? Thanks be to God which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ. Worthy is the Lamb that was slain—blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, forever and ever. We are more than conquerors, through him that loved us."

Nadab and Abihu, are not the only guilty ones, who have fallen beneath the divine indignation, for trifling with Jehovah's word and institutions. God has sanctified his name, and glorified his power by sending forth his judgments against others, who dared like them, to defile his institutions by their inventions. It was for this sin, that the ten tribes, who pretended to worship the true Jehovah through the golden calves, were driven into captivity, and forced to wander up and down, a "reproach, and a proverb, a taunt and a curse." And thus, when king Ahaz went to Damascus to meet Tiglath Pileser, king of Assyria, he "saw an altar that was at Damascus: and king Ahaz sent to Urijah, the priest, the fashion of the altar, and the pattern of it, (thinking it *handsomer*, probably, than the one made by divine appointment) and Urijah the priest built," &c. (See 2 Kings, xvi. 10—12.) The remarks of Henry on this passage are judicious and just. "The king of Assyria having taken Damascus, thither Ahaz went to congratulate him on his success, and to receive his commands. Had he been faithful to his God, he had not needed to have crouched thus to a foreign power. At Damascus, either while viewing the rarities of the place, or rather, *while joining with them in their devotions*, (for when he was there he thought it no harm to do as they did) he saw an altar that pleased his fancy extremely; not such a *plain old fashioned one*, as that which he had been trained up in attendance upon, at Jerusalem, but curiously carved, it is likely, and adorned with image work; there were many things about it which were significant, he thought, surprising, charming, and calculated to *excite his devotion*. Solomon had but a dull fancy, he thinks, compared with the ingenious artist that made this altar. Nothing will serve him, but he must have an altar just like this, a pattern of it must be taken immediately. The pattern God showed to Moses in the mount, or to David by the Spirit, was not comparable to this pattern sent from Damascus. The hearts of idolaters walked after their eyes," &c. The faithless, and temporizing priest Urijah, having made the altar, Ahaz, when he came from Damascus, not only offered sacrifices on the altar of human contrivance, neglecting the one divinely appointed, but removed God's altar away out of its appointed place, to make room for his own. And what was the issue of his idolatries, his sinful inventions and additions to God's institutions. They were "the ruin of him, and of all Israel"—brought desolating judgments upon him and his, and have transmitted his name

to latest generations, branded by the Spirit of God with this note of infamy, "and in the time of his distress, did he trespass yet more against the Lord: *this is that king Ahaz.*"

Shall we not then in conclusion, at present, prize as invaluable, and contend earnestly for, the word of God, and esteem it better unto us than thousands of gold and silver. Shall we not in the spirit of Luther, who said, that he would not take all the world for *one half* of the Bible; shall we not esteem all the gold, all the treasures of earth, as less than the dust of the balance, compared with "one leaf," *one truth*, of this blessed book. As you value its warnings, when the soul is in danger, as you value its promises in the hour of sorrow, as you would be established, and saved by its doctrines, directed by its commands, and examples, and cheered by the hope of glory which it reveals; as you would grow in grace, as you would not be charged with treason against the Head of the Church, and cast from his throne as faithless, and unworthy: we charge you, in the name of God, and as you will answer, it at his tribunal, to beware of indifference to the truth, disobedience to the truth, or neglect of the least truth, to "contend earnestly for the faith, once delivered to the saints." The church is bound to contend earnestly for the truth, to stand steadfast in the defence of every truth, every ordinance, every duty, every *tota* of the word, as she will answer it to him, who beareth the "sword with two edges," and who has proclaimed, "Whosoever shall be ashamed of me and of *my words*," (*all his words*, no exception, see Mark viii. 38,) "in this adulterous and sinful generation, of him also, shall the Son of Man be ashamed, when he cometh in the glory of his Father, with the holy angels." Let every Christian then remember his duty. Be faithful, be diligent, quit yourselves like men, be strong, live for your God, and his truths, as his covenanted people, that when the failing, dying eye looks back on a past life, you may be able to say, "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have *kept the faith.*" "Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life."

ART. II. *The Discourse of a Minister to himself in a time of trouble.*

"MAN is born to trouble as the sparks fly upward." The Christian is born to pass through and rise above it, in triumph. As it is the sovereign will of the God of glory, "to bring all his many sons" by that road to the wealthy place, it must be vain for any one to expect anything else, and very erroneous to conclude, that a man is not a child of God because he is troubled, or because his troubles are in some things peculiar to himself. For upon near inspection, there is a peculiarity in the troubles, and in the mercies too, of every one, discernible; which is to be regarded as the *mark*, which sovereign love has put upon its object. We "cannot know love or hatred (of God towards a man) by all that is before us." God sends some troubles on one man *because* he is his own child, and allows another to pass through the world under a full gale of prosperity, because he is a bastard. There is just as little to be learned concerning a man's *creed*, as the state of his soul, from the outward dispensations of God's providence towards him. People sometimes make haste to pronounce a man's afflictions to be *judgments*, for his narrowness and bigotry, as they are pleased to term it, and on the other hand, to call the success of a scheme, the countenance of heaven—the blessing of God. But do we not read, that those "of whom the world was not

worthy" were "destitute, afflicted, tormented?" Were not the Apostles, while "approving themselves as the ministers of God in all things"—"in much patience, in afflictions, in necessities, in distress, in stripes, in imprisonments," &c? On the other hand, do not perverse and corrupt teachers often succeed the best in drawing a multitude after them? Are not corrupt churches generally, very prosperous? Did ever any system under heaven enjoy greater or longer external prosperity, than that which came from the bottomless pit—Popery?

But although the afflictive dispensations of providence, are not to be a criterion, either of the state of the soul, or the soundness of a profession; yet it will be our wisdom to be stirred up by them, to a close and scriptural examination of ourselves on these points. Though we may be children, yet we may be luke warm, careless, and carnal to a degree, and for a time: though our profession be sound, and our private carriage and public official course, so far as it goes, not to be blamed; yet we may be greatly deficient. Though we may appear, on comparison with the present age of religion, as too extremely zealous and strict; yet compared with the generation of the righteous, that have gone before us, and still more compared with the intense importance of the cause of truth, in which we are engaged, we may be extremely cold and loose.

It has frequently fallen to the lot of those who have lived in the greatest nearness and familiarity with God, to suffer the severest afflictions. Witness the case of Abraham, Jacob, Job, David, and others. This is not without reasons, that are befitting the love of God; for when sore trouble is blessed, as it always is to people of that character, it is a means of bringing them to greater nearness, and fuller acquaintance still. God comes down to walk with his tried ones in the furnace, and makes visits to their souls, of peculiar endearment. Ministers of the gospel are, or *ought* to be among those who live near to God. If they are not, their official performances will be scarcely anything more than a body without a spirit. Perhaps the general experience of those in the holy ministry partakes of deep trouble. And it is wisely so? Those who *do* live in, near, and close communion with their Great Master, will as I just hinted, be brought nearer and closer by this means. Not that affliction has any thing in itself to effect this, but by a divine ordination, under the direction of infinite wisdom and power, it brings forth this fruit in them who are made up of the *flesh and the spirit*. By this means those also, who have not yet attained to this nearness, may be tutored into it, and led into the secret place of his pavilion, and have his holy covenant manifested to them; while it sometimes strips the covering off those who are not what they profess to be, and exposes them in their own colors.

There are few troubles that fall to the lot of the Lord's people, in which ministers do not share, and there are some that are peculiar to themselves. They as well as others, suffer in their property, their relations, their reputation, their personal comfort, body and mind. And by reason of their station, their suffering is frequently more severe. When the tongue of the slanderer and defamer, gets a permission to assail them, it cuts deep into personal peace and public usefulness. When persecution is let loose against the Church, *they* are generally its first victims and feel its fiercest rage. When satan obtains leave to stand up against *them* he "sifts them as wheat," and tries to insert his most deadly poison into their most vulnerable part. When *they* are left to doubt, their doubting brings in distress of a peculiar intensity, into the soul, which *no* others are strangers to. A train of most dismal conclusions rush in to the soul behind it. And while, perhaps, they are preaching

peace and consolation to the people before them, the soul within them is "melting and dropping away with heaviness and grief," they feel their "foot slipping," and to their inward sense nothing presents itself, but "overwhelming." When a private believer is in trouble, his fellows come one after another to him with words of comfort and encouragement, but a minister is thought not to *need* any! and that plain christians are not qualified to give it! and so his trouble, shut up within his own bosom, is left to prey upon the heart. Then too, his very familiarity with the scriptures, being more the fruit of official labor than of private exercise and experience, does not bring the word that is adapted, with so much power and sweetness to his relief as otherwise it would. And if the merciful sovereign, Holy One, did not frequently send the word with new power, the soul, amidst the multitude of warring thoughts *would* be overwhelmed.

The afflictions of a minister are perhaps the most important parts of his life—most important to *himself*, that he should know how to *endure* on gospel principles, and in a christian frame and temper of soul—most important to his hearers and all that know him, that he should be able to *walk uprightly*, through the whole course of his trials, that they may see that the doctrines of truth, when put to a practical trial fully stand the test. If he go straight through on his feet without staggering or falling, it may strengthen the weak and confirm the wavering more than a hundred unanswerable arguments. It may give courage to the fearful. It *will* rejoice the heart of the experienced. It will be a powerful example and lesson to the young beginner: It may, through the same gracious spirit, be the means of converting some sinners from the error of their way, and saving their souls from death, and it will be glorifying to the God of all grace and truth. But if the flesh get the upper hand, if he give way to unbelief and fear, discontent and murmuring, or charge God with being austere, and reflect upon his profession, or repent of his having entered the ministry, or say "verily I have washed my hands in innocency in vain," or become hardened and careless, and fall from his former attainments, the contrary of all these good and desirable effects will follow, the wicked will be hardened in his way, the infidel will be confirmed, satan will triumph, the weak in faith will tremble, and the righteous will hang down the head, besides that, *himself* may be spiritually injured, and go halting to the grave.

Right views of the afflictions, which are sent upon us, is a matter which requires our serious attention, as without them we cannot walk uprightly under them. If our views are confined to second causes, and their effects, or if by any means we are prevented from viewing them as included in the covenant of grace, which is "ordered in all things," as measured out to us by infinite wisdom, love, and faithfulness, and that under the guidance of these divine perfections, they will "work together for our good," we cannot be properly "exercised thereby." Also if we are careless and indifferent about this view of our troubles, though we know it to be the only true and evangelical one, and do not strenuously endeavor to bring the *eye* and the *heart* to *rest* upon it together, it is probable there may be great miscarriages under them, and that the good effects of them may be lost to us for the time. This is a common view, which all the children of God ought to take of all troubles that befall them. The covenant in regard to the troubles of the whole family is in these words:—"If they brake my statutes and keep not my commandments, I will visit their transgressions with the rod and their iniquity with stripes," &c.

But besides this, there are some views which it concerns a minister of the gospel in particular to take of them. I think that without any dan-

ger of mistake, he ought to look on all trouble and affliction as designed to put him to an experimental proof of his own doctrine before the people. Every such dispensation comes to him labelled with these words, "if ye know (*and preach*) these things, happy are ye if ye do them." You preach to others, that God's promised strength is in proportion to the day of trouble, now then draw enough from it yourself, and prove this. You preach, that justification by faith in the imputed righteousness of Christ, yields a peace to the soul that passeth all understanding, now show this peace in yourself. You often exhort to absolute submission to infinite sovereignty, which gives none account of its matters; yield now this submission. You have often called for patience under the rod; now this call comes to you. You have deprecated with a curse the "putting trust in man;" now then, when man stands aloof from your sore, show that you are content to trust in the Lord only. You have said much about reducing all doctrine to practice; an important season for practising on your own doctrine has now come to you. There *was* comparatively little to prove, that you are hearty and sincere in all these doctrines when you and your connections and your family were in health, and prosperity, and surrounded by friends, popular and apparently successful. There might easily be an appearance of *standing* while you were only propped and stayed round about, by these outward things; but now "the soul is come into deep waters," in which, there can be *no standing* unless the feet of faith have been set down and settled on the eternal truth of God, "now it is come upon thee," what shall be said "if thou faintest! The eyes of heaven, earth, and hell, are upon you, waiting to see the issue of this conflict, in which you are engaged. Now is the time to give a powerful testimony to the cause of your master; let beams of vital truth, burning in the heart, break through the thickest cloud of your calamities; let faith, hope, and patience come forth and do their work. Take hold of that very arm which is uplifted with the rod, as your refuge; say unto "God that hides himself, that smites, that slays," and that apparently, has "cast you off and forgotten you," "Thou art the God of my strength,—God my exceeding joy—the health of my countenance," "for yet I know I shall him praise."

Affliction ought to put any of the Lord's people, but especially a minister, upon *proving and trying* the word of God, that is his promise. Not that he ought to apply to it, with any doubt of it in his mind, that were neither more nor less than unbelief. But as God in marvellous condescension calls upon his people "to prove him, if he will not open the windows of heaven and pour them out a blessing until there shall not be room to receive;" and again, "the word of the Lord is tried," so there must be a *way* of trying it. Metals are tried by subjecting them to the fire. That mode of trial resembles the way in which the Lord tries his people. The trial of his own word is compared to the same thing. "The words of God, are words most pure, they be like silver tried," &c. He has given out his word on purpose, that it might be put to the severest test, that it may be seen that all the power and skill of men and devils are not able to detect any thing false or corrupt in it. Besides this, there is another sense of the phrase, to prove or to try, in scripture. We try the generosity of a person, by soliciting of him a great bounty. We try his wisdom, by putting him to contrive and execute something exceedingly difficult or intricate; his power is tried when he is put to perform something great, or hard to be done. It is in this way, that we try or prove *God's word*; by drawing largely upon it and often. God has given his word for the supply of all our wants; for our support, and deliverance, and salvation. When, therefore, we bring the

multitude of our wants, weakness and temptations, and place them *beside* his word, calling upon him to make it good, in meeting all these with adequate supply, we prove it. Now, in a time of affliction, we are, or ought to be, very sensible of many wants, of absolute weakness, extreme danger, spiritual maladies, &c., and when the affliction continues long, these are often brought up to view, and sometimes increased and multiplied. This is a special season for searching out the seasonable, adapted promise, and trying what it will do for us. Sometimes the cloud thickens and blackens, forbidding all hope, and then is the time to try the example of Abraham, who hoped against hope, and leaned on *Almighty power*. God *was able* to accomplish his promises. Are we beset round with difficulties without, and on the point of sinking within, amidst a multitude of overwhelming thoughts, let us try what that word will do; "he giveth power to him that is ready to faint, and to them who have no might, he increaseth strength." He turneth the shaddow of death into the morning. Is the heart melting down with incessant grief and sorrow? let us turn to the Psalms and see what such a verse will do, "weeping may for a night endure, at morn doth joy arise;" and this, "Why art thou cast down O my soul, and why art thou disquited within me, hope thou in God;" and this, "Be of good courage and he shall strengthen your heart, all ye that hope in the Lord." Is it almost impossible at some times to sit down with any degree of composure, to prepare for the Sabbath day? let us go again to that vade-mecum of the minister, if it should be the thousandth time, "My grace shall be sufficient for thee, and my strength is made perfect in weakness," and see what it will do. Or to that which is intended for extraordinary occasions, "It shall be *given* you in that same hour what ye shall speak." It is a great and lasting encouragement, that there can be no case of trouble, nor can there be *any* circumstance attending it, for which God has not spoken a "word in season." Let the afflicted go on then in this work, searching out the word, that suits, until he has laid the whole weight of his case, with its every particular, on the word of God. He cannot be better employed. And he shall see whether or not the words of God will stand. Let him persevere in this, from week to week, and from month to month, if trouble last so long, until "the number of his months" are finished, and he *shall* not find *one* good word to fail; all shall come to pass. He shall find that God is a friend in time of need—a tried friend, present, a sure and all-sufficient help, he *shall* not sink, he *will* be supported from one time to another, until his escape from trouble comes, and his trouble becomes his song. Perhaps it is to put him to this work, that trouble and sore affliction is sent, and to shut him up to it, that "all refuge fails him, and no man seems to care for his soul." And with the blessing of God it will be of singular advantage. Many a word of God and he, will now contract acquaintance for life. It will create a new and rich fund for the pulpit. It will strengthen all the graces. This is the very ground on which "tribulation works patience, and patience experience, and experience hope that maketh not ashamed."

Afflictions ought to set a minister upon proving and trying *himself*. This is to be done by testing himself by the qualifications required in the ministry, and the duties laid upon them in the word, especially in the example of Paul, and the injunctions which he gives to Timothy and Titus, and to the elders of Ephesus. He "served the Lord with all *humility* of mind"—"kept nothing back that was profitable to them, but showed and taught them publicly, and from house to house." He "did not shun to declare the whole counsel of God." He had "the care of all the churches." He "travailed in birth until Christ was formed in" his hearers. He considered himself "as set for the defence of the Gospel." He "could

do nothing against the truth, but for the truth." He spared no labor, hazard, difficulty, suffering or sacrifice, that was in his power to serve Christ, and establish the churches in the possession of gospel truth and liberty. "Yea, and beyond his power—he was pressed out of measure." So would he have Timothy and others to follow his example in all these and other things, wherein he followed Christ, the Chief Shepherd. "Be not ashamed of the testimony of our Lord; but be thou a partaker," says he, "of the afflictions of the gospel, according to the power of God." To all these things the minister of the gospel has solemnly promised, as the Lord shall give him opportunity and strength. Now, there is a suitable occasion for instituting a strict and solemn inquiry how he has acquitted himself. How has he regarded his ordination vows, and his solemn covenant engagement? What has his private and personal life been? How has "he ruled his own house?" How has he prayed for the flock of his charge? visited the sick from house to house? catechised? preached? and judged in courts? How has he "contended for the faith once delivered to the saints?" How has "he held fast the form of sound words?" Has he "been grieved for the afflictions of Joseph?" Has he "sighed and cried for the abominations done in the land?" Has he been earnest with God in behalf of a backsliding church in proportion to his perception and fear of impending judgments? If he will search with persevering and painful accuracy after the true answer to these and the like questions, it must needs be that he will see much to condemn and deplore, and that all he has done is defective and defiled—remaining corruptions much stronger than might have been expected from his advantages, and grace much weaker.

[To be concluded.]

ART. III. *Repentance; a Tract, by Rev. Alexander Bullions, D. D., Cambridge, New-York.*

The infatuated prodigal left his fathers's house, where he enjoyed happiness and safety, and went into a far country. There he associated with profligates, rioted in debauchery, and speedily wasted his patrimony. This reduced him to penury, and constrained him to engage in degrading employ, to gain a subsistence, which he failed of obtaining. During the whole of this ruinous and criminal process, from safety, honor and plenty, to extreme danger, deep disgrace and utter wretchedness, he lived in perpetual infatuation, without remorse for the past, and without concern about his present condition or future prospects. If conscience ever awoke and smote him, its voice was hushed in the revel of intoxication, and his agitated feelings soothed with the syren song of guilty pleasure. He was deranged, actually fascinated. The spell, however, was at last broken,—the pleasing dream dissipated by the keen gnawings of hunger, constantly and painfully demanding gratification, which he could not furnish. This brought him to his senses, and he began to act rationally and hopefully, by considering his condition, how he came into it and how he might be delivered from it, and restored to his former standing in society. Now his folly and his guilt appeared in their true colors,—he could not hide them from his eyes, and they touched his very soul. He saw and felt, that he had played the fool, in leaving his father's house—associating with the vile, and squandering all his patrimony, by indulging in crimes. Conscience told him, that he deserved forever the misery he had brought upon himself. Nothing, now prevented him

from sinking into despondency, but the persuasion of the love and compassion of his father. Compelled by his own urgent necessities, and encouraged by the hope of forgiveness and reception by his father,—he arose, returned to his father spontaneously, confessed his folly and guilt, cordially and humbly submitted to his father, and is welcomed with demonstrations of joy.

The returning prodigal is the exact representative, or pattern of every converted sinner. They have, one and all, left their father's house, service, society, and enjoyment; associated with his enemies, plunged into crimes as they could, and have tasted the bitterness of misery. God has not been in all their thoughts. They have lived in pleasure, walking according to the course of this world. This has brought them into misery either outward or inward or both. They have been made to feel that it is an evil and a bitter thing, that they have sinned against the Lord their God and that his fear was not in them. They have also felt that they were wretched and could never taste felicity unless they returned to their father's house. Persuaded that he is merciful and forgives iniquity, they have confessed to him their sins, returned to his house, and have been kindly received and richly entertained. They have been sorry for their sins, renounced them in love and practice, and returned to obedience. The views that they entertain, the feelings they experience, and the exercises they perform in their interesting progress from sin to righteousness, are expressed by the general term, repentance. The following topics with their illustrations, are intended to embrace the substance of what the scriptures reveal concerning it.

SEC. I. THE NATURE OF REPENTANCE. The genuine nature of true evangelical repentance may in part, be ascertained from the scriptural terms employed to denote it. In the Old Testament, there are two terms which we translate, by repentance. The one means a return. This imports, that the transgressor is departing from the Lord, and that the penitent is sensible of his mistake, and is now turned about, and is re-tracing his steps, in order to return to his father's house. The transgressor is the prodigal departing from his father's house; the penitent, the same prodigal returning. He has heard and is complying with the divine call, "Return, return, O backsliding children, and I will receive you." The other term signifies the deep sigh drawn from the bottom of the sorrowful heart, and is expressive of strong inward commotion. The tranquil and merry hours of the prodigal have passed away, and his soul has been made like a fiery oven, by the spirit of judgment, bondage and burning. He has been at the foot of Sinai—seen the lightning and the smoke, and heard the voice of God himself, and trembled for his own safety. He is returning unto the Lord, but it is with weeping and supplication. A sense of sin and unworthiness has broken his adamant heart, and he is now humble and contrite. He is smiting on his thigh in grief and shame for his follies and his crimes. In the New Testament, there are also, two terms which are rendered repentance. The one, and the one which occurs most frequently denotes after-thought, consideration of our past conduct, and a change of views concerning it. Once we paid no regard to it, or deemed it indifferent, and perhaps even praiseworthy, or at the very worst, deserving little censure and punishment. But if true penitents, we have seriously reviewed our past conduct, and are fully satisfied that it was an express breach of the law of God, and exposes us to its curse. This new view has filled us with much anxiety about ourselves, and this anxiety is expressed by the other term, translated repentance. Both terms denote a change of sentiment about our conduct and deep solicitude to be delivered from it.

And according to the views we entertain of God, and of ourselves, as

sinner, will be our feelings and exercises. If we deem God to be one like ourselves, who may be flattered and imposed on, we will feignedly profess sorrow for our sin and hypocritically return to him. This hypocritical repentance is common with multitudes in the day of distress, and vanishes when that distress is removed. If we see our sin to be exceeding great, and despair of pardon, we will be filled with the sorrow of the world, which worketh death. This was the repentance of Cain and of Judas. If we see our sins in the light, in which the scriptures exhibit them, and view them in connection with the pardoning mercy of God, going out to the most guilty through Jesus Christ the Mediator, our souls will be filled with godly sorrow, shame and hatred of sin, and will renounce it and return to God and our duty. This is that evangelical repentance, which is not to be repented of, and is unto salvation, and is thus admirably defined:—"Repentance unto life, is a saving grace wrought in the heart of a sinner by the Spirit and word of God, whereby, out of a sight and sense not only of the danger, but also of the filthiness and odiousness of his sin, and upon the apprehension of God's mercy in Christ to such as are penitent, he so grieves for, and hates his sins, as that he turns from them all to God, purposing and endeavoring to walk with him in all the ways of new obedience." According to this definition, repentance consists of the three following acts or ingredients:

1. Correct apprehensions of the abominable nature and fearful consequences of sin, and also of God's gracious character as the just God and the Saviour.

"Surely after that I was turned I repented, and after that I was instructed I smote upon my thigh, I was ashamed yea even confounded because I did bear the reproach of my youth." (Jer. xxxi. 19.) "Rend your heart and not your garments, and turn unto the Lord your God, for he is gracious and merciful, slow to anger and of great kindness, and repenteth him of the evil." Joel ii. 13.

The knowledge of sin, said an Epicurean philosopher, is the beginning of safety. This is true as gospel, and proved by this, that while all are sinners, there are few penitents. And what is the reason of this? Ignorance, sheer ignorance, is the true and sufficient cause. Some are so ignorant of the law of God that they know not when they keep or violate it. Some who have considerable knowledge of the letter of the law, are greatly unacquainted with its spirituality and extent. And some are so inattentive to their transgressions, that when reproved for them they plead, in excuse, that transgression is become habitual, and is committed without thought. All these are absolutely or comparatively ignorant of the nature, number and desert of their crimes. They have never seen the abominable nature of sin as committed against the Holy One of Israel, the Saviour and friend of sinners; and consequently are little affected with the fearful desert and ruinous consequences of transgression. The only sins that affect them, are those of the grosser kind, and they dread only their temporary consequences. The result is, that they remain at ease in their sins, have in general no concern about the pleasure or displeasure of God, and live hardened and impenitent. This is their usual frame, and it is never otherwise with them, except when aroused for the moment by some startling disaster that has befallen themselves or some fellow creature, and the momentary impression with all the good resolutions formed, passes away with their occasion, and they relax into their former carelessness and wickedness. This is manifestly the state, feeling and conduct of the generality of the human race, buried in ignorance and thoughtlessness, and as the inevitable consequence, living at ease in the commission of crimes while destruction is impending over them.

The frame of mind, and also the exercises of many are very different from those of ignorant transgressors. By means of instruction and personal reflection, they have attained much correct scriptural knowledge of God and of themselves, as transgressors of his law; certain circumstances and events of life, have frequently and intensely called their minds to their conduct, and every review of it, and comparison with the divine law makes them more and more sensible, that their transgressions are infinite, many of them dreadfully aggravated, and all, most abominable. Some of these fix their attention chiefly on the desert of sin, as exposing them to punishment, and being ignorant of the pardoning mercy of God, are dreading that it cannot be extended to them, are seized with terror, and their souls are rising up, in hatred of God, as their enemy, and in rebellion against him; others of them fix their attention more immediately on the abominable nature of sin, and, remaining ignorant of the purifying efficacy of Christ's blood, are exceedingly distressed with an overwhelming sense of their own vileness and unworthiness. There are others whose minds are illuminated with correct views of sin and of salvation from it. The Holy Ghost has been at work upon them as the spirit of conviction, illumination and conversion. According to the language of the prophet, they have been "converted" and "instructed." They know the law in its purity, spirituality and extent. They are acquainted with God, as the God of holiness and majesty, justice and mercy. They have reviewed his providential and gracious dealings with themselves and with others. They have also contemplated him as gracious in the Son of his love, establishing the covenant of grace, and freely giving Christ and eternal life to sinners, that were rebelling against him. His kindness is not only seen but felt by them. They have known and believed the love that God has towards them. They are persuaded that he is their sovereign, their friend and their Saviour. This conviction pervades their souls, and humbles them to the dust, because they have sinned against such an one. They see and feel, on this account, that their sin is most abominable, and this sight makes them, in grief, shame and indignation, smite on their thigh and loath themselves. They can say, when they thus view sin and God, "against thee, thee only have we sinned, and in thy sight done this ill." They are perfectly sensible, that they are so covered with the loathsome pollution of sin as to be utterly unfit for pure society, pure services, and pure enjoyments; This pollution is most distressing to them; it is ever before them, and they keenly feel their need of cleansing, and earnestly desire it. They can heartily pray, "cleans thou me, and I shall be clean." It is joyful news for them to hear, "that there is a fountain opened for sin and uncleanness." The promise of "sprinkling clean water upon them, and making them clean," is refreshing to their souls. It gladdens them to learn, on the authority of God himself, "that the blood of Jesus Christ, God's Son, cleanseth from from all sin," and "that he is made sanctification."

They are also aware of the desert of their sins. They are convinced that they are evil as well as abominable. They are sensible that they justly and certainly expose them to all the evils of this life, to death itself, and to the pains of hell forever. They are persuaded that they deserve all these, and that God would act justly in delivering them up to execution. This sense of the desert of sin, when separated from a view of the pardoning mercy of God in Christ drives to despair, but when coupled with this, impels to flee from the wrath to come, to the refuge set before us. Impelled thus by fear and hope, the trembling and alarmed sinner betakes himself to the mercy of God and cries for forgiveness for Christ's sake. He sees God appeased by the sacrifice of

Christ, all the demands of the law fulfilled, itself magnified and made honorable, and the sight inspires him with such confidence, that he comes to God as his covenant God, and takes refuge in atoning blood.

These views of sin and of God, which the penitent entertains, are not unproductive, but as influential on his feelings and conduct, as the light and heat of the vernal sun, are on the earth; the earth on its productions, and the tree on its fruits. This is the necessary result of the human constitution, according to which all the feelings of the heart, and all conduct in life originate in, and are influenced by the views of the understanding. Hence we notice,

II. That the views of sin and of God, cherished by the penitent are productive of and followed by a "certain train of feelings, which constitute the second, and a very important ingredient in gospel repentance.

The correctness of this position is manifest from experience and observation. For it is impossible to discern that we have degraded and dishonored ourselves, without, on this account, being ashamed and filled with self-loathing. It is equally impossible to discern, that our sins have already deprived us of much good, involved us in great misery, and still expose us to the torments of hell, without, on these accounts being sorry for them, really hating them, fearing their consequences, and earnestly desiring deliverance. These feelings are so natural and unavoidable in the human heart, on a perception and conviction of sin, that they are no strangers among the most abandoned of men. The most profligate, blush when detected in the commission of enormous crimes, and seek the shades of secrecy, in which to perpetrate these crimes and to conceal their shame. The criminal, conscious of his desert, dreads deserved punishment, and is earnest to escape it. The very inmates of a prison, are sorry for their crimes and actually hate them, because they have deprived them of liberty, and subjected them to punishment. But all these feelings of shame, sorrow, fear, and hatred, may exist where there is no gospel repentance. They existed in Cain and Judas, and produced in both a certain species of repentance, but not that which is saving. Their repentance was not so much for the dishonor done to God by their crimes, as for the shame and injury done to themselves. All such penitents remain strangers to shame and sorrow on account of sin till detected. The sorrow they feel is selfish, and arises, not from their sin, but from the injury they have done themselves and their friends. They love still the sin, would willingly repeat it forever, and are grieved because the law is so strict as to forbid and punish it, and that they were such fools as to incur such lasting pains and privations for a momentary gratification. Hence the very moment the fear of punishment is removed, they return to their former sins, and with pleasure again indulge in them.

Furnish, on the other hand, an individual with the views of sin and God already described, and they will be followed by a corresponding train of feelings. Let him see the intrinsic abominations of sin, its utter loathsomeness, as committed against God, and let him see himself, also, as debased and ruined by it, and he will loath and abhor himself, and hate sin with a perfect hatred. He blushes at his own degradation, and cannot lift up his face before God or man. He is really humbled, and exclaims, not in ostentation but in sincerity, "behold I am vile." And the more he contemplates the beauty of holiness and the arrangements of heaven for cleansing from sin by the blood of Christ, and the sanctification of the Spirit, the more he is affected with his sin, and sinks deeper in abasement. He now understands the language of Job, addressed to the Almighty: "I have heard of thee by the hearing of the ear, but now mine eye seeth thee; wherefore I abhor myself, and repent in dust and ashes." And seeing the abominable nature of sin, every sin is odious to

him, and he desires cleansing, even from secret faults, hates the garments spotted by the flesh, and carefully avoids contracting additional pollution.

Reflecting on the relations God and man bear to him, and on the interests of both, and on his own, he perceives clearly the dreadful injury he has done to God, to man, and to himself, by transgression. He perceives that he has insulted God his creator, benefactor and preserver, by tarnishing his holiness, perverting his goodness, vilifying his majesty, and setting his justice and vengeance at defiance. The holiness, justice and goodness of that law of love and authority which he has habitually broken, stand before him revealed in their true colors. The love, grace and condescension of the Saviour, and of the Holy Ghost, which he has hitherto despised and rejected with contempt, pierce, melt and transport his very soul. He looks on fellow sinners, who have been his companions in guilt, and betrayed by him into sin, shame and wretchedness, and his guilt and self-loathing increase, and floods of tears flow for the incurable mischief he has done them. In the agony of distraction, he looks on the havoc he has wrought, and which he cannot repair. He also considers the felicity of which he has deprived himself by his own folly and crimes, and also the dreadful evils in which he is involved. These discoveries made to him by reflection, by the events of Providence, the revelations of the Bible, and the operations of the Spirit of God, fill him with shame, sorrow and indignation, deep, sincere and keen. These discoveries manifest to him what he did not before suspect, that sin is the worst foe, the foe of his God, of man, and of himself; and viewing it with disgust, his indignation burns against it, and he is determined on deadly vengeance. He is now sorry indeed for his sin, with a godly sorrow. He hates every false and wicked way with all his heart.

The degree in which any or all of these views and feelings, which we have been attempting to describe, must exist in the truly penitent, cannot be easily nor perhaps safely determined. They will be regulated in part by the clearness of their natural perceptions of sin and duty, the tenderness of their sensibility, and the extent of their spiritual illumination and conviction. The perceptions of some are far more distinct, and their conceptions far more vivid, than those of others. The low degree, however, in which these views and feelings are found in many, discovers how little real religion they possess, and to what an alarming extent they still remain under the power of a darkened understanding, and an impenitent heart. The substance of them is realised in every true penitent, and they are never to be regarded as salutary till they render it impossible for him to continue longer in sin, and bring forth their appropriate fruits in the life. This brings to notice,

III. That the above views and feelings respecting sin lead to, and manifest themselves in a certain tenor of conduct which constitutes the third, and a very important ingredient in true evangelical repentance.

The views the penitent entertains of sin, and the train of feelings excited by them, remain not inoperative, but bring forth fruit meet for repentance. The fruits they produce are various, and may also be safely regarded as infallible evidences of its genuineness. The most common and distinguishing of these fruits and evidences of true repentance, are,

1. Frank, open confession of sin. "I will declare mine iniquity, I will confess unto the Lord my trespasses. My son, give glory unto the Lord, and make confession unto him." This confession of our trespasses is no compensation to the Lord for our injustice against him, but is evidential of our views of sin, and is ever an inseparable accompaniment of true repentance. The sinner industriously seeks to hide his sin from himself, from others, and even from God, and when detected, he extenuates and palliates it; but the true penitent ingenuously confesses his sins. Con-

vinced of their number and aggravations, and feeling the greatness of his guilt and unworthiness, he is deeply affected with his situation, and fully convinced that God would act most justly in consigning him to ruin. The permanent conviction of his soul is that he could not stand, provided God marked his iniquity. This opens his mouth in self condemnation, in justification of God, and in magnifying the riches of pardoning mercy. His secret sins he confesses unto God, and his public sins and scandals he confesses before all men, especially before the church, and those whom he has offended. His private sins he confesses with all their aggravations, but in the acknowledgment of his public sins he is more general, though equally sincere. Thus David, who confessed his secret faults, and asked for cleansing from them, confessed his public sins before his servants, his family, and his subjects, and published to the world his sorrow for giving occasion to the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme. His penitential psalms are the public confession of his open sins. The confessions of the penitent are not merely verbal, but hearty, sincere, full and particular. They are made to the omniscient God by one sensible of his delinquencies, and penetrated by a lively sense of divine mercy in his forgiveness. They are made by a returning prodigal to his justly offended Father, but who has forgiven and kindly received and entertained him. He is therefore full and particular in enumerating all his sins, with their several aggravations, declaring them openly and confessing them frankly.

2. The true penitent sincerely endeavors to have all undone which he has done amiss, and particularly to make restitution to all he has defrauded or in any respect injured. The true penitent sincerely desires that undone which he has sinfully done, and uses every exertion to counteract its pernicious consequences. In accordance with this disposition, the trespass offering was to be accompanied with ample restitution to the injured party. Our Lord thus comments on the import of this transaction. "If thou bring thy gift unto the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee, leave there thy gift before the altar and go thy way, first be reconciled unto thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift." In conformity to this, the penitent who is sensible that he has defrauded or injured a fellow creature, will endeavor to make ample restitution. If his circumstances permit, he will refund principal and interest to the injured party, or, if he be dead, to his heirs, or even to the poor. If he has been compelled, in the course of events, to avail himself of the law of insolvency, provided he is now able to refund, although the laws and usages of society would protect him in detaining what is not his own, he will treat others as he would be treated by them. He will shake his hands from detaining what in righteousness belongs to another. If unable by labor, or by retrenching all superfluous expenses to make restitution to those he has defrauded or injured, this very inability will be matter of serious regret and open confession. Thus felt and acted Zaccheus. If I have injured any man, I restore him fourfold. And that man's repentance wants one substantial evidence of sincerity who displays not the same disposition, and emulates not the example of this penitent publican.

But we may injure others in their name, peace, relations and principles, as well as in their possessions, and if penitents, we will do what we can to undo and counteract what we have criminally done. In any or all of these cases, we will hasten to clear and vindicate the characters we have calumniated, to heal the breach we have made, and to confess, confute and abandon the erroneous tenets we have advocated. Thus Paul abandoned and retracted his pharasaical errors, retracted his slanders against the gospel and its friends, commended to all, Christ and his cause, and labored assiduously to counteract the pernicious effects of his former mistakes and crimes.

3. The sincere penitent renounces the love and practice of every sin, and determines to walk henceforth in the way of new obedience. He ceases to do evil, and learns to do well. It is just as easy and natural for him to renounce and forsake sin, as to abandon a once beloved, but now hateful companion. It would do violence to all his present views and feelings to constrain him to serve sin any longer. He has seen its loathsomeness, felt its horrible effects, and trembled at its consequences; and now hating it with a perfect hatred, he forsakes it, resolved never to return to it. He has seen also the beauty of holiness, and the preciousness of Christ, and is determined to submit to his righteousness, and to keep his law. His old things are passed away, and all things become new. The tree is made good, and the fruit is good also. And without this renunciation, in profession, principle and practice, of all sin, even of the most beloved lust, and a hearty determination and endeavor to fulfil the whole law, there is no sound evidence of genuine repentance. A Judas may confess his sin, even with grief and shame, and make restitution, but the sincere penitent goes beyond him; he renounces and forsakes all sin, and commences the faithful servant of Jesus Christ. He delights in the law of the Lord, after the inward man, and it is his meat and his drink to do the will of his heavenly Father.

The correctness of the description of evangelical repentance now given, may be tested and exemplified by a reference to some passages of scripture. These will evince that it comprises right views of sin and of God, and that train of feelings, and tenor of conduct of which these views are productive. Take, as an exemplification, the account given of penitent Ephraim, Jer. xxxi. 18, 19. "I have surely heard Ephraim bemoaning himself thus: Thou hast chastised me, and I was chastised, as a bullock unaccustomed to the yoke. Turn thou me and I shall be turned; for thou art the Lord my God. Surely after that I was turned I repented, and after that I was instructed I smote upon my thigh: I was ashamed, yea, even confounded, because I did bear the reproach of my youth." He was instructed by being made acquainted with himself and with his God, the law he had broken and the penalty he had incurred. This instruction awakened in him feelings of shame, sorrow and hatred of sin. He then smote on his thigh, was ashamed, even confounded. He then confessed unto his God, renounced sin and returned to his station and duty, and experienced the kindest reception. "Is Ephraim my dear son? Is he a pleasant child? For since I spake against him, I do earnestly remember him still; therefore my bowels are troubled for him, I will surely have mercy upon him, saith the Lord."

Let us cast a brief glance at the prodigal, as another exemplification of repentance unto life. (Luke xv. 11—32.) Want aroused him from the stupor induced by sin, and brought him to his senses. Now he considered his ways; and his folly and guilt in leaving his father's house, associating with the vile, and squandering away his whole patrimony, passed in review before him. He also dwelt on the character of his father, whom he had abandoned, and the happiness enjoyed by the very servants of the household. These reflexions enlarged his views of his sin, folly and dishonor on account of the course he had pursued, and deepened his shame, regret and heart-loathing of himself and of his ways. Persuaded that his whole course was dishonorable and ruinous, and that it could not be too soon abandoned forever, he determined to arise, return to his father, make ample confession, and humbly submit. No sooner was this resolution formed, than it was carried into effect. He arose, returned, and was kindly received and generously entertained. The father saw him afar off, ran to meet him, fell on his neck and kissed him, ordered the servants to bring forth the best robe and put it on him, to put a ring on

his hand, shoes on his feet, and to kill the fatted calf for his entertainment.

Repentance is such a necessary and excellent grace, that there have been many attempts to counterfeit it. The Bible specifies many of these. It mentions the hypocritical repentance feigned by Israel when "they did flatter God with their mouth, and and lied unto him with their tongue." Ahab too humbled himself on the denunciations of his punishment, rent his garments, put on sackcloth and walked softly, but his heart was not rent from sin, neither did he walk in newness of life. Judas so far repented, that he brought back the money for which he had sold his master, cast it down at his employers' feet, and went away and hanged himself. His repentance was emphatically that sorrow of the world which worketh death. To enable the true penitent to understand more fully that repentance which is unto salvation, and to distinguish it from that hypocritical repentance which may exist in a sinner still unchanged in heart and life, we shall mention a few of the most prominent differences between them.

1. Legal and evangelical repentance differ widely in their respective origins or causes. The former flows from a perception of the evil of sin and fear of its consequences. The transgressor finds to his sad experience, that sin has deprived him of peace and happiness, pierces his heart with regret and remorse, and he sees punishment ready to seize upon him. These views and feelings compelled even Cain to exclaim, "My punishment is greater than I can bear, and it shall come to pass that every one that findeth me shall slay me." This arouses the awakened sinner's selfishness, and from a regard to his own interests he is sorry for his sins, ashamed of them, hates them on account of their hateful results, and breaks off his criminal courses to avoid their dreaded consequences. The same considerations exert an influence on evangelical repentance. This flows principally from a perception of the odious, the loathsome nature of sin. Sin is seen in contrast with the majesty, holiness and love of God, and our obligation to serve him, and then it appears utterly detestable, the soul loathes it and cannot live any longer in it. Such was the view that made those of old exclaim, "We lie down in our shame, and our confusion covers us, for we have sinned against the Lord." In these the declaration is accomplished, "Then shall ye remember your own evil ways and your doings that were not good, and shall loath yourselves in your own sight for your iniquities, and for your abominations." Cherishing these views of sin, the saint can no more indulge with pleasure in it, than a cleanly person can wallow with satisfaction in natural pollution, or an affectionate child can insult a beloved and venerable parent. Fear and selfishness, then, are the source of legal repentance; love to God and hatred of sin on account of its intrinsic loathsomeness the source of evangelical repentance.

2. Legal repentance consists with the love of sin, especially of darling lusts; but evangelical repentance hates and abominates every sin. Sin is dear to the heart of the sinner as the light of heaven. The love of it is radicated in his whole soul. It is the very element in which he lives and its commission and indulgence afford him his highest gratification. It grieves him to the very heart that the divine law is so rigid as to condemn and punish sin, which he so fondly loves. To give it up is to renounce his darling gratification, and when self-preservation constrains him to part from it, he finds that he is tearing himself from his dearest friend, and still in parting wishes it well, and longs to return to it. Even when he prays for its destruction it would pain him to have his prayer answered. Evangelical repentance sees sin to be so hateful that the sight implants in the soul such an unextinguishable principle of hatred of it as

will never be quenched but with its utter extirpation. This sight of sin effectually extinguishes delight in the most beloved lust. It causes to hate every false and wicked way with all the heart.

3. Legal repentance never forsakes every sin, nor inspires with the love of righteousness; while evangelical repentance abandons every sin, and turns to the love and practice of the whole law. The alarmed transgressor may desist from his more flagrant vices and engage in the performance of many duties, rather than perish in his transgression, but he can not and will not give up every sin. The sin that most easily besets him is dear to him as his right hand and right eye, and he will retain it and pass with it into the fire of hell, rather than abandon it. Ahab, in his alarm, put on sack-cloth, rent his garments, and walked softly, but he still retained possession of Naboth's vineyard. Herod heard John and did many things gladly, but he would not put away Herodias. Judas repented, returned the price of his treason, confessed his sin in betraying innocent blood, but he never repented of his covetousness and hypocrisy. In short, the legalist rests in partial reformation of life, while the heart remains unchanged in the love of sin. Evangelical repentance changes the heart and the life, inspiring its subjects with a determination exciting them to endeavor to forsake every sin, and to keep the law. It is their sincere determination and earnest endeavor never to return to the commission of any sin, and the love of God shed abroad in their hearts prompts them to keep the whole law. The evil they henceforth do they would not, and their every failure in obedience causes them grief of heart.

4. Legal repentance is temporary; evangelical is permanent. The robber, when pursued and terrified, desists for a time from his depredations on society, and retires to his den. His condition, however, is disagreeable, the restraint is irksome, and he longs to sally forth and renew his acts of rapine and blood. The legal penitent, in the hour of alarm, may desist from his sins, and apparently commence a new course of life. The devil, the lust that haunted him, departs and wanders in dry places, and finds no rest till it returns and reoccupies its former habitation. He may abandon one, but it is in exchange for another. He may renounce for a time apparently every sin, but he returns to them, and again wallows in them. The true saint, in resolution and in endeavor, parts with all sin now and forever. His fixed determination is to return to no sin any more. He may feel inward impulses, and be solicited by outward temptations to any sin, but he resists both; and if surprised and overcome, he is restless and uneasy as the sheep in the mire, struggles to escape, and when delivered is more guarded than ever against a relapse. He is equally determined to persist in his obedience. He has returned to his Father's house, contented to take the place of a servant in it, and being exalted to the relation of a son, he is delighted with the discharge of his filial duties. He is altogether willing to have his ear struck through in token of his engagement to serve, from love, his Master forever. His language is, "Lord, I am thy servant. Teach me, O Lord, the way of thy statutes, and I will keep it unto the end; so shall I keep thy law continually, for ever and ever."

[To be Concluded.]

ART. IV. *Remarks on the Proceedings of the Associate Synod at its late Meeting.*

MR. EDITOR.—Having been present at the late meeting of Synod, which was held at Canonsburg, and this being the first I have had the gratification of attending west of the mountains, it was to me highly interesting; and I have judged that a few brief observations respecting some of the important subjects of a public nature, which came before the Synod, might not be altogether unprofitable, nor uninteresting to your readers; especially when it is considered that the naked journal of its proceedings which has already appeared, furnishes only a narrative of the *order* of proceeding, and of the subjects acted upon, without throwing any light upon the grounds or intention of the Synod's action. This is mentioned as an apology for offering you the following remarks.

When we take a survey of the imbecility of men, and their liability to err in all the relations which they sustain in this life, the most painful reflections are suggested.—The impotency of means and instruments to accomplish any of the high and valuable purposes of human existence, is seen, and the necessity of "bearing one another's burdens," appears in a most striking point of view; and yet this view could afford no relief, had not God, in great mercy, provided us with the means by which this may be done; and perhaps in nothing more clearly than by the appointment of ecclesiastical judicatories in his church. To witness the ministers and elders of the scattered flock of Jesus Christ assembling in his name, and by his authority, from different and distant sections of country, for the purpose of consulting about the affairs of his house, deciding controversies, and settling difficulties among brethren, should inspire renewed confidence in God's covenanted faithfulness to his church, and fill the hearts of his people with gratitude, and their lips with praise. At such a time, who that has thought of the loving kindness of the Lord will refuse to "pray for the peace of Jerusalem?" "For there, are set thrones of judgment, the thrones of the house of David."

For a considerable length of time the Christian church has been flattered and amused with the syren song of harmony and peace in church courts, and love and unity among professing brethren. This cry has been so long and loud, that, like Pharaoh's lean kine, it has swallowed up almost the entire catalogue of other Christian doctrines and duties. It would therefore be unpardonable not to advert to the *harmony* of this meeting. And on this point there was little ground for complaint. At a time like the present, when the cords of discipline have been nearly sundered by the influence of a spirit of indifference to divine institutions, as great a degree of harmony prevailed as is consistent with singleness of purpose, and an honest endeavor to maintain the Lord's cause, as far as entrusted to their hands. Harmony has, in general, become another term for lax discipline, and peace another for the burying of divine truth. This kind of peace can at any time be attained by the church. All that is necessary for its attainment is a simple surrender. Cease to wield the sword of the Spirit against the "haters of the Lord," and the enemies of his truth, and they will be at peace. But wo to them that purchase peace at so high a price. Therefore we have no desire to witness greater harmony than distinguished the late meeting, so long as any degree of error in doctrine and immorality in practice shall be found in the Christian church. Controversy is as essential to a sound profession of the name of Christ, as is the circulation of blood to the existence of the human system; and will continue to be so, till "death is swallowed up in victory." Therefore no charge of want of harmony can with truth or

justice be brought against the late Synod, although there was a free and animated discussion of several critical questions.

The erection of suitable buildings for a theological seminary, and the election of a second professor, has engaged the attention and solicitude of the Synod for several years. The want of means, and the difficulty of commanding such means as justly belonged to them, for a time retarded the accomplishment of these important objects, so necessary to the well-being and extension of the church. The legislature of Pennsylvania, however, at its last session, on the second application, granted them an act of incorporation, which runs for twenty years. And although this act bears on the face of it an extreme jealousy towards a small denomination of Christians, who have ever been the unwavering supporters, for conscience sake, of our free and excellent civil institutions, in all things not contrary to the requirements of the moral law, by restricting its duration to twenty years, and by fixing the amount of property which the Synod may hold so very low; yet it answers the present necessity, and was received with thankfulness by the Synod. This act will enable the Synod to avail itself of bequests and legacies, and other just dues. The seminary building is in a state of forwardness, and will be in readiness for the reception of students at the commencement of the next session. This building has been erected at an expense of near \$7,000, and there is yet due upon it the sum of 3,500, which it is hoped will induce our congregations to comply cheerfully with the request made by the Synod, that they would take up collections and transmit them to the treasurer at Canonsburgh with all convenient speed, that those benevolent individuals, who have with becoming zeal assumed this responsibility, may not find themselves embarrassed, nor the confidence disappointed which they have placed in the liberality of their brethren. The Synod also proceeded to elect a second professor. The selection was made with a great degree of unanimity, and unexpectedly terminated on an individual who had not expected to be called to serve the church in this capacity, but who is, nevertheless, well qualified for this important station. Should his life be spared, he will enter upon his official duties at the commencement of the next session. Thus with the completion of the building and the active services of two professors, it is believed that students will be furnished with all the external means requisite to fit them for the gospel ministry, and for usefulness in the church of God. The division of labor in the seminary is as follows: Rev. James Ramsay, D. D., professor of didactic theology and church government; Rev. David Carson, professor of biblical literature and church history.

The Synod, at its meeting in 1832, adopted the following resolution, viz:

Resolved. That the following minute be adopted. There was laid on the table of Synod the Testimony of Original Seceders, and members being called on to state whether any of them individually, or any of the presbyteries, had any thing to object as a sufficient reason why we should not continue in union with said Synod of Original Seceders, as constituted under said Testimony; and nothing of this kind being stated, the Synod do accordingly resolve, that we still continue in union with said Society."

At the late meeting, a number of brethren presented reasons of protest against this resolution, and committees were appointed to answer them. It is believed that these reasons are mainly founded in a misapprehension, of the meaning of the resolution, or at least of its spirit and design. For it was observed that they consisted principally in an attempt to point out discrepancies between our own Testimony and that of the Associate Synod of Original Seceders. Whether such discrepancies exist, or not, is not our present business to inquire. But by a careful attention to the

language of the resolution it will be seen that the Synod has not approved of the Testimony of Original Seceders, nor even expressed an opinion whether or not it accords in all respects with our own. The Synod has simply said it did not see "*sufficient reason why we should not continue* in communion with said Synod of Original Seceders." Nor was it observed that any objection was made to this in the reasons of protest against the resolution. The inference then from all this is plain, that if differences did exist they should be made matters of forbearance, and that while the Synod did not judge it necessary either to point out differences between the two testimonies, or to reconcile them, it judged that there were no differences, at least of a practical bearing, of sufficient magnitude to justify a *separation*; for it must be borne in mind that the Protesters against the union of the Associate Synod of Scotland, with the Burger Synod, which took place in 1820, had been acknowledged by our Synod as the true Associate Synod of Scotland, which they unquestionably were, because they continued to maintain without variation the same Testimony which had all along been held up in the defence of truth, and in condemnation of the defections of the times. So we see it is not true, as has been "*slanderosly reported,*" by some in this country calling themselves Seceders, (not however of our communion,) "*that the protesters with Mr. Paxton at their head formed a new body,*" by refusing to go into that union. It is easily seen from this injurious report, with what facility schismatics and such as have made defection from a sound profession can charge their own sin upon those who have remaind steadfast to their covenant obligations, under the reproaches of backsliding brethren. But our Synod had previously condemned the Union of 1820, for good and substantial reasons,* to which subsequent events have given additional force, as a departure from many points of vital importance which the General Associate Synod of Scotland, had, in connexion with us, hitherto maintained, and of consequence had acknowledged the Protesters to be the true Synod. Not to have done so, would have been to condemn their brethren in Scotland for adhering steadfastly to the profession which they and we had jointly and solemnly sworn to maintain. We need not therefore be surprised at the marvellous love manifested for the union of 1820, by some in this country who had made previous defection from their covenant obligations; nor at the distressing apprehensions they express, lest our people should be deceived by adhering honestly and faithfully to the covenants of their reforming ancestors. Nor is it a matter of surprise that, after having broken covenant with God, by laying covenanting aside, but yet pretending to acknowledge its morality, lest the people should discover their glaring apostacy and forsake their ministry, they should speedily go the length of denouncing covenanting to be "*a judaizing observance,*"—"*a totally recent invention,*" &c. Both these it cannot be; but men are not troubled about consistency when opposing the commandments of God.

But then, the Protestors formed a union with the Constitutional Presbytery, to which Dr. M'Crie belonged, adopting the original Testimony of the Associate Presbytery, from which our Testimony in this country was formed, together with a statement of those points on which they had differed, as a basis of union. They have now a judicial testimony before the world; and whether or not it accords precisely with our own is not our present concern; but the question is, does it differ so widely as to make it a duty for us to declare a separation? This is the true point of controversy, and our brethren who have protested against the

* See Religious Monitor volume iv. p. 89, and note to Testimony pp. 40. 41.

minute acknowledging them still in communion with us, should turn their attention to this point. Perhaps they have done so in effect. If so, it argues well for our cause; and shows a commendable zeal in our protesting brethren, that the Synod should depart in nothing from her solemn profession; and the fact that they manifest so much solicitude on points that are mainly speculative, and can have very little practical bearing in this country, increases our confidence in them that they will continue to be equally solicitous to maintain our principles and turn them against all defections and divisive courses, and against all the practical evils which threaten us in this country. Whatever view, therefore, we take of these protests, we believe their effect will be beneficial in the end; they will probably lead to a more full and explicit statement of our principles on the subject of the civil magistrate's power *circa sacra*, and National Covenanting, than has as yet been emitted. We regard the following resolution offered by Messrs. Beveridge and Adams, and on motion of the movers laid on the table, as an evidence, that such will be the result:

“Resolved, That a committee be appointed to prepare a draught of a more explicit exhibition of our principles, upon the magistrate's power in relation to matters of religion, and upon the nature of National Covenanting, than is contained in our Testimony.”

But whatever may be the issue of this resolution, the last Synod furnished unequivocal evidence, *that no change of the principles mentioned in it will take place.* Therefore the cry which is heard from a certain quarter, that Dr. M'Crie is an advocate for civil establishments, might as well be spared, so far as it is designed to cast odium upon the Synod; because the individual opinions of Dr. M'Crie, are not terms of communion in our church, but our public standards; and because we have not as yet any well authenticated evidence that Dr. M'Crie has, respecting the magistrate's power *circa sacra*, in the least, departed from the answers to Mr. Nairns' reasons of dissent which have always been received in the Secession Church.

But we have learned from a source near akin to that which has discovered covenanting to be both “a judaizing observance,” and “a totally modern invention,” that the “more enlightened of the Associate Church” have been “*most cruelly persecuted*” because they did not join with, but opposed the Synod in its condemnation of the union of 1820. This will probably be news to your readers. It is so to me. I have not yet heard of an *auto de fe* in the Associate Church; but I suppose we are behind the enlightened discoveries of the age; and must receive as truth the statements of those more advanced in knowledge, who have discovered things in the worship of God, which their fathers knew not. It is matter of regret also, that any belonging to the Associate Church have so far lost their honesty and independence, in a free country, as to remain in a communion, where they are cruelly persecuted for righteousness sake? But the Associate Synod should have known better than to have behaved in this manner; and she should have discovered her sin without giving her dear brethren, who, though they have relinquished some of her “judaizing observances” nevertheless love her and her profession, so much trouble to keep her right. But as things are, we know of but one remedy, which promises to be effectual, to wit: let these sympathising brethren send a letter of condolence to those “more enlightened,” but “*most cruelly persecuted*” brethren, in the Associate Church, and affectionately invite them to come and join with them. If they should comply with the request, it is certain they would no longer be “*cruelly persecuted*” nor even *censured* for villifying covenant obligations, nor for holding communion with Hopkinsians and Independents; nor yet for singing human compositions in the praise of God, whenever they step

beyond the vestibule of their own congregations. But in regard to the union in Scotland, its character is fast developing, and many years will not have elapsed before it will be matter of thanksgiving to all who are in earnest in the maintenance of Reformation principles, that the Associate Synod were, in the good providence of God, led at so early a day to condemn it. Therefore, she can no more be entangled with this unholy alliance. "Let them return unto thee; but return not thou unto them."

The next item of importance before the Synod at its late meeting, which we shall notice, was the rule respecting the publication of banns of marriage. This subject had for some time attracted the attention of Synod. And as the Secession Church had never in this country attained to complete uniformity in the practice of the rule as it stands in the Confession of Faith, requiring three days previous publication, much solicitude was felt to secure uniformity, and prevent difficulties that were likely to arise, under the existing state of things. The Synod, therefore, after a free and full discussion adopted the rules which have been already published in their minutes. Of this new act little will be said; as your pages have already been extensively occupied in discussing the principles on which it is based. Nothing further, then, will be attempted, than a brief analysis. The act recognizes the moral law as the Standard of Government and discipline, by which governmental acts must be tested, and the basis on which they must rest. This Standard, then, the moral law, prohibits marriage within certain degrees of consanguinity and affinity; and also contains other prohibitions, which need not here be enumerated. It follows from this, as a native consequence, that the magistrate authorised to solemnize marriage must have "*good and sufficient evidence of the moral and legal right*" of parties requesting him to join them in marriage. If he neglect to do this he may not merely become "a partaker of other men's sins;" but he may also become a violater instead of an executor of the moral law, which is acknowledged by all christian nations to be the foundation of their civil regulations respecting marriage. The reason of this is perhaps found in the fact that the light of nature, itself, teaches the moral law so clearly on this subject. Such being the case, civil government should enact the necessary laws to secure this evidence. But it has not always done so. This imposes an additional obligation upon the church to require such evidence of her own members. But the method to be pursued for the attainment of this object is left to the light of nature, and human discretion, and may be varied according to circumstances, provided the principle is retained. Therefore the *substance* of any rule of publication is the obtaining evidence of the right of parties, while the *particular form* is matter of expediency. Hence the Synod has merely changed the "*form*" of the rule of publication, and that in a very slight degree. And the Synod with great propriety judged publication "two or three sabbaths before hand, or ten days notice to the session," the best form to elicit the necessary evidence of the right of parties. But what should be done with those beyond the pale of the Church, in the absence of proper civil regulations? As the church cannot extend the rule of publication over them, and marriage being the natural right of all men, who observe the requirements of the moral law in relation to that institution, it cannot be maintained that their refusal to observe a particular *form*, neither required by the moral law, nor enacted by the civil government, alienates this natural right. Therefore, it cannot be sinful for our ministers and magistrates to join such in marriage, provided they first obtain "good and sufficient evidence" of their right, which is the *substance* of publication itself. Hence the explanatory proviso appended to the fourth rule; and hence also, it will be seen that the Synod has not made a thing

sinful in her members, which she has not made sinful in those not belonging to her communion; for the thing sinful is neglecting to give the necessary evidence of right to marriage, and this the Synod has enjoined her ministers and magistrates to demand in all cases. While those acting under the proviso are left to adopt such mode as circumstances may seem to require for eliciting evidence, they will be constrained to use great caution. For it will be found exceedingly difficult to obtain this evidence in the absence of publication; and both the letter and spirit of the act will pronounce them censurable for marrying without the evidence. By this act also the Synod has acknowledged that their authority to rule is prescribed by the law of God, and extends not beyond her own communion; while she has testified against civil rulers who neglect to enact necessary laws for obtaining such evidence of the right of parties to marriage as is demanded by the moral law.

Although the principles of the act were fully discussed the language of the explanatory proviso is defective; and perhaps the Synod is less to blame in this instance than the committee on the publication of the minutes, as that committee were authorised to make the necessary verbal corrections; but by some unhappy oversight, I perceive the words *ministers and magistrates* have been omitted, which leads to the impression that the Synod designed to exclude ministers from marrying such as do not belong to our communion. The proviso in question should read thus:—

“But this fourth rule shall not be construed to prohibit magistrates from the full exercise of their civil office, or [ministers and magistrates] from marrying persons not belonging to our communion, who yield obedience to the requirements of the civil law and the first three rules of this act.”

Such were the views of Synod as appeared from the remarks of speakers on this proviso; and we take the first clause to be a simple position, and the second to be exegetical of the first; or in other words, that the Synod designs not to interfere with the civil duties of magistrates in her communion, unless they shall be guilty of open breaches of the moral law in the discharge of those duties. This law must be regarded by all her members whatever other relations they may sustain.*

It remains to be seen whether these principles will be able to pass unscathed through the fiery ordeal of our protesting brethren.

Finally: whether we contemplate the Associate Church in respect to her internal condition or in respect to the relative position she occupies, either towards other ecclesiastical bodies, or towards the world, we see that her ministers and people are loudly called to the duties of watchfulness, prayer, and perseverance in well-doing. She has many sins both of omission and commission that need to be repented of and corrected. God has given her in charge a precious legacy; and let her see to it that

* Since the foregoing was written, a book containing the Acts of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, between the years 1638 and 1649, providentially came into the hands of the writer, among which is found the following, adopted in 1638, a period which has not been inaptly denominated the second reformation in Scotland:—

“*The Assembly alloweth this article.*—Anent Marriage without proclamation of bans, which being in use these years by gone hath produced many dangerous effects: The Assembly would discharge the same, conforme to the former acts, except the Presbyterie in some necessarie exigents dispense therewith.”

The reason assigned in this act for publication is the “dangerous effects” arising from its neglect; which with the permission to Presbyteries to dispense with its observance in certain cases, shows that the Assembly viewed it to be a mere prudential rule. This, together with the reason assigned in the foregoing paper, to wit:—that ministers and magistrates are bound to know the right of parties, it is believed furnish a basis sufficiently broad on which to rest a rule requiring publication in some shape, and triumphantly sustain the Synod in varying its form.

her trust be executed in a manner becoming faithful stewards. God has hitherto enabled her in a good degree to maintain his truth in opposition to a "flood of errors" in the visible church; and a failure to bring forth fruits becoming the witnesses of Christ would, besides other evils, exert a most pernicious influence upon other ecclesiastical bodies, who have reproached her for giving a faithful testimony, and confirm them in their sinful opposition to many precious truths of God's holy word. She is beginning to assume an importance on the public mind in many places, and men are beginning to look at her peculiar principles either in search of truth or in a spirit of opposition. This furnishes an additional reason for FAITHFULNESS. "Be ye faithful." The number of her ministers has been nearly doubled within the last ten years. Twenty-seven ministers and fifty eight congregations have been added within the last seven years. While these things are noticed as a memorial of God's faithfulness, it should be remembered that an increase of numbers brings an increase of dangers to a sound and scriptural profession; it furnishes the adversary with a greater number of points of attack, and presents a powerful temptation to put confidence in her own strength, or moral influence, or favor with the people. All, or either of which is destructive to the very being of the church of God. Let a meek and conciliatory spirit obtain among brethren, which is not inconsistent with, but essential to, a firm and decided adherence to all truth. Beware on the other hand, of indifference or opposition to any of the peculiar principles, which we are under covenant obligations to maintain. For such a course must inevitably lead to division, and all its concomitant evils. No conscientious man, no *honest* man can remain in the communion of the Associate Church who has no love to her profession. Our increase has been greatly retarded for the want of ministers, though at present there is a prospect of improvement in this respect. "The harvest is truly plenteous; but the laborers are few; pray ye, therefore, the Lord of the harvest, that he would send forth laborers into his vineyard." LAOS.

ART. VI. Synod of Cincinnati.

Presbytery of Cincinnati.—The petition of this Presbytery for a division came up, when, it appearing that the petition did not pray for a division by geographical lines, but on the principle of "elective affinity," a motion was made to the effect, that the principle upon which the division is asked, is unconstitutional, and therefore the division prayed for, cannot be granted; and with but little discussion, the motion was carried. We have heard this case compared to that of the Presbytery of Philadelphia; but while we are unfriendly to the principle of division, proposed in the rejected petition, we must say that the circumstances of the case are totally unlike. We shall only mention one of those circumstances, which will sufficiently show the difference of the two cases. The petition for a division of the Philadelphia Presbytery, upon the principle of "elective affinity," was from a minority, without the consent and contrary to the mind of the Presbytery, who presented a petition for a division upon the constitutional principle: whereas, the petition, in the present case, was the petition of the Presbytery, the minority, (with one exception,) silently acquiescing in the application, willing to leave the disposal of it to the wisdom of the Synod. This single feature of the petition from the Cincinnati Presbytery, were there no other points of difference—and there are many—entirely destroys the parallelism of the cases.

Rev. George Beecher's Case.—Synod took up the complaint of Mr. Dobbins and others, against the decisions of the Presbytery of Cincinnati, whereby they sustained as parts of trial for ordination, the examination of Mr. Beecher in theology, and his sermon, which gave evidence of his entertaining doctrinal views at variance with the standards of our church, and of his using "novel phrases and expressions." A list of specifications, exhibiting the grounds of the complaint, accompanied it. After the records of Presbytery relative to this case, and the complaint and specifications had been read, Dr. Beecher, in behalf of Presbytery, prayed that further proceedings in the case might be arrested, on the plea that Presbytery was not prepared to answer, although the specifications had been read in open Synod, on the preceding Friday, and the complaint itself, which contained the grounds of complaint, in a summary form, had been read before the Presbytery. Synod, however, granted the request, and the business was made the order of the day for Thursday.

Complaints against Cincinnati Presbytery.—The complaints against the Cincinnati Presbytery, by Dr. Wilson and others, were then taken up. It appeared that the Presbytery had indefinitely postponed the consideration of two resolutions which had been brought before them; one of which ordered the appointment of a committee of investigation into the truth of the rumors in circulation, charg-

ing Dr. Beecher with holding and teaching erroneous sentiments; and the offer appointing a committee to examine certain publications, said to be written by the Doctor, and reported to contain doctrines at variance with our church standards. The indefinite postponement of these resolutions was complained of as injurious to the purity and peace of the church, to Dr. Beecher himself, and contrary to the injunction of Synod last year, by which the Cincinnati Presbytery were enjoined to "exercise discipline upon such as disturb the churches, either with novel sentiments or such expressions as are calculated to excite suspicions." Our readers will understand us as not giving the words of the complaints; but as presenting a summary of their contents, as well as our recollection serves us. After hearing the complainants, and Dr. Beecher in reply, the Synod adjourned till next morning.

Before the adjournment, several of the members asked and obtained leave of absence during the remainder of the sessions. We mention this, because we are convinced, that if all the members had remained, at the risk of every inconvenience, the decisions of Synod would have probably been different from those that we are about to record.

On Thursday morning, the Synod resumed the unfinished business. After hearing the parties, and the remarks of the members, till between seven and eight o'clock in the evening, the Synod refused to sustain the complaints, by a vote of 21 to 17.

Mr. Beecher's Case Resumed.—The Synod then proceeded to the order of the day. The complaint and specifications were read. The complainants were asked how they would support their specifications? It was answered, "By competent and credible testimony." It was then asked, of what kind? To which it was answered "Oral testimony." It is proper here to remark, that the case precluded all appeal to any written document, as the Presbytery had sustained, as part of his trials, an unwritten sermon by Dr. Beecher. Dr. Beecher remarked, on the part of Presbytery, that they were prepared to show, that part of the specifications were mistakes, and that the rest, consisting of expressions taken out of the connexion in which they were spoken, gave a meaning wholly different from that which the speaker intended. Mr. Mahan, on the same side, solemnly declared that the Presbytery were prepared to deny the whole of the specifications, and assured the Synod that in the course of examination and hearing the sermon, he had heard no such things as the complainants alleged. The members of Synod doubtless felt impatient to return to their charges, and we are convinced that this feeling had a powerful influence in magnifying the difficulty which now presented itself in the conflicting testimony likely to be brought before them. They foresaw that the case would require protracted attention, and perhaps lead to unpleasant discussion; and in such circumstances, we were not surprised at the decision to which a rather desultory exchange of thought brought them, although we thought it a wrong decision, which was to dismiss the complaint. They also censured the Presbytery for sustaining, as part of trials for ordination, an unwritten sermon. The complainants gave notice of an appeal to the next General Assembly, and a complaint, with reasons, were read before the Synod, signed by about thirty members, together with a protest signed by eight or ten. If the Synod had proceeded to take the testimony in support of the specifications, they would not have found so much difficulty in the case as they probably anticipated. Although our memory is, perhaps, very little more tenacious than Mr. Mahan's, we could distinctly remember when the specifications were read over, having heard the expressions specified, in so many words, spoken by the candidate in the course of his examination and sermon. Others, too, recollected them well. And very few, we apprehend, if any, who were present at the time the trials were sustained, would have attempted to deny them. It is true they might have attempted to extenuate the meaning of the expressions, and make them very harmless. But the Synod were amply competent to judge of the accuracy of the interpretation. If Synod had proceeded, as we think they ought to have done, to hear the parties, we are persuaded that they would have sustained the complaint. But they appeared to have so much dread of entering upon the business, that a resolution was passed, that Synod was incompetent to take the offered testimony! We shall probably recur to the subject again, being too unwell to pursue it at present.—*Standard.*

ART. VII. *Extracts from the Minutes of the Synod of Philadelphia, at their Sessions held in Columbia, Pa., November 2, 1633.*

The following paper was presented to Synod by the Rev. Mr. Engles, viz :

Whereas, the report of the committee appointed by the last Assembly, to whom was referred the complaint of the Second Presbytery of Philadelphia, was founded, in the apprehension of that Presbytery and of the committee, that said Presbytery would be received by this Synod, at its present meeting as a constituent member: therefore,

Resolved, 1. That while this Synod reprobate and condemn both the principles on which the Presbytery of Philadelphia was divided, and also the exercise of unwarrantable authority by the Assembly in dividing the Presbytery; and while the Synod expressly forbids any act of theirs in this matter, to be considered as sanctioning either the principle or the act above alluded to and condemned, yet regarding the peculiar circumstances of this case, and with the above declaration of Synod, the Synod do hereby receive the Second Presbytery of Philadelphia as a constituent member of this body.

2. *Resolved*, That in the exercise of the right of Synod to divide and unite Presbyteries, this Synod do hereby unite the Second Presbytery of Philadelphia with the Presbytery of Philadelphia, and ordain the two Presbyteries thus united to be known as the Presbytery of Philadelphia.

3. *Resolved*, That in the exercise of the same prerogative, the Synod do hereby divide the said Presbytery of Philadelphia by the line of Market-street, in the city of Philadelphia, extending as far east as may be necessary, and west to the Schuylkill, then up the Schuylkill to the extremity of the Presbytery; and that the ministers and churches south of said line be known as the Presbytery of Philadelphia, and those of the north side be known as the Second Presbytery of Philadelphia.

During the discussion of the first paragraph of this paper, Rev. Dr Green moved the postponement of it to take into consideration the following, viz:

Resolved, 1. That by the constitution of the Presbyterian church, it is the right of Synods, exclusively, to form and divide Presbyteries.

2. That it is destructive of order and discipline, and contrary to the spirit and scope of the constitution of the Presbyterian church, that a Presbytery should ever be formed on what has been denominated the principle of elective affinity; that is, of individuals whose views, feelings, and doctrinal tenets are believed to harmonize with each other, but which are known to be opposed in many important particulars, to those of their brethren from whom they are separated.

3. That what has been denominated the Second Presbytery of Philadelphia, was formed in violation of the exclusive right of this Synod to organize new Presbyteries within its own bounds; and was also formed on the obnoxious principle of elective affinity; and therefore can never be recognized by this Synod as a constitutional Presbytery, and in that character be received as an integral part of this body.

4. That this Synod considers itself as deeply aggrieved, and as having been treated with peculiar disrespect by the last General Assembly of our church, in the refusal of the said Assembly so much as to hear the remonstrance and representations of this Synod, in opposition to a measure adopted by that Assembly.

5. That all those who were members of the Presbytery of Philadelphia before the meeting of the General Assembly of 1832, be considered as at present members of this Synod; it being understood that the original members of the, so called, Second Presbytery of Philadelphia, shall, previously to their being enrolled as members of this Synod, declare that they now do, and hereafter will, consider and treat the so called Presbytery as a nullity; and that none who have become members of the so called Presbytery since its first formation, are, at present, to be admitted as members of this Synod.

After a protracted discussion of the motion, the ayes and noes were called for, and it was decided not to postpone—Ayes 22, noes 43.

Whereupon the discussion of Mr. Engles's paper was renewed, and being considered by paragraphs, it was finally adopted—Ayes 39, noes 20.

It was then *Resolved*, That the Second Presbytery of Philadelphia meet in the Central church in the city of Philadelphia, on Wednesday the 27th instant, at 11 o'clock, A. M.; and that the Rev. Dr. Neill, or in case of his absence, the Rev. Dr. McDowell, preach the sermon, and preside until a moderator be chosen.

Resolved, That the licentiates and candidates which formerly belonged to these Presbyteries respectively, belong to them as now constituted.

Resolved, That the proceedings relative to the union and division of the Philadelphia Presbyteries, be forwarded by the clerk for publication in the Presbyterian and Philadelphian.

[The Second Presbytery has refused submission to this deed of Synod.]

A member of the Synod has furnished us with the following:—An appeal and complaint from Joseph Montgomery, George W. McClelland, Thomas Bradford, jun., and William Darrach, elders and members of the Fifth Presbyterian church in the city of Philadelphia, against a decision and sentence of the Second Presbytery of Philadelphia relative to a call to the Rev. Dr. Beman, of Troy, N. Y., to be pastor of said church, was presented to Synod, and referred to the judicial committee, who reported that they found the same to be in order, but as the case involved important questions of a general influence upon the churches, they recommended that the case, under the peculiar circumstances of it, be referred to the General Assembly for final trial and adjudication which was adopted and the case referred.—*Presbyterian*.

OBITUARY.—It is with feelings of sorrow, that we announce to the readers of the Monitor, the death of that venerable servant of God, the Rev. Francis Pringle. He departed this life at the house of his son, Mr. Thomas Pringle in the city of New-York, on the 2d of November in the 86th year of his age, and 62d of his ministry. His death appears to have been accelerated by means of a fall, which he received about six months since, and which prevented him from afterwards leaving his room. We understand that he enjoyed great tranquility of soul in prospect of death, and approached his end in the full assurance of hope. The peace of God which passeth all understanding evidently kept his heart and mind through Christ Jesus. Few ministers of the gospel have passed through life with a purer character or a more unblemished reputation. He was indeed an ensample to the flock over which the Holy Ghost had made him an overseer, as also to his younger brethren in the ministry. In the death of this aged father our church has sustained a very serious loss, the loss of his prayers, the loss of his counsel, the loss of his example. But what has been loss to us, we have good reason to believe, has been gain to him. Shortly before his death he sent us for publication a sermon entitled "Prayer for the prosperity of Zion." This was, probably, the last sermon which he composed; and it exhibits a mind vigorous and active as ever, and shows that his ardent desires for the peace and prosperity of the church remained unabated till the last. This sermon we will endeavor to lay before our readers in the next Number of the Monitor. In reference, then, to the death of this good man and aged servant of Jesus Christ, may we not apply the words of the Holy Spirit? "Mark the perfect man, and behold the upright; for the end of that man is peace." Ps. xxxvii. 37.

ECCLESIASTICAL NOTICE.—The Associate Presbytery of Albany at their meeting on the 20th ult. received into christian and ministerial fellowship, the Rev. David R. Defreest, formerly a minister in the Reformed Dutch Church, but for some years past a Seceder from the fellowship of that church. Mr. Defreest, according to Presbyterial appointment, is now engaged in supplying our vacancies with the bread of life.

THE
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,

AND

EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

JANUARY, 1834.

ART. I. Prayer for the prosperity of Zion—A SERMON.

[Written by the late Rev. FRANCIS PRINGLE, shortly before his death, in the 85th year of his age.]

Ps. li. 18. Do good in thy good pleasure unto Zion : build thou the walls of Jerusalem.

THE Lord is sovereign, he doth according to his will in the armies of heaven, and among the inhabitants of this lower world. His sovereignty is conspicuous in all his works, but especially in his dispensations towards, and concerning his church. It shines in the favors shown to his ancient people. He chose them to be a peculiar people to himself, above all people on the face of the earth. He established his worship among them, and was pleased to fix upon Zion and Jerusalem as the centre of that worship, the city of their solemnities, placing his name there. This he did without any ground of preference in that people, or in that place, but to display his adorable sovereignty, and to serve the ends of his own glory, in the preservation and support of the true religion, and for the good of his church. *In Jerusalem were set the thrones of judgment : the thrones of the house of David.* David, whom, for the glory of his sovereign and distinguishing favor, he chose to be *his servant, taking him from the sheepfolds ; from following the ewes great with young, he brought him to feed Jacob his people, and Israel his inheritance.*

David manifested an ardent zeal, a pious solicitude for the honor of divine worship, and the ordinances thereof. He was particularly anxious to provide a decent and honorable accommodation for the ark of the covenant, that eminent symbol of God's gracious presence with, and powerful protection of his people ; placing it in a tabernacle prepared for it, near his own palace in Jerusalem : thus *finding out a place for the Lord ; an habitation for the mighty God of Jacob.* He projected also the building of a magnificent temple to the honor, and for the worship of Jehovah. The Lord approved the pious design, but forbade the execution, reserving that work to the peaceable reign of his son and successor, Solomon.

But how disgracefully to his character, was this man after God's own heart left to act, when guilty of the complicated crime, to which there is a reference in this Psalm.—An awful warning to him *that thinketh he standeth, to take heed lest he fall.* His base, adulterous connection with Bathsheba, and his deliberate, treacherous murder of her husband, Uriah, are indelible stains upon his memory ; gave great occasion to the enemy to blaspheme ; threatened very evil consequences to the church of God,

and the interests of religion; and provoked the Lord's dreadful displeasure. This Psalm exhibits David's deep sorrow and repentance; his humble confession, and importunate supplications for pardoning and sanctifying grace, and for renewed peace and comfort.

But while the royal penitent is solicitous to have all his sins forgiven, and to experience the returning tokens of the divine favor to himself, he is not forgetful of the interests of religion, or of the church. That no lasting injuries might arise to the church from his fall; nay, that the Lord would graciously exert himself in her favor; forms a distinguished and important article in the series of David's supplications. *Do good in thy good pleasure unto Zion; build thou the walls of Jerusalem.* When Zion and Jerusalem are mentioned distinctly, Jerusalem means the city, which after it was taken from the Jebusites, was the metropolis of the kingdom of Israel during the reigns of David and Solomon; and after the revolt of the ten tribes, of the kingdom of Judah. Zion is that part of the city of Jerusalem, which David strongly fortified, which he beautified with magnificent buildings, and called by his own name, the city of David. As it was the centre of the worship which God established and appointed to be celebrated by and among his people Israel, God is said to dwell there. Hence Zion and Jerusalem are frequently represented as typical of the gospel church, the true city of the living God, where he delights to dwell, to reveal his truth and his will, and to display his glory for the salvation and happiness of his people. A prayer, therefore, for Zion and Jerusalem is to be considered as expressive of a concern and desire for the Lord's protecting, blessing and prospering his church. Do good, show favor, manifest kindness, have mercy on Zion. The following clause serves to illustrate, explain and amplify this request,—build up the walls of Jerusalem: walls about a city are for defence against enemies. The text accordingly contains a prayer for the Lord's affording safety and protection to his church, prospering her interests, her increase in number, blessing ordinances for the gathering in of his elect, and promoting the edification of his people in faith and love, in holiness and harmony. Lastly, observe the spring of such favor; the Lord's good pleasure, his free will and sovereign goodness.

All that is farther proposed, is to offer some remarks suggested by the passage, with a few inferences.

REM. 1. The church is the peculiar object of divine care, favor and good will.

The prayer in the text proceeds upon a confidence of this being the case. And the truth of the proposition must be so obvious to every one, upon even a cursory view of the inspired oracles, and of the dispensations of divine providence towards her, that there appears no great need to enlarge in proof of it. The language of endearing affection so frequently employed concerning Zion and Jerusalem, whatever application it may bear to them literally, can be understood in its full import, only when referred to the church of God. *The Lord hath chosen Zion; he hath desired it for his habitation. This is my rest forever: here will I dwell; for I have desired it. Great is the Lord, and greatly to be praised in the city of our God, in the mountain of his holiness. Beautiful for situation, the joy of the whole earth is Mount Zion—the city of the great King. There is a river, the streams whereof make glad the city of God; the holy place of the tabernacles of the Most High God is in the midst of her; she shall not be moved; God shall help her, and that right early. They shall call thee, the city of the Lord, the Zion of the Holy One of Israel.* The characters by which she is designated and distinguished, justify the remark. She is the house of God, the church of the living God, the city of the great King, his bandry, his building, a holy

Temple to the Lord, a habitation of God through the Spirit, the household of faith, the flock of God, his peculiar people, his treasure, his jewels, the lot of his inheritance, his beloved, the dearly beloved of his soul, the spouse of Christ, his bride, his love, his dove, his undefiled, his body, the fulness of him who filleth all in all. The most endearing names, indeed, are every where in scripture, used concerning the church, expressive of the affectionate regard of the Most High. The predictions and promises of the Almighty to and about her, and the dispensations of providence towards her, preserving, defending, delivering, and taking vengeance upon her enemies, might all be adduced in proof of the remark. But superior to all other testimonies of the divine regard to the church, is the triumphant display of sovereign grace and infinite love, in her salvation by the eternal, only begotten son of God. "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his son to be the propitiation for our sins." "Christ loved the church and gave himself for her."

REM. 2. Whatever God does in behalf of his church, is the effect of his mere good pleasure. He indeed "worketh all things after the counsel of his own will." "Thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure, they are and were created." "And the Lord chose Jacob unto himself and Israel for his peculiar treasure." To what cause is this to be ascribed?—his own sovereign good pleasure: "For I know that the Lord is great, and that our Lord is above all gods. Whatsoever the Lord pleased, that he did." When Moses celebrates the distinguishing favor of the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob to their posterity, he warns them against the proud, self-flattering conceit, as if, personally, they possessed some superior worth, giving them a title to such distinction. "Speak not thou in thine heart—saying, For my righteousness, the Lord hath brought me in to possess this land." "Thou art an holy people unto the Lord thy God; the Lord thy God hath chosen thee to be a special people unto himself, above all people that are upon the face of the earth. The Lord did not set his love upon you, nor choose you, because you were more in number than any people (for ye were the fewest of all people;) but because the Lord loved you, and because he would keep the oath which he had sworn unto your fathers." Was there any thing in literal Zion or Jerusalem, that could be supposed to induce the Lord of all, to place his name there, to desire and choose Zion for the place of his rest? Zion has its name from aridness. It appears to have been originally a dry, unfruitful, worthless ridge or top of a mountain, and derives all its distinction from God's free choice of it to be the centre of the Old Testament worship; and Jerusalem, from his appointment of it to be the city of his solemnities, the royal city, and from the privileges connected therewith. And in this view, do they not serve for an emblem of the original state and the gracious state of church members, the stones in the spiritual building? What are they by nature, but wretched, and miserable, poor, blind and naked,—"Dead in trespasses and sins, children of wrath, even as others:—alienated from the life of God; the slaves of sin, and of their father, the devil; having hearts deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked; their carnal mind enmity against God, not subject to his law—compared to wolves, leopards and lions, bears and serpents, for treachery, cunning, cruelty, rapacity, violence and malignity? Isa. xi. Correspondent with this is the character, given by himself, of one who was called by divine grace, not only to form a part of the spiritual building, but to be a master builder. "I was a blasphemer, a persecuter, and injurious, but I obtained mercy." For helplessness, deformity and loathsomeness, she resembles the new born infant cast out into the open field, to the loathing of her person, none pitying or having compassion: "We

ourselves were sometimes foolish, disobedient, deceived, serving divers lusts and pleasures, living in malice and envy, hateful and hating one another." To infinite love then, absolutely free, sovereign, unspeakably rich grace, must be ascribed all that God hath done in and for the salvation of the church. "As 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 sheweth mercy." "God who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us; even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ, (by grace ye are saved.)"

REM. 3. The glory of building up the church belongs only to the Lord, Do good in thy good pleasure unto Zion; build thou the walls of Jerusalem. Upon this rock will I build my church, is a declaration which could be made by none, but the Great God, our Saviour. This work is as far beyond all human skill and strength, as it is beyond the power of any man to redeem his brother or give to God a ransom for him." What, the Redeemer says, with respect to the purchase of redemption, holds equally true with regard to the actual redemption of every individual who is saved. "I looked, and there was none to help; and I wondered that there was none to uphold; therefore mine own arm brought salvation." The character of such as compose the church of true believers, above described, duly pondered, furnishes irresistible evidence of the truth of the proposition. Blind, and prejudiced against the truth, by one another, and by the God of this world, voluntary slaves of sin and satan, what man, what creature, can deliver out of this deplorable condition? In carrying on this work of building the church, it has pleased the Lord of all, to employ and honor mortals, and, in certain respects, other creatures also, visible and invisible, as his instruments. In a special manner, he has given pastors and teachers, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ. But does he employ them, because he stands in absolute need of them, or because of any fitness they naturally possess in themselves? Far from it. After the most laborious exertion of their talents, "neither is he that planteth any thing, neither he that watereth." In the very passage in which Paul speaks of ministers as laborers together with God, and of himself as a wise master builder, he calls the church God's building. The spittle did as much to open the man's eyes who was born blind; the shadow of Peter as much to the healing of the diseased over whom it passed; the waters of Jordan to the cleansing and curing of the leper; as all ministerial instruments can do towards the true building of the church, in converting those who are yet in their sins, or edifying those already converted,—farther than that they are means adapted to the reasonable and moral nature of man. All their motions, operations and success, depend entirely on the Lord. "Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it." Since then the instruments of God's own providing and appointing, have no inherent, efficacious influence in building up gospel Jerusalem, we are sure that whenever it is effected, it must be the work of God himself. Other houses are built by men, but he that builds the church, the house of God, is no other than he who built all things, that is, no other than he whose name is called the Mighty God, who laid the foundation of the heaven and the earth, "Even he shall build the Temple of the Lord, and he shall bear the glory."

REM. 4. The genuine children of Zion, those who are really among the living in Jerusalem, will take a lively interest in the welfare of the church. The same spirit, in a measure, animates them all, which the

royal Psalmist so feelingly expresses, "If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning; if I do not remember thee, let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth; if I prefer not Jerusalem above **my chief joy.**" The peace and true prosperity of Zion, involve the glory of the Redeemer, and the best interests of mankind. When genuine christianity is professed, the truth of the gospel maintained, ordinances regularly and faithfully dispensed, and accompanied with divine energy in the conversion and salvation of souls, and in a conversation becoming the gospel, in which things the true glory and prosperity of the church consist;—God is glorified, the Redeemer sees of the travail of his soul, and is satisfied, and mankind have their true, their best interests secured and promoted. To be deeply concerned about these things, is the native fruit of a mind renewed after the image of God, and will lead us to be followers, imitators of God, as dear children. For Zion is the constant object of his peculiar regard. His eyes and his heart are continually upon his church from the beginning of the year to the end of it. It would please the adversary, if it could be said with truth, "This is Zion whom no man seeketh after." But there is a remnant in every age whose cordial wish is, "peace be within thy walls, and prosperity within thy palaces."

REM. 5. One principal way by which the friends of Zion will testify their regard and concern for the church, is prayer. Other means have their use, and are not to be neglected. Some are called to more public exertions in her cause than others, particularly ministers, and other office bearers in the house of God. Pastors and teachers are expressly said to be given for the edifying of the body of Christ. At *this* they are to aim in all their ministerial labors, preaching and teaching; in all their instructions, public and private, enforced by a good example; being "examples of the believers in word, in conversation, in charity, in spirit, in faith, in purity." "In all things showing themselves patterns of good works; in doctrine showing uncorruptness, gravity, sincerity, sound speech, that cannot be condemned; that he that is of the contrary part may be ashamed, having no evil thing to say of you." But every one in his proper sphere has something to do for the propagation of religion, and the welfare of the church. But whatever other means are used, whatever good instructions, good examples, or contributing of our substance, prayer is especially to be attended to. Those who may have little else in their power, have access to this, and every other method, without this will prove abortive. To this means our Lord directs, when he teaches us to pray, "Our Father who art in heaven, hallowed be thy name; thy kingdom come; thy will be done on earth, as it is in heaven." This method of showing our concern for Zion, is current in scripture. Many examples of such prayers are on record. "Return, we beseech thee, O God of hosts, look down from heaven, behold, and visit this vine; and the vineyard which thy right hand hath planted." "Return, O Lord, how long! and let it repent thee concerning thy servants." "Let thy work appear unto thy servants, and thy glory unto their children. And let the beauty of the Lord our God be upon us; and establish thou the work of our hands upon us; yea, the work of our hands establish thou it." "Cause thy face to shine upon thy sanctuary, that is desolate, for the Lord's sake." "Return for thy servants' sake, the tribes of thine inheritance." "Revive thy work in the midst of the years,—in wrath remember mercy."

In praying for the welfare of Zion, we can be at no loss for pleas wherewith to enforce our requests, or for topics of encouragement. A few may be mentioned; particularly,—

God's interest in his church, and his new covenant relations to her,

She is his by manifold strong and endearing ties. He is her founder, the Lord hath founded Zion; her builder, her God, head and husband, protector, ruler and governor. "The Lord shall reign for ever, even thy God, O Zion, to all generations." "Praise the Lord, O Jerusalem: praise thy God, O Zion." "Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion; shout, O daughter of Jerusalem: behold, thy king cometh unto thee." "For I saith the Lord, will be a wall of fire round about, and will be the glory in the midst of her." Nay, "God purchased the church with his own blood." "He loved the church, and gave himself for her." So that she is his purchase, his property and possession. "God is in the midst of her, she shall not be moved." "He will feed his flock like a shepherd."—

What he has done for her. What he did for the seed of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, redeeming them from their bondage in Egypt, by a mighty hand, and a stretched out arm, and by a train of astonishing providences, forming them into a church and nation, providing them with various ordinances of religion, settling them in the promised land, preserving, multiplying, prospering, chastising and delivering—may all be regarded as typical of what he has done for the true Israel, the church of the living God. He hath visited and redeemed his people. He hath appointed ordinances for the conversion of sinners, and the edification of such as, through grace believe; he hath maintained his church hitherto, through much opposition from hell and earth, so that a succession of faithful witnesses to the truth of the gospel, and for the purity of ordinances, has been raised up in all past ages. At the Reformation from Popery especially, his power was gloriously displayed. And many have been the signal appearances of our God, in behalf of a covenanted Reformation, in the days of our fathers, the good effects of which have reached down to the present time. Of the truth of this, we are witnesses. "The Lord hath done great things for us; whereof we are glad."—

What he promises to do. "Behold, the Lord's hand is not shortened, that it cannot save; nor his ear heavy, that it cannot hear." "Glorious things are spoken of thee, O city of God"—Things relative to the safety, and perpetuity, and enlargement of the church, her increase in members, in purity, peace, honor and prosperity. "No weapon formed against Zion shall prosper." "The Messiah's dominion shall extend from sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth." "I have made a covenant with my chosen; I have sworn unto David my servant. Thy seed will I establish for ever, and build up thy throne to all generations." "He shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand; and he shall see of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied." "The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever." "Now faithful is he who hath promised, who will also do it." "The mouth of the Lord of Hosts hath spoken it." And as infallibly securing such glorious results, let us rejoice in the assurance of the rich supplies of the Holy Spirit. "As for me, this is my covenant with them, saith the Lord; my Spirit that is upon thee, and my words which I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seed's seed, saith the Lord, from henceforth and for ever." "I will pour water upon him that is thirsty; and floods upon the dry ground: I will pour my Spirit upon thy seed, and my blessing upon thine offspring; and they shall spring up as among the grass, as willows by the water courses." "It shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh."—

The connexion of God's glory with the prosperity of the church.—
"When the Lord shall build up Zion, he will appear in his glory."

The call to be so exercised. We are directed to "pray always with all prayer and supplication." "Pray for the peace of Jerusalem."—"Remember the Lord afar off, and let Jerusalem come into your mind." "For Zion's sake, I will not hold my peace, and for Jerusalem's sake, I will not rest, until the righteousness thereof go forth as brightness, and the salvation thereof, as a lamp that burneth." "I have set watchmen upon thy walls, O Jerusalem, which shall never hold their peace day nor night; ye that make mention of the Lord, keep not silence; and give him no rest, till he establish, and till he make Jerusalem a praise in all the earth."—

Our own interest,—the interests of our souls, present and future, are involved in, and connected with the Lord's building up of Jerusalem. When the Lord pours out his Spirit, blesses his ordinances, and communicates of his rich grace, "abundantly blessing Zion's provision, and satisfying her poor with bread; clothing her priests with salvation; and making her saints shout for joy"—what refreshment, what abundance of peace, joy and comfort is experienced.—

The interest of the present generation, for whose profiting by the means of grace, we ought to be much concerned; and also of posterity. Natural affection prompts parents to care for their offspring, to wish their happiness, and to adopt such measures as are competent to them, for promoting and securing it. But true happiness is in proportion to the prevalence of true religion, the success of the gospel, and the prosperity of the church. "He established a testimony in Jacob, and appointed a law in Israel, which he commanded our fathers, that they should make them known to their children: that the generation to come might know them, even the children which should be born, who should arise and declare them to their children; that they might set their hope in God, and not forget the works of God, but keep his commandments."

In all this exercise, we should call to our aid, and take special encouragement from a realizing persuasion of Christ's continual intercession for the church's preservation, sanctification and unity, of which we have a blessed specimen in his prayer. John xvii.

REM. 6. A penitent spirit will especially show its concern for the church, in earnest prayer for her prosperity. The example of David in the text, justifies the assertion. The Psalm is expressive of his sincere and deep repentance for his sin, particularly in the matter of Uriah and Bathsheba. To think of the great occasion he had given to the enemy to blaspheme, of the reproach he had brought upon religion, and of the hurtful consequences it was likely to have upon the best interests of the church; could not but excite the most bitter sorrow and anguish in his soul. To counteract, as far as possible, the baneful influence of his grievous fall, he, no doubt felt a strong obligation to exert himself to the utmost to repair the injury, to recommend religion by a holy, penitent, circumspect, exemplary deportment; and a fear, lest the Lord might be provoked by his enormous, aggravated offence, to forsake his ordinances, and write *Ichabod* upon his worshipping assemblies; combined with a conviction, that all endeavors to revive religion, and prosper the interests of Zion, would have no success, without his gracious blessing, stirred him up to pray, "Do good in thy good pleasure unto Zion; build thou the walls of Jerusalem." The same sentiment will prevail with true penitents in every age of the church. They are of a public spirit, and apprehensive, lest by their sins, they should be as Achans in the camp, troublers of Israel,—how earnest will they be in their prayers, that the Lord would redeem Israel from all his iniquities, and in this way from all his troubles.

INF. 1. The high honor of all whose hearts the Lord stirs up to lay

themselves out to promote the cause of true religion, and genuine christianity, and thus contribute to the best interests of gospel Jerusalem.— This honor have all his saints, in whatever sphere they move, wide or narrow, public or private. They are builders together with God. Those indeed in public office in the church, especially ministers, are, in their official capacity, characterised builders: and what an honor to be employed as such. “The work itself is great and honorable, building an habitation for God to dwell in; whose house are we. Ye are the temple of the living God. Christ himself sustains the character of the foundation, the chief corner stone, the supreme builder. You are God’s building. And ministers are co-workers with and under him. And those who are faithful, while a glory, an honor is derived to them from the work itself, are assured of a glorious reward to follow. “When the chief shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away.” “Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life.”

INF. 2. Consolation and encouragement to the children of Zion. The building of the church shall make progress. It is the doing of the Lord. His glory is interested in it. And the combined opposition of hell and earth, shall not be able to prevent the carrying it on, and bringing it to perfection in the consummate holiness and felicity of the whole church of the redeemed, to the full manifestation of the glory of a three one God. “All that the father hath given me shall come to me; and him that cometh unto me, I will in no wise cast out.” “For I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me.”— “And this is the father’s will which hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me, I should loose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day.” “And this is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son and believeth on him, may have everlasting life; and I will raise him up at the last day.” “Who art thou, O great mountain! Before Zerubbabel thou shalt become a plain: and he shall bring forth the head-stone thereof with shoutings, crying, grace, grace unto it.”

INF. 3. Ground of lamentation. That so many professing christians show such apathy, such supine indifference about the true building of the church, the maintenance and advancement of the religion taught in the scriptures. What multitudes of such care for none of these things!— That so great opposition is made to the truth as it is in Jesus, in many important articles, by not a few who profess the christian religion. That if they lay the foundation, many build upon it, the wood, hay and stubble of extravagant fancies and vain delusions. It is especially grievous to observe among the professed friends of a covenanted Reformation many instances of conduct, inconsistent with genuine, well directed zeal for the edification of the body. With them, even with them, are to be found, in this respect, sins against the Holy One of Israel.

But while many things are for a lamentation, would it not argue a criminal inattention to the doings of the Lord, and the operations of his hand, to overlook the zealous efforts which have been made, and still are making, with increasing energy, by religious bodies of different name; for spreading the gospel, and particularly by the translation of the holy scriptures into the vulgar tongues of the heathen nations, and taking such active measures for the dissemination of the word of life among the many millions of the human race, who have been sitting in darkness, in the region and shadow of death. The times in which we live are particularly distinguished by a remarkable zeal for diffusing by such means, the light of the gospel, to the remotest nations of the earth. Should not our minds be filled with joy, and thankfulness, on such accounts, and our zeal animated to promote, in our respective places, the common cause of Christianity?

Ministers, especially, should be excited, by the foregoing considerations, to exert themselves, in the exercise of their office, individually and unitedly, to promote the edification of the church, more particularly that part placed under their immediate care; "taking heed to themselves, and to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made them overseers, to feed the Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood." Imitating the Apostle, who says, "we do all things for your edifying." The relation which they stand in to the church by office, a regard to the honor of God, the glory of Christ, their present usefulness and comfort, and their final account, with other considerations, will doubtless have weight with all, who deserve to be accounted ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God, to have that important object still in view. And whatever be their labors, and their success,—to be denied to themselves, and to give all the praise to the Lord. And while they give themselves to the ministry of the word, let them be no less attentive to give themselves continually to prayer.

But let all church members be concerned, according to their ability, to edify one another, and earnestly seek the edification of the church of Christ at large. "Walking in the fear of the Lord, and in the comfort of the Holy Ghost, the churches throughout all Judea, and Galilee, and Samaria, were edified and multiplied." If we would expect any remarkable revival of religion, we must stir up ourselves to take hold of the Lord, to call upon his name, to put him in remembrance, and plead the accomplishment of his gracious promises. "For this I will be enquired of by the house of Israel, to do it for them: I will increase them with men like a flock." When the Lord designs to appear in any remarkable way in behalf of his own work and people, he ordinarily excites them to abound in the duty of prayer, for the plentiful effusion of his Spirit. For to his gracious, powerful, quickening, sanctifying influence, all true revivals of religion are to be ascribed. And to be earnestly concerned for the revival and reformation of religion in the church at large, may be considered as an evidence of the persons so concerned being themselves acquainted with and exercised to religion. In 1 Cor. chap. xvii., the Apostle illustrates the intimate union and communion which church members ought to have, and, in a measure, have with one another, by the beautiful and instructive similitude of the natural body; in which, while every individual member, has its particular, distinct station, office and care, it has also a feeling for, and a care about the rest, and contributes to the beauty, benefit, usefulness and perfection of the whole.—"The members should have the same care one for another. And whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it: or one member be honored, all the members rejoice with it." It would be unnatural in the members of the body to be indifferent about one another. So they act an unnatural part in the church of Christ, who indulge a selfish, narrow spirit, and have no lively, generous concern for the public interests of religion, the spiritual prosperity and enlargement of the church, through the accomplishment of such promises as these. "There shall be an handful of corn in the earth upon the mountains; the fruit thereof shall shake like Lebanon: and they of the city shall flourish like grass of the earth." "His name shall endure for ever: his name shall be continued as long as the sun: men shall be blessed in him, and all nations shall call him blessed." "Unto him shall the gathering of the people be." "I will give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation to the ends of the earth." "Other sheep I have which are not of this fold: them I must bring, and they shall hear my voice and there shall be one fold, and one shepherd." "And the gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world, for a witness to all nations; and then shall

234 *The Discourse of a Minister to himself in a time of trouble.*

the end come." "All the ends of the world shall remember, and turn unto the Lord; and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before thee; for the kingdom is the Lord's, and he is the governor among the nations." How exemplary is Paul's exercise, "my heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel is, that they may be saved." "Save now, I beseech thee, O Lord; O Lord, I beseech thee, send now prosperity."—"Save thy people, and bless thine inheritance; feed them also, and lift them up forever."

But if we be really concerned for the building up of Zion, the edification of the church, we will be earnest in prayer, and other means of divine appointment, to have our own souls prospering, to be growing in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ.—We will seek to have more and more of the evidence and comfort of being "built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone." To whom coming as to a living stone, disallowed indeed of men, but chosen of God, and precious; we also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ. To him be glory both now and forever, Amen.

ART. II. *The Discourse of a Minister to himself in a time of trouble.*

[Concluded from page 206.]

THE time of affliction is a time in which a minister has peculiar need to watch very strictly his temper, his tongue, and his heart. It is just as true that all afflictions as well as other things, work together for the *destruction* of the flesh in the Christian, as that they work for the good of the *spirit*. The flesh is fully apprised of this, and therefore meets all afflictions as an irrecoverable enemy, and like any other warrior musters all its forces to oppose the corrections of God. All the plagues of the heart that may have, during prosperity, been quiet and concealed, all the lusts, all the passions, the proud, the vain, the atheistical thoughts that are or ever have been in the man, will come forth like the battallion of an army equipped with all the fury, wrath and malace which is in the magazine of the heart. And the rashness and imprudence, or misapprehensions, or the ill timed speech and cruel surmises, and severe judgments of others is their powerful auxiliary. And if these gain the day woe to the minister himself—the peaceable fruits of affliction will be in an instant destroyed—God will be dishonored, and what the consequence to his future usefulness on the souls of them that are looking on, may be, none on earth and only one in heaven can tell. I say, therefore, he is called to watch at his peril. And to let not a single thought, or emotion be admitted to a *hearing* in the soul, nor a word to pass the lips which cannot give to the sentinel the words, HUMBLE SUBMISSION.—While he stands at this post he will have a fine opportunity for discovering what a poor, weak, sinful worm he is! What a terrible hold of sinful thoughts and passions his heart is! What dreadful and unutterable things are there! It is an abyss without a bottom, ever boiling up to its surface new and more horrible forms of wickedness!—Amazing grace of God to make of such a creature a minister of Jesus "to preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ!" Marvellous merits of Christ, that makes his services acceptable before the throne of the Most Holy! Great must be the grace given when he can preach at all with such a heart within him!

• He will find out a great many things that may be of singular use to him all his life after.—That corruption is far stronger, and has done far

more in his doings than he had ever supposed—that there are plagues in his heart, which he had scarcely thought to be in any heart—that pride in a minister is the most horrible moral deformity, that the mind created can ever conceive—that humility is his most beautiful garment—that his debt to the beloved Jesus, for putting him into the ministry calls on him to spend and be spent, as a token of gratitude, but it can never be paid—and therefore, that he is *more* indebted than a private Christian.

It ought to be a minister's care to *justify* God in his trouble. He must know that there is a "cause wherefore God contends with him"—a "need be for his heaviness through manifold tribulations." His language before the people should be, "I will bear the indignation of the Lord, because I have sinned against him, till he arise and plead my cause, and execute judgment for me,"—his prayer before God should be, "show me wherefore thou contendest with me." "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." His reflections within himself should be, "Shall we receive good at the hand of the Lord, and shall we not receive evil." However great and peculiar his troubles may be, it is befitting in him like Aaron "to hold his peace," and to "be dumb, because God did it." What seems mysterious and incomprehensible in his case he should lay to that word, "what thou knowest not now thou shalt know hereafter," and the future part his life and circumstance, which often go beyond the utmost stretch of human forethought to provide for them, or to calculate at all, he ought to lay on that word, "commit thy way unto the Lord, trust also in him—and he shall bring it to pass."

He may learn, in the course of his afflictions a little more acquaintance with the temptations and wiles of satan. That wily serpent knows well how to select his time and opportunity. When the Christian is in trial, and his weakest grace and strongest corruption is brought out so view, then is his time to set on. As he cannot destroy a Christian, his manner with him is different from that which he uses towards those whom he considers his own. His object with him is to *terrify* and distract, and interrupt his comfort and joy. And, if not restrained, he can turn a time of trouble and affliction into a time of terror and dismay.—When the mind is agitated—and busy imagination is keenly alert, he frequently colors out the fatherly corrections, as the "dreadful fierceness of his wrath," as the judge. This is one of his artifices, by which, with the help of the legal spirit and unbelief within, he often succeeds in filling the mind of God's child with "fearful terrors," and shutting out, for a time, the comforts which come even with affliction, when it can be relied on as the doing of a *father*. At such a time sin is called to remembrance as it should be—another of his wiles is to show it to the soul through a magnifying glass, that it may strike the imagination as too great to be pardonable—or, as *the unpardonable sin* itself. And it is not hard to work the mind into a belief of this, if it has been previously led to suppose that God is dealing with us as a judge. And now the conclusion resting on these premises is cast upon the soul like a thunder bolt, you are not a Christian at all! All your professions are and have been hypocrisy! You "have preached the gospel to others it is true, but *you*—are a cast away!—But if this does not take—if the afflicted one on looking over again the grounds of his hope cannot discover it to differ from what the scripture holds out, neither can he charge himself with known and allowed insincerity and hypocrisy in his professions, the serpent immediately alters his course. "Well, you have preached and prayed and done much in religious life, and may be supposed to know as much about it as any other,—What does it all serve you now? You took hold of

the promise, and committed yourself, and family, and affairs unto God. Yet all this misery and destruction is come upon you. Can there be any reality in it? Is it not all a cheat? Suppose that at this moment the Holy Spirit enables the soul to reject with abhorrence the blasphemous suggestion, as alike contrary to scripture and reason; the tempter is still ready with another stratagem to this effect. "How completely you foiled Satan; how patiently you bear trouble; what an example you are to others; few have made your attainments; you are a tried saint; your people must respect you greatly." Vanity would swallow down this in a moment as a sweet morsel, but the still small voice of the new creature enters its protest—"Not I, but Christ that liveth in me." Another of his wiles is to avail himself of constitutional peculiarities, which affliction brings more prominently into action. If the person is constitutionally quick and hasty, this cruel adversary will try by some incident or other to beguile him out of the King's highway, which is, "to wait for God in the way of his judgments," and "with the soul to desire him in the night." Perhaps in some moment of hasty impatience, some false construction on the ways of Providence is hastily thrust into the view of the mind, with a view to its adoption. Or, some hasty, uncharitable conclusion respecting the conduct of men is presented for utterance, which would often act upon a Christian community like a fire-brand in a magazine. Or, some plan for future life, taking the matter out of the hand of a faithful Providence, is under vivid colours hastily presented to the eye. But time would fail to enumerate. By these the soul is tossed like a vessel in a storm; at one time it mounts to heaven, and at another goes down to the depths; it reels and staggers like one drunk, and is at its wits end, and would certainly be swallowed up and go down to everlasting night; but God in mercy will not permit this; he hears its prayer; and his word changes this storm into a calm.

A minister has sometimes, in the course of affliction, opportunity of witnessing, in a very striking manner, the great uncertainty of all things in this life. They go with the setting sun and return with his rising, and change about continually like the wind. And it is most fit that he whose office it is to draw the attention and heart of men to the upper world, and the glory of the Redeemer's eternal kingdom, should have clearly before him the meanness, inadequacy and uncertainty of this as a foil to set it off. Is it not fair that he who, more than others, has professed to forsake all things for Christ and his gospel, should be presented with opportunity to show that it is *more* than profession?

Again, his affliction may explain the meaning of Christ's words, when he says, that he who forsakes all for him "shall have a hundred fold (or such things) in this life, and in the world to come life everlasting."—For, "the earth is the Lord's, and the fullness thereof;" and on such occasions, he sometimes opens the hearts of his people to sympathize with the afflicted, as so many fathers and mothers, sisters and brothers, and their purses to pour out a profusion of supply to his necessities, until like Job he has got double what he lost. And truly, besides supplying the lack of the mere temporal, perishing thing, this comes upon the wounded soul like a healing balm. 'Tis the Father's hand wiping off the tear from the cheek of his child. It is the sympathy of the whole body with its suffering member. It powerfully, yet most *directly* reproves the despondency of the soul in its downcasting and darkness, when it comes in upon the back of such doleful sayings as this: "Is't true that to be gracious the Lord forgotten hath, and that his tender mercy he hath shut up in his wrath?"

Affliction may discover to a minister that he hath been mistaken as to his usefulness, and as to the relish that is for his doctrine. It may disco-

ver that it was much greater than he had supposed, and that though he saw it not, the Spirit of God was at work upon hearts, giving them to taste the sweetness and excellency of gospel truth, and enlisting their affections to it, and to all that are the friends of it. This ought to encourage him to go on and not slack his hand under any the most discouraging external appearance of things. For he is a poor judge of the work of God. There may be seven thousand where he thinks there is not one. While others are going far upon the other extreme, even to manifest delusion, counting their many thousand converts, and hopeful, and anxious, when neither the doctrine preached, nor the practice that follows it, taken as a whole, answers to converting work at all, he may, in this dark and cloudy day, possibly go to an extreme of discouragement. But, "though Israel should not be gathered" at all, we must go on in the course of plain duty, casting in the seed, and leaving it in the hand of Him who ordains the seasons, and the appointed weeks of harvest.

A minister ought to study to turn his affliction to good account, in serving his master and edifying the church. He ought to be better qualified to sympathise with the distressed, he ought to know their heart and its inquietude better, and should be stirred up to their relief with all the experimental knowledge which he has thus obtained. His life should be a more edifying example—his converse more heavenly, and his discourses more practical, close and weighty. The dispensations of Providence may and ought to put him on a train of discourses adapted to the occasion, and suited to bring up into his view the duties, the trials and the comfort and deliverance of the afflicted—illustrating the sufficiency and freeness of divine grace—the fitness of the promise for the darkest day of trouble. In this way he, "drawing his bow at a venture," may hit precisely the case of some poor distressed soul, or he may prepare others for the trials into which they are about to enter. And who knows if it was not to qualify him for doing this very thing that his own trials were sent upon him. If his afflictions may scandalize some at religion, they may, through the divine blessing, produce the contrary effect on others, and bring them to a thorough conviction of its superlative excellency.

The people cannot be mere spectators of a minister's afflictions. They and he are too closely connected to admit of this. As well might the foot or the hand pretend to be mere spectators of the troubles of the eyes or the mouth. Can it be of no concern to the flock that its shepherd is in difficulties? It will be readily admitted that it is their bounden duty to offer up prayers in his behalf. The apostle claims this much for ministers at all times. "Brethren pray for us." This much they are bound to do, "one for another," and "for all men;" much more for their minister in trouble. But it is their duty also to see whether their prayers for him have been answered or not. Whether he is supported, comforted, patient, steadfast in faith, giving glory to God, or the contrary.—Surely, besides, that this is a necessary contribution to his strength and encouragement; it is a matter in which their own personal comfort and edification under his ministry is much concerned—to see whether he practices what he has preached to them—to see whether the grace of God is sufficient in him—to see whether their prayers are of any avail before God—whether his ability to deal with them in their trouble be merely a literary acquirement, or christian experience also. This must be found out by private godly converse with him. To see him abroad, or hear him in the pulpit, is no proof. One may laugh when his heart weeps and is disconsolate. He may preach comfort and feel but little. That the private Christian or elder can tell him nothing which he does not already know, and that therefore it is needless for them to essay conversation with him, is not admitted, either premises or conclusion. But

suppose it were, the duty would still remain; for by soliciting him to converse with them they could still discover how the matter went with him. In various ways this appointed mean might be blessed to him and to them. While he gives his views to them he thereby receives fresh strength to his own heart. While they drop the well known or common place sentiment, it may come to him with more than common power. But, again, if he stand firm in the trial on the sole word of God, and they see that it bears him up, their duty is to go and do likewise. And if they see him stagger and fall, fret and complain, impotent and unbelieving, they ought to understand that their duty is to follow no man farther than he follows Christ—that principles, not men, is their standard.

In many cases, the strokes inflicted on him are also intended for their reproof and correction. God contends with them also through him. In this case every one has an account of his own that ought to concern him. How does the matter stand? Have they either over-valued or under-valued the servant? Have they profitted by his ministry?—received the instruction given?—submitted to the reproofs and corrections administered? Or are they stationary in religion? Are the same sins still committed—the same duties still neglected?—or, rather, *more* cold, hardened and careless? It is a very important inquiry this, to which they are summoned by a minister's trials. Perhaps it is to warn them that he may soon be removed or rendered incapable of profiting them, or that similar trials are just at *their* own door.

A minister in trouble is sometimes a *sign* to the church. Thus was Isaiah, when he went "naked and barefoot." Thus was Ezekiel, when "the desire of his eyes was taken away with a stroke." In these cases it was a sign of coming judgment, still heavier than all that had preceded it—even captivity and desolation. And the sign may portend destruction still.

From this view of a minister's afflictions, I would infer that "it is very good for him to be afflicted." "Blessed is the man whom the Lord chastises and teaches him out of his law." It improves his experimental knowledge of the scriptures, and of the power of divine grace, and the riches of divine condescension and love. It makes him to know more of the evil nature of sin in his own heart—more of the wiles of Satan. It makes him more humble, more weaned from sublunary things, more submissive. And it gives him most convincing testimonies of God's faithfulness. And he is bound to "set to his seal that God is true."

Again: it should teach every one, and a minister more especially, to judge more charitably of others. Weakness, confusion, and great perplexity, must doubtless have often, during his trouble, have given to his case and state a forbidding appearance, according to which, had he been judged, his real state would have been misrepresented: which, therefore, instructs him in the necessity of great caution and tenderness in respect to others.

Again: we may see that the proper government of the temper is a great matter in affliction. Without this, though the root of the matter be in him, he may be betrayed continually into some snare or other. Rash steps, sudden conclusions, or haste, should, above all things, be shunned. "In patience he should possess his soul." One hasty step at such a time may put him farther out of his right course than he may be able to regain for years. Doubtless there will be many things said and done in circumstances, at times, or by persons, that will greatly provoke to this very thing. At the very moment of David's deepest distress, Shemei comes out and curses him, and throws stones; but he, instead of hastily giving leave to Abishai to take off "the dead dog's head," looks above and sees that the Lord had bidden him curse David—it was a part

of the appointed affliction—let him curse. And most of all should he beware of rising up suddenly from under his trouble, or allowing its weight suddenly to diminish upon his heart. Very sad may be the consequences of such a step. The hiding of God's countenance—greater hardness and indifferency of heart—and heavier strokes of correction afterward.

Again: inasmuch as the afflictions of a minister are of so vast and extended importance to himself, to the church and to the world, and seeing that his path is beset with so many dangers of miscarriage, and snares on the right hand and on the left, without and within, it much concerns him to "do all to stand," and especially after putting on his whole armor, and doing *all* that in him lies, he ought to "*pray always* with all prayer and supplication in the Spirit, and watching thereunto with all *perseverance*." His eye and his heart ought never for a moment to be away from the throne of grace,—that his "foot may be set on an even place," and his steps established steadfastly. "Thy way Lord show, teach me thy paths, lead me in truth, teach me."

Finally, if great spiritual advantages are to be obtained by affliction; if they lift us farther from earth and nearer heaven, the greater humility and watchfulness must be requisite to keep what has been gained. For there is, undoubtedly the greater danger of spiritual pride and security, which surely lays us open to Satan's most fearful temptations of all sorts. It is just like ascending higher up in the air, which makes one more giddy and ready to fall. Above all things, then, humility and watchfulness, with this prayer, "Make strong what thou hast wrought for us, Lord."

ART. III. *Repentance; a Tract, by Rev. Alexander Bullions, D. D., Cambridge, New-York.*

[Concluded from page 215.]

SECT. II.—THE AUTHOR AND SUBJECTS OF GOSPEL REPENTANCE.

God is the author, and sinners, considered as regenerate and believing, the only subjects of repentance unto life. Sinful creatures, if left to themselves, would never repent, even though space was given them for repentance. Satan and his associates in crime have never grieved because of their rebellion against Jehovah. They still love iniquity, and are determined, at the expense of eternal ruin, to persist in its perpetration. Adam, by transgression, lost all the enjoyments of paradise, and exposed himself to endless misery; but instead of repenting, confessing and turning to God, fled from him and hid himself among the trees of the garden. The severest judgments have been inflicted on sinners, and the greatest outward mercies conferred on them, yet they have remained impenitent. And the result cannot possibly be different. For how can a heart filled with hatred against God, relent, mourn for offending him, renounce iniquity, and love righteousness? It is as impossible for a fallen, proud creature to repent, as for the frost of winter to produce vegetation, or for the dead to arise and come forth to life. And no instance can be produced of it. Nearly six thousand years have passed away, and during the whole of that period the annals of truth record not a single example of a sinner, by his own exertions, repenting and obtaining salvation.

Jehovah himself, Father Son and Spirit, is the sole author, the only efficient cause of evangelical repentance. "Then hath God to the Gen-

tiles also granted repentance unto life. If God will peradventure give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth. "And I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and of supplications, and they shall look upon him whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn for him as one mourneth for his only son, and shall be in bitterness for him as one that is in bitterness for his first born."

Christ, as Mediator, is called to be a prince and a saviour, to give repentance to Israel and forgiveness of sins. As a priest, he has appeased the anger of Jehovah, and opened a way for the return of the guilty to his favor, and thus presents the strongest encouragement to repent. As a prophet, he has revealed the scheme of mercy, and is inviting sinners to consider their ways, and return unto the Lord. As a king, he is proclaiming pardon to the guilty, commanding every rebel to repent and return to his allegiance, and shedding down the Spirit to dispose, and enable transgressors to repent and return to the Lord. He thus opened his personal ministry: "Repent ye and believe the gospel."

The Spirit of the Lord is also intimately concerned in repentance. He is the immediate cause of it, the Father and the Son operating through him. It is his province in the economy of mercy to set the sinner's transgressions before his face in their number, aggravations and deserts, to convince him of his pollution and danger, and reveal unto him the pardoning mercy of God, and the justifying righteousness of Jesus Christ. When he is poured out as the spirit of grace and supplication, and acts as the spirit of grace, convincing the hardened of their sins, enlightening the understanding of the blind, renewing the will of the obstinate, and purifying the affections of the polluted, then the subjects of his work look on Christ, whom they have pierced, and mourn for that piercing with godly sorrow.

Sinners considered as regenerated and believing are the exclusive subjects of evangelical repentance. In innocency Adam was implicated in no crime, and repentance was not his duty. The inhabitants of heaven, though actuated with hatred of all sin and love to holiness, have no consciousness of guilt, no painful feelings for present transgression, so cannot be the subjects of repentance. All men on earth being sinners, repentance is become the imperious duty of all. God commandeth all men, every where, to repent. Paul, proceeding on this divine command, testified both to the Jews and also to the Greeks, repentance towards God. Hence it is called repentance from dead works, sin being its proper object; of these, whether public or private, of omission or commission, of greater or less magnitude, all men are bound to repent, and to turn, in purpose and in reality, to the love and practice of new obedience.

But while it is the duty of all men to repent, and many of them do repent, according to the sorrow of the world, that worketh death, none do repent unto life, but elect and believing sinners. Some transgressors are so hardened in crimes that they are past feeling. Their neck is an iron sinew, and their brow brass. They cannot blush, and they refuse to be ashamed. Others of them live in great thoughtlessness and stupidity, and when any alarming occurrence arouses them, they either delay repentance, till some convenient season, or cherish a momentary regret, terminating in some superficial and transient reformation. This is that legal repentance, found in ungodly, reprobate men, as Cain and Judas, and in many of the elect themselves, previous to any change of heart. In adults this is properly the precursor and preparation for evangelical repentance. The latter is found only in true believers. For there is a looking to Christ with the eye of faith, previous to mourning for him. It is a sight by faith of Christ as crucified, and of God as reconciled, that

produces that kindly sorrow which true penitents feel, and which brings them to Christ. Hence Ephraim saith, "Surely *after* that I was turned I repented, and *after* that I was instructed I smote upon my thigh; I was ashamed, even confounded, because that I did bear the reproach of my youth."

If this representation be correct, then gospel repentance precedes not, but follows faith. Legal repentance may, and generally, if not uniformly, does precede faith; but gospel repentance proceeds from faith, as its fruit and effect. Indeed, none but believers can have such a sight of sin, of God, of themselves, and of righteousness, as is productive of genuine repentance. And this repentance is indissolubly connected with grace and salvation. It is repentance after a godly sort, not to be repented of, and repentance unto salvation. Every other kind and grade of repentance may be found in the reprobate, but evangelical repentance, as well as faith and salvation, is confined to elect and believing sinners.

SECT. III.—THE MEANS OF REPENTANCE.

The means of repentance are various, and variously contribute to it. The Holy Ghost, though the efficient cause of repentance, does not usually operate in its production immediately, but mediately, through the instrumentality of a system of means. Some of these are occasional, merely exciting and calling the attention of the sinner to himself and salvation. Of this description are the events of Providence, whether prosperous or adverse. The goodness of God, although despised, should lead the transgressor to repentance, by calling his attention to the beneficence and mercy of God, as encouragements to the guilty to repent and expect forgiveness. The ills of life being manifestations of God's displeasure against sin, are admirably calculated to arouse from stupidity and induce serious consideration, and have often produced these effects. It is, indeed, God's usual procedure, to bring into the wilderness, and then and there begin the good work. It was Ephraim's *wounds* that made him bemoan himself. It was *want* that brought the prodigal to himself, and was overruled to produce the disposition and resolution to return to his father's house.

The grand standing and instrumental means of repentance is the word of God, read and preached. The law exhibits to the sinner his vileness and danger, and thus fills him with hatred of sin, and shame and sorrow on account of it, and awakens an earnest desire for deliverance. "By the law is the knowledge of sin." It is the fire to heat and the hammer to break in pieces the flinty heart, and thus to prepare it for the gospel. It produces however nothing, even when applied by the Spirit, but a legal repentance, and separate from the gospel would never fill the heart with the love of God and of holiness, and produce kindly relentings for iniquity, because committed against infinite majesty, grace and goodness. To this the gospel is as essential, as the law is necessary to prepare for its operation. It exhibits God as hating sin with a perfect hatred, and determined, as the righteous Governor of the universe, to maintain the honor of his law, but at the same time it reveals him as our gracious Father, giving, from pure love, his Son to die for our salvation. This discovery awakens a new train of feelings; our views of God are entirely changed: we see him to be at once the greatest and best of beings, and cannot forgive ourselves for ever having treated him as we have done. The very thought that he is pacified towards us, notwithstanding of all that we have done, leads us to loathe ourselves, and we cannot forgive ourselves for having sinned against him. We now feel willing to be hired servants in his house, contented to take the lowest place, and count his service freedom, pleasure and honor.

To render any mean effectual for this end, our use of it and the ac-

companying blessing of God, are indispensably necessary. It is in vain to expect a bountiful harvest, unless we cultivate the field, and God give rain from heaven, and fruitful seasons. God hath conjoined both in the institution of the means, and it would be enthusiasm and impiety to put them asunder. The case is exactly the same in religion. Jehovah has ordained, and he blesses a system of means for commencing religion in the heart, and for carrying it on to perfection when begun; and it is absurd to expect the result where these means are neglected; or that the use of them will prove effectual when the co-operating influences of heaven are withheld. If we would then find these divinely instituted means of salvation effectual, we must diligently use them, and fiducially and prayerfully depend on God for the blessing. In particular, in respect of repentance, we should be much in the exercise of self-examination, reading of the scriptures, hearing the gospel preached, meditation and prayer.—The first, second and third of these are admirably calculated to acquaint us with our hearts and ways, our present condition and future prospects. The fourth would affect our souls, and render the knowledge attained by self-examination, reading the scriptures and hearing the gospel, influential. The last would draw down the divine blessing on all the preceding means, and we should find in our happy experience the benefit of crying with Ephraim, “turn thou me, and I shall be turned.”

SEC. IV.—THE SEASON OF REPENTANCE.

There is a time for every purpose under the sun, and every thing is beautiful in its season, and some things have such a particular season that if they are not then done they never can be done. The field that is not sown in season cannot produce a crop in harvest. There is also a season for repentance, in which we may expect the divine blessing to make our use of the prescribed means effectual. “Behold now is the accepted time, behold now is the day of salvation.” “Harden not your heart as in the day of temptation in the wilderness, unto whom I swear in my wrath that they should not enter into my rest.” “Seek ye the Lord while he may be found; call ye upon him while he is near.” “O Jerusalem, if thou hadst known, even thou, at least in this thy day, the things that belong unto thy peace: but now they are hid from thine eyes.” These declarations of God inform us that there is a day for doing the work of repentance, and when that day is closed, and the night cometh, it can no more be done forever.

The proper season for repentance is the first moment that ensues on the commission of sin. The moment any sin is committed, that same moment repentance is to be commenced, and while sin continues and is repeated, repentance must also be continued and repeated.

Youth is the most proper period of human life to commence repentance. Early repentance prevents the waste of precious time in sin, the confirmation of vicious habits, and the accumulation of crimes and misery. The farther any travel in sin, if they ever repent, the farther they have to return with weeping and supplication. Wounds that might easily be healed when fresh, can hardly be cured when gangrened. Sins that might have been early and easily crushed in the beginning, like the young of serpents and beasts of prey, when matured require the strength of the giant and the labor of years to destroy them. Then right eyes long endeared have to be plucked out, and right hands cut off. Then a war with the flesh has to commence, and unless prosecuted with energy to victory, we must be often shamefully conquered. Ease, carnal security, and Satan, prompt to defer repentance, but it never can be easier or more profitable than it is at the present moment. For it is as difficult for those that are accustomed to do evil, to repent, as it is for “the Ethiopian to change his skin, or the leopard his spots.”

But while youth is the most proper season for repentance, the season of it in general is not past till death closes the scene. We say "in general," for the sentiment seems countenanced by scripture, that individuals, as well as societies, may so advance in impenitence that their day of grace closes before death arrests them and seals their doom. But be this as it may, the delay of repentance till old age is both foolish and criminal. We read of two that were translated to heaven without tasting death, and of but one that in the course of four thousand years repented unto salvation at the eleventh hour. This holds out a solemn warning, that the probability of repenting late in life is extremely small. And how unseasonable, to have the first and great work of life to commence at the close, when the faculties are enfeebled, and disease and pain are distracting mind and body. How great madness to continue provoking God by delaying repentance when our days are in his hand, and he may cut us off in a moment, and "swear in his wrath that we shall not enter into his rest." And if the language of the Bible give fearful intimation that the day of grace to some is terminated before their natural life ends, the admonition comes in loud and thrilling accents: "Prepare to meet thy God." "To-day if you hear his voice, harden not your hearts." "For I say unto you, except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish."

SEC. IV.—MOTIVES TO REPENTANCE.

We have the most urgent motives and encouragements to repentance.

1. Till we repent we remain under God's-sentence of condemnation, and must perish. Said Christ, and repeated it to assure us of its infallible certainty and importance, "Except ye repent ye shall all perish." We have sinned, and therefore have become obnoxious to the curse. We have sinned times innumerable, and this increases the greatness of our danger. But suppose that we had sinned but once—as one murder is fatal, so one transgression subjects the transgressor to death the penalty of the law. This penalty is denounced against every transgressor of a law that is holy just and good. It contains not one ingredient more than transgression deserves. It is what the judge of all the earth has determined, and when inflicted, every mouth will be stopped from a conviction of its righteousness. It renders the transgressor completely miserable; but this is his just desert. And it will be infallibly inflicted. As the penalty is just, its infliction is certain. "The soul that sinneth shall die." Jehovah the just would act unjustly if he did not inflict it. But he will render to every man according to his works; tribulation and anguish to every soul that sinneth, to the Jew first and also to the Greek. Nay, without repentance the crime is persisted in, and there can be no holiness here nor happiness hereafter. For till the heart is weaned from sin, it cannot accept of the grace of the gospel, or bow to the supremacy of God in the law, and thus remaining impenitent under the dominion of sin, cannot find admission into heaven, and is utterly unprepared for any of its enjoyments. Life and death, then, are suspended on repentance. Remaining impenitent, we are condemned; repenting, our sins are blotted out, and we ourselves are saved.

This doom, however dreadful, is, obviously and incontrovertibly, most reasonable and righteous. To be satisfied of this, arouse thyself, transgressor, and consider the number of thy sins. They are more than the hairs upon thy head. They are innumerable. "Every imagination of the thoughts of thy heart," God being witness, "is evil only, and that continually." Thy soul abounds with these as the tree with blossoms, and they are all "evil," either being conversant about what is evil, or as the product of a soul destitute of the love of God. Thou sustainest manifold relations to God and to fellow men, and each gives origin to many

duties, and in all these thou hast sinned, and come short of the glory of God. Art thou in youth or old age, rich or poor, sick or healthy? Each condition has its duties, and hast thou not failed in the acceptable performance of them? How needful and reasonable then is thy repentance, and how dangerous continuance in impenitence? Consider not only the number, but also the aggravations of thy many sins. They have been committed against a law holy, just and good, and clearly announced in scripture. They have been committed against thy Creator, thy bountiful Benefactor, thy indulgent Father, and thy righteous Lord and Judge. And remaining impenitent under such numerous and heinous sins, canst thou escape the righteous judgment of God? Consider also the vile, the petty motives, that have induced thee to commit thy numerous and aggravated offences. It has been to enjoy the momentary gratification of some base appetite or accursed lust. Thou hast for a thing of nought, sold thyself to work iniquity. And ought not this consideration to fill thee with shame and self-loathing? And if not, thy condemnation will be so just, that all the righteous will acquiesce in it, and thy own mouth will be shut when thy doom is pronounced. Consider also the fearful mischief thou hast wrought to compass thy vile gratification. See the havoc thou hast made. Art thou a parent? By thy pernicious maxims and example thou hast taught thy children to travel with thee to hell, and hast been accessory to their ruin. Art thou a child, a brother, a sister, a neighbor? Art thou in a private or public station? Thy transgressions have tended to seduce others from the path of righteousness to sin and ruin. They have deprived thyself of true honor and felicity, involved thee in misery, and exposed thee to eternal destruction. And remaining impenitent, will not this destruction be reasonable, just and inevitable?

2. God is expressly commanding sinners to repent, and delights in pardoning the penitent. It is not left optional with the sinner whether he will repent or remain impenitent. The great God has interposed his authority, and commanded every sinner to repent. "But now God commandeth all men, every where, to repent." This command is proclaimed to thee, O transgressor, by the dispensations of Providence, and by the voice of conscience within thine own bosom. It is also most distinctly announced to thee in the scriptures. Listen and thou shalt hear the voice from heaven, saying, "Repent and believe the gospel." He is sending his servants to preach repentance and the remission of sins. He is reiterating to thee the call, and seconding it by conferring on thee at one time favors, and, at another, by trouble, smiting and again healing. And to encourage thee to comply with this reasonable command he is assuring thee, "that he has exalted Christ Jesus, a Prince and a Saviour, to give repentance and the remission of sin." He is telling thee that he "delights to pardon," and that he pardons without reserve and without upbraiding the returning penitent. He sees him when afar off and afraid to come, goes forth to meet him, falls on his neck, kisses him and kindly receives and liberally entertains him. And wilt thou persist in disobeying the command of heaven and refusing to comply with the entreating voice of mercy offering to thee a full, free, and everlasting pardon? How dreadful the guilt, and how justly will he refuse to hear when thou criest, and laugh when thy calamity cometh? To day, hear his voice, harden not thy heart, lest he "swear in wrath that thou shalt not enter into his rest." "Kiss the son lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way when his wrath is kindled but a little. Blessed are all they that put their trust in him."

3. Repentance is connected with and followed by the richest advantages to the penitent. Repentance is no vain service, but connected with the whole happiness of a sinner. In the constitution of God it has sal-

vation annexed to it. "Repent ye, therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out." Jehovah dwells with the true penitent. "But to this man, saith the Lord, will I look even to him that is poor, and of a contrite spirit, and trembleth at my word." It leads to and terminates in true comfort. "Blessed are they that mourn for they shall be comforted." And well may such rejoice; for they are reconciled unto three dreadful enemies, the justice of God, their own conscience, and to death. The justice of God is the enemy of every impenitent sinner, but it protects the penitent." If we confess our sins he is just and faithful to forgive our sins, and to cleanse us from all iniquity." Conscience, when awakened, not only threatens, but wounds, piercing the vitals and destroying all peace. The believing penitent enters into peace. Death is the king of terrors to the sinner going on in sin, but to the pardoned penitent death is divested of its terrors, and he can thus triumph over it. "O death! where is thy sting? O grave! where is thy victory?" In short it opens, though not meritoriously, but by the gracious constitution of God, the gates of paradise for the reception of the penitent. Not a genuine penitent was ever rejected by him that delights in mercy, and not one of them misses heaven. They believe and are saved.

Is repentance, then, accompanied and followed by the richest advantages? Let us make sure that our repentance is genuine. Let no repentance satisfy us which is not full, sincere, prompt, constant and scriptural. Let us test its genuineness by its fruits. Paul thus enumerates these, and let us try our repentance by them. 2 Cor. vii. 10, 11. "For godly sorrow worketh repentance to salvation, not to be repented of; but the sorrow of the world worketh death. For behold this self-same thing that ye sorrowed, after a godly sort, what carefulness it wrought in you, yea, what clearing of yourselves, yea, what indignation, yea, what fear, yea, what vehement desire, yea, what zeal, yea, what revenge."

4. Many transgressors have repented and have been pardoned and saved. The Lord God, merciful and gracious, has already pardoned many guilty criminals, taken them into his favor and admitted them to heaven itself. Some of these have been most atrocious criminals. Manasseh, who made the streets of Jerusalem to run with innocent blood, was pardoned by him that sent his son to save the chief of sinners.—Paul, that breathed out slaughter against the church of Christ was pardoned by him that blotteth out iniquities like a cloud, and transgressions as a thick cloud. Pardon was offered to the very crucifiers of the Lord of glory, and they were called to repentance. Let none then despair. Obey the divine and gracious call. Isa. i. 16—20. "Wash you, make you clean, put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes, cease to do evil, learn to do well, seek judgment, relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow. Come now and let us reason together saith the Lord. Though your sins be as scarlet they shall be as white as snow. Though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool. If you be willing and obedient, ye shall eat the good of the land. But if ye refuse and rebel, ye shall be devoured with the sword; for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it."

ART. IV. *Prophetic Times.*

No Commentator on the REVELATION, has displayed more acumen of genius, and none has obtained a more numerous host of followers, than the learned and celebrated JOSEPH MEDE. The principal feature of the

plan, upon which he conducts his exposition, consists in the use of **SYNCHRONISMS**. He saves himself the labor, and his reader the tedium, of examining verse by verse the sublime and mysterious **APOCALYPSE**, and of collecting in detail the result of each process, before any definite idea can be formed of the entire map of this wide-spread survey and long-extended series of human and of divine transactions. He lays hold at once of all the passages, whether in the beginning, the middle, or the end of the book, which in his judgment refer to events coincident in respect of time, and *synchronizes* them—proves their coincidence from characters legible on the face of the prophecy itself. His next object is to show the connecting points between the different clusters of prophecies thus formed by synchronism. The plan adopted by **MÈDE** is certainly an admirable one. And it appears strange that so many commentators, who almost implicitly receive his sentiments, have never thought of observing the same process in transmitting them to their readers. But while we cheerfully accord to the learned English Divine the honor of inventing a method, which excels in perspicuity and facility, the accuracy of several of his synchronisms may very safely be disputed. And to me it appears that the incomparable **VITRINGA**, of the **REFORMED CHURCH OF HOLLAND**, in his **ANACRISIS APOCALYPSEOS**, as far surpasses all other commentators in correctness of interpretation, as the ideas which he derives from several of the prophetic symbols exceed theirs in magnitude and grandeur. For example, he not only synchronizes the seven epistles to the churches of Asia with the seven seals of the book opened by the Lamb, which epistles most expositors throw out of the Revelation, by refusing them a prophetic sense: he likewise discovers in the six first seals a train of events, which are visible, tangible, comprising all the great changes that have affected the church of God upon the one hand, and imperial Rome, both in her Pagan, and Antichristian forms upon the other, and that for a lapse of many ages—a train of events, the history of which already astounds mankind—while the catastrophe of the great drama is yet future, and will one day, not far distant, cause the ears of one class of men to tingle, and the mouths of the other to reiterate loud hallelujahs. Then follows the long-protracted silence, or rest, of the seventh seal, which constitutes the Millennium. How pitiful, compared with this, is the deceptive advantage gained by the church in the victory of Constantine!

But the principle of synchronizing is susceptible of a more extended application, and a more enlarged prospect is desirable, of the times signified by the Spirit speaking in the prophets, than has been given it by the above named ingenious inventor, than has been exhibited in the **ANACRISIS** of **Vitringa**. The prophecies of the Old Testament ought to be measured and compared with those of the New. The precise time occupied by the fulfillment of each, ought not only to be shown in detail—the connection of all the parts of prophetic revelation ought to be distinctly marked, so as to turn the prophecies into one compact body of Bible History. **Bishop NEWTON**, in his excellent **DISSERTATIONS ON THE PROPHECIES**, has contributed greatly to the promotion of this desirable end. But some important prophecies of the Old Testament, the fulfillment of which it is necessary to consider, in forming one unbroken chain of prophetic events, are by him entirely omitted. In one word, that writer, who invites his reader to follow him as his guide, in traversing and surveying, acre by acre, and yard by yard, the vast field delineated in the roll of divine revelation, when unfurled to its utmost dimensions, will do such reader a kindness at least, if not discharge an incumbent duty, by previously presenting him, through means of a chronological chart, with a bird's-eye view of the whole landscape. All further de-

scription of particular sections of territory will, by this method, be rendered more concise and intelligible—less laborious to the expositor—more satisfactory and pleasing to the reader. Such is the design, however imperfect the execution, of the following SCHEME OF PROPHETIC TIMES :

B. C. 3999. The creation. This era is known by computing from the deluge 1656 years—the aggregate of the lives, which the antediluvian patriarchs lived, each before the birth of his son and successor.—To Shem assign 100 years, which he lived before the flood. To Noah 500, before the birth of Shem. Lamech 182, Methuselah 87, Enoch 65, Jared 162, Mahaleel 65, Cainan 70, Enosh 90, Seth 105, Adam 130. In all 1656.

B. C. 2343. The universal deluge. Formed by computing from the call of Abraham 422 years—the aggregate of the post diluvian patriarchs' lives, which each lived before the birth of his son. Assign to Terah before the egress from Ur of the Chaldees 200 years, Nahor 29, Serug 30, Reu 32, Peleg 30, Eber 34, Selah 30, Arphaxad 35, Shem 2 years, between the birth of Arphaxad and the beginning of the flood.—In all 422.

B. C. 1921. The call and egress of Abraham from Ur of the Chaldees. Formed by computing from the exit from Egypt, 430 years, Ex. xii. 40, Gal. iii. 17, compare Gen. xii 1.

B. C. 1916. Departure of Abraham from Haran of Mesopotamia. Found by computing from the birth of Isaac, 25 years. For Abraham was 75 years old when he left Haran and 100 at Isaac's birth. Gen. xii. 4, and xxi. 5.

B. C. 1891. The birth of Isaac. Found by computing from the exit out of Egypt 400 years, according to Gen. xv. 13. Acts vii. 6.

B. C. 1491. Exit from Egypt upon the night of the first passover. Computed from the founding of the temple in the fourth year of Solomon's reign, 480 years. 1 Kings vi. 1. This number may be collected from the book of Judges, by computing the times allotted to each, and by adding the several terms that preceded or followed between the exit and founding, thus : Peregrination in the desert 40 years. Joshua and the elders 18, Othniel 40, Ehud 80, Deborah 40, Gideon 40, Abimelech 3, Tolah 23, Jair 22, Jephthah 6, Jbzan 7, Elon 10, Abdon 8, Sampson 20, Eli 40, Samuel and Saul 40, David 40, Solomon 3. In all 480. The term of each judge is to be reckoned from the death of his immediate predecessor, so as to include the intervening time of servitude. And the 450 years mentioned in Acts xiii. 20, are to be understood as they are given—not in the exactness of a chronological writer, as in 1 Kings vi. 1,—but in the latitude of style allowed to an extempore speaker—*about* 450 years, including all the chronological terms of the judges. The exact sum of which is 437 years.

B. C. 1054. David reigned in Hebron.

B. C. 1044. Location of the Ark in Zion. Compute 3 years in addition to the reign in Hebron, for the Philistine wars, and one ineffectual effort to bring up the Ark. From this location commence the 390 days of the sin of Israel. Ezek. iv. 5. The Mount Zion continued by divine appointment to be held sacred till *the abomination of desolation* was set up by Titus the Roman, in A. D. 68—a period in all of 1111 years.

B. C. 1014. Solomon reigns.

B. C. 1011. The founding of the temple in the fourth year of Solomon's reign in the month Zif.

B. C. 1004. The dedication of the first temple, after 7 years spent in building. From this dedication till the Reformation by Luther, in A. D. 1517 is precisely one great PROPHETIC WEEK—a week of years—amounting to 2520 years.

B. C. 974. The separation of the tribes, in the first year of the reign of Rehoboam. Found by computing 388 years from the destruction of Jerusalem in the eleventh of Zedekiah, or 370 from the begun captivity in the fourth of Jehoiachim. Assign to Zedekiah 10 years, Jehoiachin 3 months, Jehoiachim, after the begun captivity, 8 years. The same, before the captivity, 3, Jehoahaz 3 months, Josiah 31 years, Amon 2, Manasseh 55, Hezekiah 29, Ahaz 16, Jotham 16, Uzziah 52, Amaziah 29, Joash 40, Athaliah 6, Ahaziah 1, Joram 4, Jehoshaphat 25, Asa 41, Abijah 3, Rehoboam 17. Amounting in all to 388 years. The odd months are omitted, to supply the supposable defect in the last year of some of the reigns.

B. C. 719. The siege of Samaria by Salmanezer begins, in the seventh of the reign of Hosheah king of Israel, and the fourth of Hezekiah king of Judah. This siege being a blow at "*the head of Ephraim*" commences the 65 years *breaking* foretold by the Prophet. Isa. vii. 81.

B. C. 709. Revolt of the Medes, and reign of Dejoces, which commence the dismemberment and fall of the Assyrian empire. Computed from the death of Cyrus, according to HERODOTUS, 180 years. Cyrus was king of Persia and Media 30 years, the last 5 of which only he was emperor of the whole ancient Assyrian and Babylonian dominions. Assyages of Media 35 years, Cyaxares 40, Phraortes 22, Dejoces 53.—This revolt accordingly took place in the fourteenth of Hezekiah king of Judah, when Senacherib's army, warring against Libnah, and menacing Jerusalem, was destroyed by an angel. Isa. xxxvi. and xxxvii. chapters.

B. C. 694. Manasseh's reign, with which commence the 40 prophetic days of the sin of Judah. Ezekiel, iv. 6, and 2 Kings, xxiv. 3, 4.

B. C. 654. THE PROSTRATION. Ephraim is broken, or (consternatus, humi dejectus est) cast upon the ground from being a people, Manasseh is carried captive in the forty-first of his reign. Here terminate, in one point, the 390 days iniquity of the house of Israel, the 65 years breaking of Ephraim, and the 40 days iniquity of the house of Judah. This prostration being effected by Essarhaddon, who is called the king of Assur and of Assyria. Ezr. iv. 2, and 2 Kings xvii. 24, and who must have reigned at Babylon, may be considered as commencing the era of the Babylonian empire—the first of the four great IMPERIAL BEASTS. Daniel vii. 3. From that day till the end of the reign of the APOCALYPTIC BEAST, which is Antichrist, the church of God, which has been reserved from absolute prostration, continues in *subjection*, alternately persecuted and corrupted by the successful powers which have swayed the imperial sceptre. This reign and prostration are commensurate and coincident in respect of time—commenced with the forty-first of Manasseh—comprehend a period of one great prophetic WEEK, SEVEN TIMES, ONE WEEK OF YEARS OF YEARS, 2520 years—the half of this WEEK had elapsed in A. D. 606 ending—the whole will be completed in A. D. 1866, which terminates the reign of Antichrist, the last of the IMPERIAL BEASTS. Lev. xxvi. 28. Daniel iv. 6, 17, and 26. It is not necessary that the Esarhaddon mentioned by Ezra, who is the Assardinas of Babylon in profane history be the same as Esarhadon the son of Senacherib of Ninevah. This last may be the same as Sardanapalus of profane history. At the vision of the SEVEN TIMES, Daniel sat *astounded one hour*.

B. C. 620. An eclipse of the moon noticed at Babylon, from the calculation of which Ptolemy has corrected the ancient chronology.

B. C. 604. The captivity of the Jews in Babylon, commences in the first year of the reign of Nebuchadnezzar, and fourth of Jehoiachim.—According to the prophecy of Jeremiah, and the history of Ezra, it included *a week of ten years*, ending in the edict of Cyrus. Jer. xxv. 11, Ezra, i. 1.

B. C. 566. The destruction of the city of Jerusalem and the temple, in the nineteenth of Nebuchadnezzar, and eleventh of Zedekiah, the last king of Judah. Jer. lii. 5, 12. Here commences a second week of tens, contemplated in the same prophecy with the former, Zech. i. 12, and ending in the dedication of the second temple.

B. C. 536. The conquest of Babylon by Cyrus. Isa. xlv. 1. Belshazzar is slain, and Cyrus' relation, and confederate Cyaxares, that is, Darius the Mede—succeeds to the throne of empire.

B. C. 534. The edict of Cyrus in the first of his reign. The release of the Jews from captivity. The reign of the RAM begins. Cyrus, the greater of the two horns. Median and Persian came up last. Dan. viii. 3. Here ends the first week of tens, embraced in Jeremiah's prophecy.

Here commences, with the imperial reign of the RAM, the 2400 prophetic days, according to the Septuagint reading, which end with the reign of the Little Horn, that is, Antichrist, in A. D. 1866. The Babylonian empire, or LION, lasted 120 years, 4 prophetic months, leaving the above number of days, that is 6 years and 8 months of the great WEEK, for the three remaining Beasts.

B. C. 522. Another eclipse of the moon, remarkable for its use in chronology. Ptolemy of Pelusium, in Egypt, born about A. D. 90, an eminent mathematician, and also a Christian, has calculated the precise times of two remarkable eclipses, which had been observed and recorded by the Chaldean astronomers at Babylon. One of these was recorded as happening in the fifth year of the reign of Nabopolassar, the father of Nebuchadnezzar the Great. The historians assign to him a reign of 21 years. The other in the seventh of Cambyses, the son of Cyrus the Great. By the unerring rules of astronomy, the lapse of years between these two celestial phenomena, is found to be 98: the first to have happened in the year of Nabonazar 127, which is J. P. 4093, B. C. 621; the other in the year of Nabonazar 225, which is J. P. 4191, B. C. 523.

B. C. 516. The dedication of the second temple, in the 6th year of the reign of Darius Hystaspes, ends the second week of tens. To Nebuchadnezzar, according to history, both sacred and profane, assign 43 years. Evilmerodach reigned two full years, Neriglissar four, and Laborasarchad some months, according to Berosus, in Josephus. Assign to the three last reigns in all 8 years; to Belshazzar 17; Darius the Mede 2; amounting to 70 in all. Cyrus lived and reigned, according to Xenophon, 7 years from the conquest of Babylon, consequently only 5 from the commencement of the Medio-Persian empire, which is the first year of Cyrus, in the reckoning of the sacred writers. The erroneous opinion, that Xenophon numbers his 7 years of Cyrus' reign from the death of Darius or Cyaxares, and that the first of those seven corresponds to the first year of Cyrus in scripture, has exceedingly disturbed the whole system of Bible chronology; and is, until removed, an insuperable obstacle to the correct interpretation of the prophecies, both of the Old Testament and the New. Cambyses was Cyrus' son and successor, and reigned 7 years. Smerdis the Magician, 8 months. These two are called Ahasuerus and Artaxerxes in scripture. Ezra iv. 6, 7. Assign to them together 8 years; add 5 years of Darius Hystaspes, which he reigned prior to the dedication, and it makes 18 years in all, from the edict of Cyrus, and 70 from the destruction of the city and the temple by Nebuchadnezzar.

B. C. 458. The decree to restore and to build Jerusalem, in the 7th year of Artaxerxes Longimanus. Ezra vii. 1—26. Here commence the 70 weeks' vision, relating to the advent and work of Messiah, to be terminated and sealed up in his death. Dan. ix. 24. Darius Hystaspes reigned 36 years; but only 31 after the dedication of the temple.—Xerxes the Great, who is the Ahasuerus in the book of Esther, reigned

21 years. Artaxerxes Longimanus, before the decree to restore and build, 6 years. Amounting to 58 in all. The high-priest at the time of this decree was Eliashib, the same as Jozabad. He was the son of Joiakim, and grandson of Jeshua, the contemporary with Zerubbabel. This decree was not made by Artaxerxes Mnemon, nor by any later person of that name. For the grandson of Jeshua could not, in that case, be supposed to be living at the date of the decree. Neh. xii. 10. Ezra viii. 33. Neh. iii. 1.

B. C. 445. Nehemiah made Satrap of Judah, in the 20th of Artaxerxes Longimanus. Neh. ii. 1.

B. C. 409. End of the 7 weeks building of the street and wall; that is, of the policy and order of the body ecclesiastic and of the nation. Beginning of the 62 weeks.

B. C. 1. One year before the vulgar era, Christ is born, about the time of the autumnal equinox. Found by computing from the 15th year of the reign of Tiberius, 27 years, and allotting to Tiberius 2 years co-partnership with Augustus in the empire, according to Velleius, Paterculus and Suetonius.

A. D. 20. MESSIAH THE PRINCE. End of the 7 weeks and 62 weeks. Beginning of the kingdom of heaven in the baptism of John, 483 years from the decree, about the time of the vernal equinox.

A. D. 29. Christ is baptised, and enters upon his public ministry, three and a half years from the commencement of his kingdom, about the time of the autumnal equinox, and about 30 full years from his birth.

A. D. 33. Christ is crucified about the time of the vernal equinox, thirty-three and a half years of age, three and a half from his entrance on the ministry, and seven full years from the commencement of the principedom, kingdom, or reign, in the ministry of John. Thus *he confirmed the covenant with many for one week.* And here end the 70 weeks of years. *The midst of the week* (*Heb.* the half of a week) here begins.

A. D. 68. The abomination of desolation is set up; Jerusalem is compassed with armies; the daily sacrifice and oblation cease. These events happened one half week of tens of years after the crucifixion of Christ, and the completion of the seventy weeks of years. Dan. iv. 27. Mat. xxiv. 15. Luke xxi. 20. This is the year in which Nero dies, and Galba succeeds him. He and Otho and Vitellus reign in succession a year and more in all. *Josephus* l. 4, ch. 9.

A. D. 70. Jerusalem and the temple destroyed by Titus and the Romans, about the time of the passover, which is near the vernal equinox.

A. D. 97. The Revelation received and written by John in Patmos.

The **FIRST SEAL** commences with the reign of Nerva, and extends 154 years; but if from the baptism of John, it embraces a period of 225 years. The *conquering* period; the *Ephesian* state of the church; labor and patience; trial and condemnation of lying apostles; decline of first love; hatred of Nicolaitans; Michael's war with the dragon after the woman's parturition with the *man* child.

A. D. 251. The **SECOND SEAL** commences with the reign of Decius, and continues 62 years. The *persecuting* period; the *Smyrnan* state of the church; blasphemy of the synagogue of Satan; imprisonment; tribulation ten days. Thus the Dragon, at this era cast to the earth, persecutes the woman.

A. D. 257. Flight of the woman into the wilderness begins with the Valerian persecution, which is the last but one of the ten persecutions, called *general*. Here is the first era of the *treading under foot* of the outer court by the Gentiles, and of the two witnesses prophesying in sackcloth. Hence to the Reformation by Luther is precisely 1260 prophetic days.

A. D. 303. The **FLOOD** emitted from the mouth of the Dragon, which is the tenth and Dioclesian persecution; the tribulation of ten prophetic days; the yawning earth swallowed up this flood; the convulsions of the empire, by intestine wars, resulting in the victory and sole command of Constantine, ended the persecution.

A. D. 313. The **THIRD SEAL** commences with the reign of Constantine the Great. The *famishing* period; continues 294 years; the *Pergamean* state of the church; holding fast Christ's name; Antipas slain; Satan's seat; Balaamites and Nicolaitans tolerated; Pelagianism, Arianism, and many gross superstitions prevail. But exact trial of fundamental doctrines made in ecclesiastic councils, as if by weight and measure.

A. D. 325. The council of Nice, which had been preceded by that of Eliberus, Arelat, Ancyra, and Neocesarea; and is followed by those of Laodicea, Sardica and others, in all which many important points of doctrine are stated and vindicated, and many foolish and superstitious ceremonies are intruded, or regulated and enjoined, by ecclesiastic canons. The hierarchy greatly swells itself in magnitude and power. Images begin to be introduced.

A. D. 606. This year *ending*. The **FOURTH SEAL** commences with the reign of the *seven headed and ten horned BEAST*. Phocas, the emperor of Constantinople, being the seventh head of the Dragon, and also of this **BEAST**, proclaims, by imperial edict, Boniface III. **UNIVERSAL BISHOP**. Thus the Dragon gives the Beast his seat, (which is Rome,) and his power and great authority. The Roman emperor had always been, till this date, the chief Pontiff of the established religion.

This same year Mahomet retires to his cave to digest his Koran, which he gives to light, and begins his conquests **A. D. 622**. This is the Thyatyrans state of the church; the *mortal and hell-like* period; charity, and service, and faith, and patience of the witnesses; woman Jezebel the seductrix; fornication and idols; *kill with death*. This seal extends to a period of about 560 years.

A. D. 1177. The **FIFTH SEAL** commences here—if not ten years sooner—with the persecution of the Waldenses. Pope Alexander III and Frederick Blue-beard, the emperor, make peace. The latter, prostrating himself to kiss the foot of the former, receives the kiss of peace in return. Thus says *Sigonius*. According to others, the Pope presses his feet upon the emperor's neck, repeating the words of Ps. xci. 13.

The third Lateran council is called this year, by Alexander, consisting of three hundred bishops and a great number of abbots. Canon 1, ordains the election of Pope by cardinals only. Canon 2, anathematizes the Waldenses under the name of *Cuthari*. Canon 3, condemns the marriage of the clergy under the name of *concupinage*.

This is the crying period; thy Sardine state; white robes walk in white; "*their brethren also he killed*." Continuation of this seal, if it began **A. D. 1167**, will be precisely one centennial week.

A. D. 1215. The fourth Lateran council, consisting of 412 bishops, 71 archbishops, Innocent III presiding. Here is confirmed by solemn decree transubstantiation, auricular confession, and *papal omnipotence*. Here is instituted the military order of *crusaders*—avowedly against the Saracens—really against the Waldenses.

A. D. 1517. The Reformation begins by Luther's preaching against indulgences, and his publicly burning the Pope's bull. This ends the 1260 days of the woman's flight, and of the witnesses' prophesying. It ends *one* period of 42 months' treading under foot.

The killing of the witnesses here begins, from which era till their resurrection will be one half week of centuries—three and a half great prophetic days. During this period, that is the latter part of it, the dead

bodies of the martyrs are lying unburied in the street of the great city. Persecution has literally destroyed the Protestant churches in Germany and France, and left nothing comparatively but nominal professors in their room.

A. D. 1866, *ending*. The SIXTH SEAL. The *wrathful* period. The Philadelphian and Laodicean states of the church commence at the same time by SECESSIONS. The former has *an open door*, and will be kept in *the hour of temptation*, become universal, and continue to the end of the world. The other is lukewarm, nauseous, will be *spued out*, unchurched. Here ends the reign of the Beast, of the Little Horn, the SEVEN TIMES.

A. D. 1942. The MILLENIUM.

J. A.

ART. V. Letter from Scotland.

The Associate Church in this country has been greatly blamed for declining the communion of the United Session Church of Scotland, and also for *not* declining communion with the Original Seceders; because, as is alledged, some in the latter body are advocates for "church establishments." The subjoined letter will show this allegation to be true of the United Church; so that in this particular the two bodies are on a par. But the reasons which have induced the Associate Church to prefer one body to the other, draw deeper, and are vastly more important than any considerations of a political character. With the peculiar political relations of Presbyterian bodies in Scotland to the government of their country, we in this country have no direct concern. The peculiar and diversified views of civil establishments entertained by individuals in all the branches of the Presbyterian church in Scotland, should not be used as an argument either for or against them, by any in this country possessing common candor. Because it is an extremely nice point to settle; because its settlement belongs to them; and because there are powerful considerations bearing upon it, which have no existence in this country. That country in its national character is under solemn *covenant* engagements to God to profess and maintain the true Reformed religion; not so here. The government of that country has all along extended its aid to religion, from which it may be inferred that if its aid is now to be withdrawn from the Reformed religion, it will be bestowed upon its opposite—Popery; not so here. These peculiar differences might be extended; but enough has been advanced to show that the question of civil establishments, in Scotland is one thing, and in this country quite another. Not that we suppose *principles* capable of change. But in order to overthrow the existing constitution in Scotland, it would be necessary to prove, not merely the sinfulness of its details, but also of its subject matter, which would present the strange anomaly of the church, in a period of signal reformation, covenanting to maintain a sinful constitution. But in this country the question assumes a different shape. Here, it has been settled, by Seceders and others, that the magistrate is bound to countenance and *protect* religion. In what respects and to what extent this countenance is to be given, are questions, which have not been definitively settled, only that it shall not be to the injury of the civil rights of others. We conclude, therefore, that their views of the magistrate's power *circa sacra*, should not be used either for or against our brethren in Scotland. Nevertheless, it must be confessed with sorrow, that there is an evil spirit at work in the Protestant churches both of Britain and America. It has become quite fashionable for professing Christians to compliment corrupt and corrupting governments, for their freedom from religious obligations, and to flatter them for their indifference to the moral character of, those over whom God in his Providence has given them authority, for this specific purpose, that they should be "a terror to evil doers, and a praise to them that do well." It is notorious that our civil rulers manifest the greatest unconcern whether the people become Protestants, Papists, Turks, or Pagans; and in this, their hands are strengthened by professed Christians, who use language on this subject which, a century ago, could only be heard from the lips of avowed infidels. And if liberty of conscience should not be wrested from the visible church by the civil arm, it will not be owing in any degree to her exertions to prevent so fearful a calamity. Why so much sensitiveness in the Christian church, lest civil rulers should acknowledge their obligation to, and dependence upon, the Divine Being? Who that has any discernment of the times does not see that "that zeal which influenced our forefathers for the truth," and which inflicted a wound upon the "man of sin" from which he has not yet recovered, "has in a great measure forsaken our land?"

From such considerations as the above we are not prepared to say that either the writer of the subjoined letter, or those, who it is supposed think with him, among Original Seceders, are wrong. So far as can be judged, at this distance, of the present controversy in Scotland respecting civil establishments, it appears that *Protestants* are struggling to break down every barrier erected by their reforming ancestors against the papal see! And we should not be surprised if they were again made to feel the fury of that prophetic beast; nor yet should we be surprised to see his bloody sceptre swayed over this fair republic. The affairs both in church and state, are so obviously shaping to give him an unobstructed reception, that nothing but the special interposition of a merciful God can preserve us from the fangs of the monster.

MR. EDITOR:—I send you the following extract from a letter, dated March 25, 1833, received from a friend in Scotland, belonging to the *United Secession Church*. If you judge it worthy of a place in the Monitor, it is at your service.

“Mr. Thomas Charters, son of the late Thomas Charters, Berwick, whom perhaps you will recollect, is present Mayor of Berwick. What a change of times, that a Seceder should be a Mayor! He still attends our meeting, and adheres to his profession! The abolition of the *test*, which took place lately, is of advantage to those who could not conscientiously take it. The emancipation of the Catholics, opened the way for them into parliament: and at our last election, a number of that persuasion were returned for Ireland. What the result may be, time only can determine. The Catholics will never be satisfied till they get all the power into their own hands: and get Ireland into their own hands. May the time soon come when the cry shall be heard, “Babylon is fallen, is fallen, and shall no more arise.” May the Lord hasten this in his time. In many places in England, and even in Scotland, the number of Papists is greatly on the increase! That zeal which influenced our forefathers for the truth has in a great measure, forsaken our land,—of late, there has been a great cry raised against church establishments of every kind, Presbyterian, as well as Episcopalian. And voluntary Church associations have been formed in Edinburgh, Glasgow, and various other places, and Seceders have taken a prominent place in them. What would Cullfargie,* the Erskines, and the other fathers of the Secession, have said to this! Their advocates endeavor to bring strong arguments in favor of their scheme, from your side of the Atlantic, and extol the present state of religion with you, which they in a great measure, impute to the want of establishments. What is your opinion on this subject? I am afraid, that if we had no Parish Churches, whole districts, even in our beloved land, would be destitute of the very form of religion. Let patronage be abolished, and let the pure doctrines of the gospel be preached, and there can no evil arise from a moderate stipend being raised from the land.

ART. VI. *Correspondence between the Lords and Commons in the Parliament in England, and the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland; also between said Assembly and the Assembly of Divines met at Westminster, 1643—1648.*

It is believed that the following correspondence will be read with interest by all who have it not in their possession. It will give some insight into the faithful contentions of our christian fathers, and should it lead any to greater watchfulness in this respect, its publication will not be in vain.

A Declaration of the Lords and Commons in the Parliament of England, to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland.

The Lords and Commons in Parliament, acknowledging with humble thankfulness to Almighty God, the disposer of hearts, the christian zeal and love which the General Assembly of the Churches of Scotland, have manifested in their pious endeavors for the preservation of the true Reformed Protestant religion, from the subtle practice and attempts of the Popish and prelatical party, to the necessary reformation of church discipline and government in this kingdom, and the more near union of both churches, do earnestly desire that reverend Assembly to take notice, that the two Houses of Parliament, fully concurring with them in these pious intentions, for the better accomplishment thereof, have called an assembly of divers godly and learned divines, and others of this kingdom, unto the city of Westminster, who are now sitting and consulting about these matters. And likewise have nominated and appointed John, earl of Ruthland, Sir William Armine, baronet, Sir Henry Vane the younger, knight, Thomas Hatcher and Henry Darley, esquires, committees and commissioners of both Houses, to the kingdom and states of Scotland; who, besides their instructions in matters concerning the peace and commonweal of both kingdoms, have received directions to resort to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, and propound and consult with them, or any commissioners deputed by them, in all occasions which may further the so much desired reformation in ecclesiastical matters in this church and kingdom, and a nearer conjunction betwixt both churches. In performance whereof, Mr. Stephen Marshal, and Mr. Philip Nye, ministers of God's Word, and men of approved faithfulness and abilities in their function, both members of this Assembly of divines here congregated and sitting, are appointed to assist and advise the same committee in such things as shall concern this church. And the two Houses do hereby recommend the committees and divines aforementioned, to the reverend Assembly of the Church of Scotland, to be by them received with favor, and credited in those things which they, or any three or more of them, shall propound to them.

It is likewise desired, that that reverend Assembly will, according to their former promise and resolution, send to the Assembly here, such number of godly and learned divines, as in their wisdom they think most expedient for the furtherance of this work, which so much concerns the honor of God, the prosperity and peace of the two Churches of England and Scotland; and which must needs have a great influence in procuring a more safe and prosperous condition to other reformed churches abroad. And that their endeavors may be more effectual, the two Houses do make this request to them, with their authority, advice and exhortation, so far as belongs to them, to stir up that nation to send some competent forces in aid of

this Parliament and kingdom, against the many armies of the Popish and Prelatical party, and their adherents, now in arms for the ruin and destruction of the Reformed religion, and all the professors thereof. In all which they shall do that which will be pleasing to God, whose cause it is, and likewise safe and advantageous to their own church and kingdom, who cannot securely enjoy the great blessings of religion, peace and liberty in that kingdom, if this church and kingdom, by the prevailing violence of that party, shall be brought to ruin and destruction.

JO. BROWNE, *Cleric. Parliamentorum.*

HENRY ELSYNGE, *Clr. Com.*

The Answer of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, to the Declaration of the Honorable Houses of the Parliament of England.

The General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, having received a Declaration from the honorable Houses of the Parliament of England, by their committees and commissioners now residing here, have thought good to make known unto the Lords and Commons in Parliament, that all the members of this Assembly, and others well affected here, do with most thankful respects, take special notice of the expressions which they have been pleased to make in the aforementioned Declaration, not only concerning their approbation of the desires and endeavors of the General Assembly of this Kirk, for the reformation of the Church of England, and the union of both churches in religion and church government; but also concerning the resolution of both Houses, fully to concur with them in these pious intentions. With the same thankfulness and due reverence, they acknowledge the high respects expressed towards them by both Houses, in directing unto them their committees and commissioners, assisted by two reverend divines, and in desiring some of the godly and learned of this Kirk to be sent unto the Assembly sitting there.

The Assembly doth bless the Lord, who hath not only inspired the Houses of Parliament with desires and resolutions of the reformation of religion, but hath advanced by several steps and degrees that blessed work; by which, as they shall most approve themselves to the Reformed churches abroad, and to their brethren of Scotland, so shall they most powerfully draw even from heaven the blessings of prosperity and peace upon England. And as it is the earnest wish of their brethren here, that the true state and ground of the present differences and controversies in England, may be more and more cleared, to be concerning religion, and that both Houses may unceasingly prosecute that good work first and above all other matters, giving no sleep to their eyes, nor slumber to their eyelids, until they find out a place for the Lord, an habitation for the mighty God of Jacob, whose favor alone can make their mountain strong, and whose presence in his own ordinances shall be their glory in the midst of them. So it is our confidence, that the begun reformation is of God, and not of man; that it shall increase and not decrease; and that he to whom nothing is too hard, who can make mountains, valleys, crooked things straight, and rough ways smooth, shall lead along and make perfect this most wonderful work, which shall be remembered to his glory in the church, throughout all generations.

And lest, through any defect on the General Assembly's part, the work of reformation, (which hitherto, to the great grief of all the godly, hath moved so slowly,) should be any more retarded or interrupted, they have, according to the renewed desires of both Houses of Parliament, and their own former promises, nominated and elected Messrs. Alexander Henderson, Robert Douglas, Samuel Rutherford, Robert Balzie, and George Gillespie, ministers of God's Word; and John, Earl of Cassis, John, Lord Maitland, and Sir Archibald Johnston, of Waristoun, ruling elders, all of them men much approved here; with commission and power to them, or any three of them, whereof two shall be ministers, to repair unto the Assembly of Divines, and others of the Church of England, now sitting at Westminster, to propound, consult, treat, and conclude with them, and with any committees deputed by the Houses of Parliament, (if it shall seem good to the honorable Houses in their wisdom to depute any for that end,) in all such things as may conduce to the utter extirpation of Popery, Prelacy, heresy, schism, superstition and idolatry; and for the settling of the so much desired union of this whole Island in one form of church government, one confession of faith, one common catechism, and one directory for the worship of God, according to the instructions which they have received, or shall receive from the commissioners of the General Assembly, appointed to meet at Edinburgh from time to time, with the Assembly's power for that end. And as the General Assembly doth most gladly and affectionately receive and fully trust the committees and divines sent hither, so do they hereby commend the aforementioned commissioners, not only to the like affection and trust of the Assembly there, but also to the favor and protection of both Houses of Parliament.

And for the further satisfaction and encouragement of their brethren of England, the whole Assembly, in their own name, and in the name of all the particular churches in this kingdom, whom they represent, do hereby declare, that from their zeal to the glory of God, and the propagation of the gospel, from their affection to the happiness of their native king, and of the kingdom of England, and from the sense of their own interest in the common dangers of religion, peace and liberty, they are most willing and ready to be united and associated with their brethren in a nearer league and solemn covenant for the maintenance of the truly Reformed Protestant religion, against Popery and Prelacy, and against all Popish and Prelatical corruptions, in doctrine, discipline, worship, or church government; and for the settling and holding fast of unity and uniformity betwixt the kirks of this Island, and with the best Reformed churches beyond sea. Which union and covenant shall, with God's assistance, be secured by their co-operating with their brethren in the use of the best and most effectual means that may serve for so good ends. For the more speedy effectuating whereof, to the comfort and enlargement of their distressed brethren, (whose hope deferred might make their

hearts to faint,) the whole Assembly with great unanimity of judgment, and expressions of much affection have approved (for their part) such a draught and form of a mutual league and covenant betwixt the kingdoms, as was the result of the joint debates and consultations of the commissioners from both Houses, assisted by the two reverend divines, and of the committees deputed from the Convention of the estates of this kingdom, and from the General Assembly. Expecting and wishing the like approbation thereof by the right honorable the Lords and Commons in Parliament, and by the reverend Assembly there, that thereafter it may be solemnly sworn and subscribed in both kingdoms, as the surest and straightest obligation to make both stand and fall together in that cause of religion and liberty.

As the estates of this kingdom have often professed, in their former Declarations, the integrity of their intentions against the common enemies of religion and liberty in both kingdoms, and their great affection to their brether of England, by reason of so many and so near relations; so doubtless now, in this time of need, they will not fail to give real proof of what they before professed. *A friend loveth at all times, and a brother is born for adversity.* Neither shall the Assembly, or their commissioners, be wanting in exhorting all others to their duty, or in concurring, so far, as belongeth to their place and vocation, with the estates now convened, in any lawful and possible course which may most conduce to the good of religion and reformation, the honor and happiness of the king's majesty, the deliverance of their brethren of England from their present calamitous condition, and to the perpetuating of a firm and happy peace betwixt the kingdoms.

[To be continued.]

ART. VII. *The Reformed Presbyterian Church.*

SEVERAL difficulties have of late agitated this branch of the visible church. It is doubtless well known to our readers, that an unhappy *schism* has taken place in the above named Body, in this country. This was effected at the meeting of their General Synod in August last, by one of the contending parties' removing, before the court was constituted, to another place and constituting by themselves. The cause of this division appears to have been a diversity, (or at least a supposed diversity) of sentiment respecting the established principles of their church, on the subject of its civil relations. From the following article, which we copy from "THE CHRISTIAN FREEMAN," (a respectable paper published under the patronage of the Secession Church in Ireland,) we learn, that the Reformed Presbyterians, in that country, have also been involved in difficulties arising from a diversity of views respecting their principles on the subject of the magistrate's power *circa sacra*. The Rev. Mr. Houston, the editor of THE COVENANTER, had in that paper asserted and defended the magistrate's right to punish *heretics* and *idolaters*. In this he had been opposed by the Rev. Mr. Paul, the excellent author of "ARIANISM REFUTED." The consequence was that Mr. Houston libelled Mr. Paul and some others, who had espoused his cause, before the Synod. The following is a brief account of the trial and its issue.

On Tuesday the 9th of July, the Annual Meeting of the Reformed Presbyterian Synod, was held in Moneymore, when the Moderator for the past year, the Rev. Thomas Houston, of Knockbracken, delivered a discourse from Rev. ii. 10, "*Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life.*" The Rev. J. Sweeney, of Faughan, near Derry, was then chosen Moderator for the present year, after which, the remainder of the day was spent in the arrangement of routine business; and on Wednesday the Synod was occupied chiefly with interlocutory matters, preparatory to the investigation of one of the most extraordinary cases that have been brought before a Presbyterian judicatory, for at least, half a century. This case, which had excited intense interest, not only in the Reformed Presbyterian body itself, but generally amongst the members of other communities, was formally taken up by the Synod on Thursday, and, in order that our readers may understand its merits, a few words of explanation will be necessary.

When the Periodical called the *Covenanter* was about to be established, it was at first put under a committee of management, with which committee the Rev. Thos. Houston became dissatisfied, and assumed to himself the exclusive direction of the Periodical. After some time, various articles appeared in it on the subject of the civil magistrate's power in ecclesiastical matters, enforcing it as one of his special *duties* in a christian state, to root out and extirpate by the *sword* heretics and idolaters. The Rev. John Paul, of Carrickfergus, whose merits, as an able and successful defender of the doctrinal peculiarities of the christian system, are well known to the religious public, felt himself called upon to disown the tenets put forward in the *Covenanter* which tenets he conceived, went to justify persecution; and, with this view, he published a letter in the *Belfast News-Letter*, contrasting the doctrines of the *Covenanter* with the authorized explanations of the Reformed Presbyterian church, on the subject of magistratical interference. Mr. Houston replied, declining a newspaper controversy, and threatening to bring Mr. Paul under the censure of the church for writing against him, instead of complaining to his Presbytery. Articles, however, continued to be published in the *Covenanter*, to which articles Mr. Paul replied in an elaborate pamphlet, entitled "*The Covenanter Reviewed*," &c. A number of other matters were also mixed up with the controversy; the result of which was, that at the meeting of Synod in Belfast, last year, Mr. Houston exhibited a *libel*, containing a long catalogue of charges against Mr. Paul and implicating as accomplices four of Mr. Paul's friends, viz.—the Rev. Messrs. Alexander, C. Houston, Henry, and Orr, because they had assisted in *circulating* Mr. Paul's pamphlet.—The whole matter was referred to the adjudication of the Synod, this year at Moneymore.

After a great deal of discussion, about matters of form, it was at length arranged on Thurs-

day, that Mr. Paul should be tried separately, and that the other ministers should also have separate trials. The first part of the case related to the conduct of the Northern Presbytery, in allowing Mr. Houston to deliver a long speech against Mr. Paul at one of their meetings, when Mr. Paul was absent, and when, even if he had been present, he was not amenable to their authority. The Presbytery were acquitted of any evil intention, but the conduct Mr. Houston was censured as irregular and disorderly. The second part of the case included the Rev. Thomas Houston's charges against Mr. Paul, the most remarkable feature of which was Mr. Paul's alleged doctrinal error in denying the right of the civil magistrate to *restrain and punish, by the power of the sword, heretics and idolaters*—in other words, all whom Reformed Presbyterian Church, acting under the infallible guidance of such liberal christians as Mr. Houston, should judge to be infected with the leaven of heresy or idolatry! On this, and the other subjects connected with it, Mr. Houston spoke for nearly eight hours, and one of the principal objects of his speech was to enforce the position that the *judicial law of Moses is not repealed*—that it is still *authoritatively binding upon christian states and christian magistrates*—that the *penal laws* of the old dispensation against *erroneous opinions* in religion are no more repealed than the laws against *robbery or murder*, and consequently that it is the *duty* of the magistrate to enforce those penal laws. He also insisted that, as this opinion was a part of the creed of our Presbyterian ancestors, we are bound to adhere to it—that the penal laws against heretics and Papists, which were passed after the Reformation, were embodied in the national Covenant, and were solemnly sworn to by Covenanters every time that they sat down to the Lord's table. Even a *passive toleration* of erroneous sects, by which is meant, simply *allowing men to live uninjured*, and to retain their religious peculiarities, he characterised, in the words of Act and Testimony, as “the *cut-throat* of all *true religion*,” and he joined with the Auchensauigh renovators in regarding as a “*sin to be mourned over before God*,” the non-execution in modern times of the penal statutes of the reforming period, one of which statutes ordained, that every *Papist* who should be convicted a *third time* of hearing mass should be punished with *death*! To this act, and others of a similar tendency, the Rev. Thomas Houston acknowledged his belief that he was solemnly bound, and he reiterated and pressed the sentiment, that whatever the Jewish magistrate did in regard to the suppression of error, the Christian magistrate might do for a similar object—nay, that he was bound to do it in conformity with the written law of heaven. He would not, however, say that he would inflict *capital* punishment; he would leave that to the discretion of the magistrate: and here was the marvel; for if the *law* be unrepealed, the *penalty* must remain in full force in every case of transgression, since it is the *law-maker alone*, who can interfere with it in the way either of mitigation or removal, the duty of the legal functionary being restricted to the simple act of seeing its provisions *faithfully* carried into effect, and so much as this Mr. Houston has himself acknowledged in his publications. To do Mr. Houston justice, he confessed that he would not think of carrying his principles into effect “*till an after day*,” when the nation would be thoroughly *reformed*—that is, when *Covenanters would be in possession of civil and political authority*! How merciful in this young divine to keep his hands off his heretical neighbors so long as he knows that he has not the *power* of doing them injury! He would let men *hold* as many opinions as they please, but they must *conceal* them—how indulgent!

Mr. Paul replied at considerable length, resting his defence as a member of the covenanted church, on the fact, that the principles of toleration which he had maintained were the identical principles which the church itself had repeatedly avowed in its authorised explanations of the sense in which those passages of the Standards, which refer to the magistrate's power, were to be received. He also entered into an able examination of the two dispensations; and showed, with great force of argument, the utter inapplicability of the principle of the Jewish theocracy to Christian states, unless there were in the latter, as there was in the former, a visible, *infallible* authority, to whom references could be made, and whose immediate response should definitively settle every point of religious controversy. The principles which had been advanced by Mr. Houston, he could not avoid regarding as the very essence of persecution, and calculated to lead different sectaries to exterminate each other, whenever they should feel themselves strong enough to set about it with any prospect of success. He regretted that in the 19th century, and in a Protestant community, he should be compelled to fight over again the battle of civil and religious liberty, and to assail principles, from the very imputation of which, even Popery was anxious to free itself.

On Saturday, the case was issued by the Synod's unanimous concurrence, in a set of resolutions which had been prepared by a select committee. These resolutions merely affirmed a number of general principles relative to the mediatorial headship of Christ over the nations, and the duty of magistrates and subjects to promote *true* religion, and to suppress error by *all scriptural means*, without, of course, stating what these “*scriptural means*” might be. In conclusion, all *persecution for religious opinions* was strongly condemned, as was also the opinion that men might be injured, merely because they differed from Covenanters. In reference to the conduct of the two parties concerned, Mr. Houston was strongly censured for having violated his engagement with the committee, and positive disapprobation was expressed of ministers of the same body writing in opposition to each other. Mr. Houston offered an apology to Messrs. Alexander, Clarke Houston, &c., for having published his charges against them in the *Covenanter*, and, in consequence, these ministers did not press their right to a trial.

Thus was amicably terminated, *ad interim*, a controversy, which had been on the very point of rending the Reformed Presbyterian body in Ireland, and we hope we may regard it as the last effort that will ever be made to fasten a system of judaizing bondage, or anti-christian intolerance, upon the descendants of men, whose blood was shed in defence of our civil and religious FREEDOM.

THE
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,

AND

EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

FEBRUARY, 1834.

ART. I. *Slavery.*

In conformity to a pledge already given, we lay before our readers, in the present number, the act of Synod condemning Slavery in our communion, passed 1831, together with reasons of Protest against said act given into Synod in 1832, and the Answers to said reasons given in by a committee of Synod in 1833. While the Synod accepted these answers from their committee, as in general satisfactory, owing to their great length, they had not time to go into such an examination as was necessary before a formal adoption; therefore these answers must be regarded as the report of a committee, accepted as such, but not sanctioned as a deed of Synod. It is believed that a careful perusal of these documents will go far towards furnishing the reader with the merits of the slavery controversy. It is only further to be added, that a committee was appointed in 1832, to report the best means to carry more fully into effect this act condemning slavery, which reported at the last meeting, to strike out all of said act after the resolutions; and this report now lies upon the table as unfinished business.

The Act.

Resolved, That as slavery is clearly condemned by the law of God, and has been long since judicially declared to be a moral evil by this church; no member thereof shall, from and after this date, be allowed to hold a human being in the character or condition of a slave.

Resolved, That this Synod do hereby order all its subordinate judicatories to proceed forthwith to carry into execution the intention of the foregoing resolution, by requiring those church members under their immediate inspection, who may be possessed of slaves, to relinquish their unjust claims, and release those whom they may have heretofore considered as their property.

Resolved, That if any member or members of this church, in order to evade this act, shall sell any of their slaves, or make a transfer of them, so as to retain the proceeds of their services, or the price of their sale, or in any other way evade the provisions of this act, they shall be subject to the censures of the church.

Resolved, Further, that where an individual is found, who has spent so much of his or her strength in the service of another, as to be disqualified from providing for his or her own support, the master in such a case is to be held responsible for the comfortable maintenance of said servants.

That the foregoing resolutions may be carried into full effect, the Synod do agree to recommend to persons holding slaves in our communion, that the following directions be observed:

1. Let slaves be manumitted at home, where this can be done in agreeableness with state enactments

2. Let slaves be removed, or let families together with their slaves remove to non slave-holding states.

3. Let the slaves be sent to Liberia, or delivered over to the agent of the American Colonization Society, or sent to the colony of colored people in Upper Canada, in cases where it shall be found most practicable; and in order to this, Synod will appoint an agent, to whom masters are to make known their willingness to part with their slaves, without remuneration: and said agent will be authorized to collect funds in such manner as he shall judge best, and disburse them, in defraying the expenses of the removal of such slaves, to the place of their destination; provided always, the consent of the slave be obtained

4. Let any member of this church purchase slaves from owners, not of this church, and give them their liberty, or retain them in their service until compensated by their labor for the sum

expended in their redemption. Also, let masters contract with their slaves and pay them just wages, for a limited time, until remunerated for the expense of raising and educating them, if any such remuneration be in justice due, which matter is to be determined by the master and slave themselves, but in case they cannot agree, by some disinterested individuals by them chosen. Moreover, in order to prevent a reversion to a state of slavery in such cases, the slaves shall be delivered by bills of sale to the agent of Synod above mentioned, who shall give an approved security, that those slaves shall not be taken from their masters, nor come into the power of another owner till liberated.

5. Let pastors, settled in those states where slave-holding exists, instruct the congregations under their care in the evil of that practice, and urge them to a discharge of their duty respecting it; let sessions also take care that the above resolutions and directions be duly observed in the admission of members to the fellowship of the church, and in their practice afterwards; and also let them acquaint the slaves with what the Synod has now done in behalf of their natural rights and privileges.

Reasons of protest against an act of the Associate Synod, respecting Slavery, passed at Canonsburg, May 1831.

Before we lay down our reasons of protest against the act of Synod respecting slavery, passed May 1831, we beg leave to state very briefly the matter in dispute, and to point out what we judge to be an error in that act, of such importance as justifies the step we have taken.

We explicitly state that we do not find fault with the act in question, because it declares that "slavery is clearly condemned by the law of God." An act of Synod passed May 1811, on the same subject, declares that "it is a moral evil to hold negroes, or their children in perpetual slavery." This act, we, with other members of Synod, did propose to adhere to and enforce. Neither do we object to the late act because it makes emancipation a term of communion in the Associate Church: the foresaid act of 1811, makes it a term, in more plain, and we think, more appropriate language, and with more consistent limitations. In Resolution 2d, it says, "All persons belonging to our communion, having slaves in possession, are directed to set them at liberty" &c., and in Resolution 3d, "Those slave-holders, who refuse to renounce the above claim, (that is, of right to buy, sell, or bequeath slaves as transferable property,) are unworthy of being admitted into, or retained in the fellowship of the church of Christ." We do not say that in passing the act of 1831, there was a formal intention to treat the act of 1811, with contempt, although there is too much appearance of it. In the late act, it is indeed said that "slavery has been long since judicially declared to be a moral evil, by this church;" yet it is not said that it had ever before been made a term of communion, or that any order had ever been taken to remove the evil. But as the act of 1811, makes emancipation a term of communion, it is difficult to conjecture why this feature of that act is wholly kept out of view in the late one.

To return to the grounds of protest; we wish it to be distinctly understood, that the leading point in dispute, the principal thing in the late act on slavery, which we judge necessary to protest against is, that it requires the *instant* emancipation, without any exception, of all slaves held by persons in our communion. This charge, the directions in the act, may indeed contradict, but cannot make untrue, nor explain away.—There are, indeed, in the late act, other things liable to objection. The style and tone are too harsh and imperative, calculated to excite resentment rather than to impress the conscience, and are more becoming the civil or military authorities, than a Synod of Presbyterians: such as, "from and after this date"—"the Synod order all subordinate judicatories to proceed *forthwith*"—"require church members to relinquish their unjust claims"—"let slaves be manumitted at home"—"let slaves be removed"—"let slaves be sent to Liberia," &c.

But in the first place, we protest against this act which makes the holding of a person in the "character and condition of a slave," even for the shortest period of time, and in all cases whatever, a ground of exclusion from the communion of the church, because it is not only without a warrant in the word of God, but is contrary to it. In this act it is said that "slavery is clearly condemned by the law of God." With this in a certain application we cordially agree; and freely admit that slavery is a moral evil, a sin. From this admission, it is inferred that we must acknowledge our obligation to require immediate emancipation in all cases, and that to delay, is to tolerate and indulge sin. This inference is specious, and to some, it may appear conclusive. The first Resolution of the act in question is based on it, though the directions allowing delay are at war with it. That our views may be understood on this point, on which so much misapprehension and misrepresentation have prevailed, the Synod will do us the justice to observe the following distinction. To seize, buy, sell, or hold a person in the character or condition of a slave, against his will, and designedly for the sake of gain, honor, pleasure, or for any selfish purpose, is "slavery clearly condemned by the law of God." Synod may easily find a warrant in the word of God for making slavery, in this sense, a ground of church censure: in the

sense we admit that slavery is a moral evil. But for public authorities to hold a person in the condition of a slave for his crimes, for an individual to hold a person in that condition, so long as the civil laws put it out of his power to set him free, or while such freedom as could be granted, would be injury and injustice to the slave himself, or dangerous to society, or while any other cause exists, which would render immediate emancipation either unjust or impracticable, we do not admit to be a moral evil, nor censurable. On this ground we plead for delay; on this ground the apostles are acquitted of the charge made against this practice on the matter of slavery, by the late act of Synod; and on this ground the directions in the act of Synod itself are based, common sense and conscience, in this case, compelling a reluctant contradiction of the Resolutions. They who hold that what is a moral evil in one case, is a moral evil in every case, ought to rescue the apostles from the censure necessarily involved in such a judgment. It must be admitted that slavery, in the days of the apostles was a moral evil in the same sense in which it is now; and if it must be a moral evil in every case, the apostles were guilty of tolerating a sin, a known sin.—For the Apostle Paul, instead of “ordering” christian masters to emancipate their slaves, immediately, however dangerous, unjust, difficult, or impracticable, on pain of exclusion from the communion of the church, directs both masters and slaves how to discharge the duties of their respective places and relations. We think no man can read with any care the Epistle to Philemon, or 1 Tim. vi. 1, 8: and believe that the Apostle designed to enjoin or enforce the rule, requiring immediate emancipation, under all obstacles. Rather, who can resist the evidence that the Apostle, in these passages condemns such a rule? Christian slave-holders, at that time, lived under Roman laws, which, it is well known, either prohibited the liberation of slaves, or made it very difficult. This is precisely the case with those christian slave-holders with whom we are connected; and we think the same rule should be observed now, which was given then—the rule which allows masters to retain their slaves until emancipation becomes both just and practicable.

2. We protest against the act in question, because it would operate unjustly towards slave-holders in our communion, especially such as have been received since the year 1811. It would operate as an *ex post facto* law, to condemn for having done what was done against no law made or acknowledged by Synod. Members have been admitted and continued in our communion according to the act of 1811, which, while it condemns slavery as a moral evil, yet allows slave-holders to continue in communion so long as they perform certain specified duties to their slaves, and while emancipation is prohibited by state laws. We therefore think that the Synod cannot, in good faith instantly annul the relation between such masters and their slaves, while the obstacles to emancipation are not diminished, but greatly increased. But if Synod do make emancipation, in all cases, an absolute term of communion, they should, in justice to such members allow them some compensation, and a reasonable time.

3. We protest against this act because, in requiring the instant emancipation of slaves, it requires church members to do something, as the condition of continuing in communion which is not in their power. This, the Synod themselves do virtually admit; for in the second and third directions which they recommend to slave-holders to observe, all the plans proposed for liberating slaves, require considerable time; such as removing slaves to non-slaveholding states, sending them to Liberia, delivering them over to the agent of the American Colonization Society, sending them to Upper Canada. And the plan which slave-holders would most readily adopt is not practicable at all as long as the agent of Synod is not appointed. Besides, this plan of an agent as the medium of emancipation, without which little can be done, we believe will be a nullity in practice. The agent would require a considerable salary as a compensation for his time and trouble; he would require very considerable means for the reception, accommodation, and disposal of the slaves delivered to him; and the funds to meet such expenses, we presume, will not soon be in the hands of Synod. It may be added, that it will be difficult, if possible at all, for the agent to furnish security sufficient to satisfy the reasonable demands of slave-holders.

Again, it is out of the power of slave-holders to comply with this act; because it requires, in some cases, things that are contrary to one another. The first Resolution requires that “from and after this date (May 1831,) no member of this church shall be allowed to hold a human being in the character or condition of a slave;” yet Resolution 4th, requires slave-holders to maintain superannuated slaves. Direction 3d, requires the consent of the slave, in order to his freedom, which plainly implies that he shall be retained in slavery if he so desires. Direction 4th, allows slaves to be retained for remuneration, by contract, and for education. How the *condition* of those persons so retained, and retained under the direction and authority of masters according to law, is to differ from that of slaves, we cannot tell? But we know that they must be held in the *character* of slaves, for the laws in slave-holding states know

a person of color in no other character, unless he be legally free. Therefore it is impossible for slave-holders to comply with the first resolution, while circumstances render it necessary to adopt any of the plans now specified.

4. We protest against the act because it requires Presbyteries and Church Sessions "forthwith to carry into execution the intention of the first Resolution," in all cases, *without* liberty to judge of the expediency, reasonableness, humanity, or justice of the immediate application of the requisition. Were the mere possession of slaves a crime, and a crime of the same kind with adultery or murder, or had it been a definite term of communion in the church for some time, or had there been criminal remissness charged against those "subordinate judicatories," the peremptory injunction might have been justifiable, though not the lordly style. But it cannot be pretended that any of those occasions for the exercise of this high authority existed in the present case. Those "subordinate judicatories" might justly complain that they were denied, not only a discretionary power, but even all judiciary power with respect to the time, the manner, or the extent of the execution of the sentence in the first resolution. They are "ordered forthwith to require all church members under their inspection possessed of slaves, to relinquish their unjust claims, and to release" their slaves. Thus they must require those people to relinquish their claims, not to hold their negroes in the "character and condition of slaves," though they may have claims on them for purchase or education, and though they can hold them in no other character or condition. They must require these people to "release" their slaves instantly, though it may be altogether out of their power to do so for some time, or perhaps forever, and though they may have claims on the service of the slave, which are perfectly just.

5. We protest against this act because the subordinate judicatories are ordered, in carrying this act into execution to do what would be not only harsh and cruel to the negroes, but *highly injurious and unjust*. When slaves, according to this act, are released, if not removed, they must, by law, be sold into hopeless bondage; if they be removed, it would occasion, in almost all cases, the separation of the nearest relations. It is very seldom that the slaves, related as husband and wife, parent and child, brother and sister, all belong to the same person, or to persons under the control of Synod, or to those who would all be disposed to emancipate. To separate brothers and sisters is cruel; to separate parents and children is unlawful; but to separate husband and wife shocks every religious and moral feeling. Yet all this must be done, if this act is to be instantly executed. The slaves are chiefly interested in this matter; the violation of their rights is all that renders slavery sinful, how shall we acquit ourselves or repair their wrongs by measures that shall further violate their rights and render their condition more miserable, by emancipation than it was in a state of slavery. This may be done by those who style themselves the friends of humanity, undertaking a cause, which they do not understand. The fourth Resolution would be cruel and unjust in its operation. To require masters to support superannuated slaves, after removing the younger ones, is not only, in cases of poverty, old age and debility, unjust and cruel to the master, but much more so to the slave. In many cases, it would take away the whole support of such slaves and leave them literally to perish. If the public sympathy should interfere in time, for the support of the masters, it would not be so prompt and zealous for that of the slave.

6. We protest against this act also, because it can effect very little good, though executed in its fullest extent, and will certainly produce much evil. The evils immediately respecting the negroes themselves, have been in part stated in the last reason; and the benefits they will receive by it will be very far short of what is probably expected by many who are in favor of the act. But a very few can be liberated, even according to the act—a numerous class must be retained for expense of purchase and education—many will not accept of liberty, if offered on condition of removal, and therefore must be retained—many should not be separated from their relatives, who could not be manumitted at home, and must be retained—many are held under deed of trust, or for debt, who can not be emancipated though their holders were willing to do so. The number, therefore, to be benefitted by this act, must be very few, some placed in worse circumstances than before, many rendered discontented without the prospect of relief, slavery will still be continued in our church, and be a continual source of perplexity and chagrin. The benefit of manumission at home is very small; it is not restoration to full liberty, to citizenship. Such persons can, in none of the United States, be admitted as witnesses in courts of justice, on equal terms with citizens; they cannot hold the lowest civil office, nor vote at elections.

Neither does this act meliorate the condition of those slaves who are to be retained. The 4th resolution, indeed, requires masters to be held responsible for the support of aged slaves: but this resolution was useless, for the slave laws secure this much more effectively: and even the act of Synod of 1811 required masters to give their slaves suitable food and clothing. Direction 4th allows masters to contract with a certain

class of slaves, and to pay them wages till they have remunerated themselves for educating them. This is surely a new method of obtaining our dues, and according to the letter of this direction, the slaves would, it is true, be gainers by the care of Synod, but it is not probable any such contract will be made. If the intention of this direction be to prevent masters from exacting more from their slaves than is due, this was secured as fully, and more intelligibly, in the act of 1811. Much is proposed to be done by delivering slaves by bills of sale to the Synod's agent: but besides the want of any such agent, a bill of sale would be no legal security for the freedom of the slave against a claim of debt, or of heirship, unless the redemption money be paid. Without this, the law accounts the bill of sale nothing but a cover for fraud. Nor could the bill of sale prevent the original owner from reclaiming the slave in every case.

Much has also been proposed to be done by contracts between masters and slaves, and by wages given for the service of the latter. But such contracts are not acknowledged by state laws, and cannot be enforced. Neither do state laws permit a slave to enjoy the benefit of wages, as a freeman, even though he could claim them. They forbid him to trade as a citizen, or to hold property above a very small amount.

7. We further protest against the act in question, because it enjoins the infraction of state laws, and unnecessarily exposes the members of our church to their penalties. Direction 5th enjoins sessions to "acquaint the slaves with what Synod has now done in behalf of their natural rights and privileges." This information would not only be useless to the slaves, but would be calculated to excite a spirit of insurrection. It would, however, be a serious infraction of the session laws of some of those states in which our church is involved in slavery. Such an infraction we think is forbidden by the word of God. (Rom. xiii. 1—9. Titus iii. 1.) Such an infraction of civil laws, and consequent exposure to their penalties, where to say the least, the duty is doubtful, not imperious; where all that is in question is but an alienable right, counterbalanced by rights as sacred, the right of self-preservation and the public safety, may suit the zeal of the fanatic, but cannot command the respect of sober judgment.

8. We moreover protest against the act in question, because of the precipitancy with which it was carried through Synod. It is true the subject of slavery had been long before Synod, and regular steps had been taken respecting it, till May, 1831. Though an overture on the subject was regularly before Synod, yet it was not that overture which was passed into an act, not even that overture amended, it was totally rejected, and a new one hastily prepared and adopted, without reference to Presbyteries. And the inaccuracies, contradictions and inefficiency of the act pointed out, are sad testimonies to the necessity of circumspection and order in framing terms of communion for the church.

ANDREW HERON,
 JAMES RAMSAY,
 JAMES ADAMS,
 A. ANDERSON,
 THOMAS ALLISON,
 WILLIAM M. McELWEE.

Answers to Reasons of Protest against an Act of the Associate Synod respecting Slavery, passed at Canonsburgh, May, 1831.

Our protesting brethren declare that they do not find fault with the act because it asserts that "slavery is clearly condemned by the law of God," nor "because it makes emancipation a term of communion:" both of which things they acknowledge to be contained in the act of 1811, which they say "they, with other members of Synod, did propose to adhere to, and enforce." This, we must acknowledge has, so far, an imposing appearance, and is well calculated to conciliate the favorable opinion of the friends of truth and justice. We promise not to forget these concessions, whatever turn the discussion may take hereafter. When they add, that "the act of 1811 makes it a term in more appropriate language," we have not the least conception of what they mean; and when they add farther, "with more consistent limitations," we can only conjecture. Perhaps the sequel may discover that this expression is intended for a saving clause for the doctrine of the old act on the subject of emancipation, by which they would make it to mean, that so long as the state of the laws, and other circumstances, remain as they are, slavery is lawful, and emancipation is not to be required. This, perhaps, is "the consistent limitation," with which they suppose the old act condemns slavery, and "makes emancipation a term of communion." As to their complaint of an apparent intention on the part of Synod to treat the former act with neglect, it is stated with hesitancy, is partly answered by themselves, and will appear to be quite groundless and imaginary, if it is found that the new act in fact harmonises with a fair construction of the old.

The question now recurs, what is it the protesters have against the Synod's act, or what can they allege consistently with a fair and honest adherence to their own declarations? 'We shall hear it from themselves, and in their own language.

"We wish it to be distinctly understood, that the leading point in dispute, the principal thing in the late act on slavery, which we judge it necessary to protest against, is, that it requires the *instant* emancipation, without any exception, of all slaves held by persons in our communion." It is true, they go on to say, they have other grounds of complaint; "the style and tone are too harsh and imperative," &c. &c. But these are only subordinate matters, on which they are not themselves disposed to insist, and to which they will of course excuse us from making any particular reply. The gist of the controversy, the radical fault of the act lies, they suppose, in what is stated above. Now it is evidently the design of this statement, to promote the impression that the act *directly* and *formally*, requires the "*instant* and *entire* liberation of all who have been hitherto held as slaves by the members of our communion, without any regard either to moral or physical objections in the way. The truth of this statement to be sure we utterly deny. But how shall we disprove it? If we say that some, (and we might say nearly all) of the provisions of the act imply the contrary, they have shown us already how *easily* they can dispose of this by having recourse to the very convenient supposition, that the act is inconsistent with itself. Still we might urge, that it is but fair to allow the act to explain itself, that the provisions of the act do not prove that it is inconsistent with itself, but only that it is inconsistent with their construction of it; that is, that their construction of it is wrong. We might easily show, that on their plan the Bible itself might be proved to have as many contradictions, as there are instances in which one part contradicts what has been groundlessly assumed to be the meaning of another; but we have a shorter method to bring this matter to an issue with the protesters. We avail ourselves at once of the privilege of the negative side. We deny the "charge" and demand the proof. This, such as it is, we have at once in their first reason of protest, in which they say, "we protest against this act, which makes the holding of a person in the character and condition of a slave, even for the shortest period of time, a ground of exclusion," &c. This, they would have it believed, is the same thing with requiring that *instant* and universal emancipation, against which they profess to be protesting. But every body sees that this says nothing directly on the subject of emancipation at all; it is neither more nor less than a decisive judicial condemnation of slave holding, in principle and in practice. We need not spend a moment to prove this, both because it is manifestly true, and because the protesters are aware of it. They have now quoted the Synod's language, and they immediately proceed to show us that they understand it. And what now? This phantom of instant and universal emancipation, might serve as an apology for the onset, but it becomes invisible the moment they come into collision with the Synod's act, indeed, and we see it no more till they have occasion to call it up. It is plainly impossible to proceed a step further, without contesting the truth of the Synod's doctrine about the *absolute unlawfulness* of slavery. And since they proceed to do so, every body must see, whether they will or not, that this doctrine and the plain unqualified avowal of it is the real ground of offence, and that this is, after all, the "leading point in dispute, the principle thing in the act they judge it necessary to protest against," their declaration to the contrary notwithstanding. This doctrine of the act, that "slavery is clearly condemned by the law of God," they professed to acknowledge in the introduction, as we have seen, and now they offer to repeat this confession, with the additional recommendation of doing it "*cordially*," provided they are only *allowed* to slip in the *qualifying expression*, "in a certain application." Now we can very sincerely declare, that we would gladly refuse them this indulgence; but if they will have it so, we must submit, though we are sorry indeed that the good confession which they witnessed in the outset should so soon shrivel and shrink to what we think may be called at best a *meagre and ambiguous orthodoxy*.—"How has the gold become dim!" "From this admission (they pretend) it is inferred that they must acknowledge their obligation to require immediate emancipation in all cases." The protesters then would have us believe, that their doctrine on the subject of slavery is still so indubitably sound, that they are exposed to the charge of inconsistency, for not adopting even the extravagant views they have imputed to the Synod on the subject of emancipation. If so they have been wronged indeed. For ourselves we must say, that so far from drawing such an inference from their doctrine in the *qualified shape* in which it now appears, we can see little or no reason why they should be for emancipation at all. No, whatever inconsistency there may be between the doctrine they avowed at the commencement and their present doctrine, there is certainly none at all between their present doctrine and their continued opposition to the Synod's act.

But to proceed, we shall certainly do our brethren the "justice" they require, "to observe their *distinction*" on this subject, though we cannot promise to be so accom-

modating as to believe that it is founded in truth. The first branch of their distinction defines what they account *unlawful slavery*, thus: "To buy, sell, seize, or hold, a person in the condition of a slave against his will, and designedly for the sake of gain, or for any selfish purpose, is slavery, clearly condemned by the law of God." The second branch of their distinction defines, on the other hand, what they take to be lawful slavery thus: "But for public authorities to hold a person in the condition of a slave for his crimes, for an individual to hold a person in that condition, so long as the civil laws put it out of his power to set him free, or while such freedom as could be granted would be injury and injustice to the slave himself, or dangerous to society, or while any other cause exists which would render immediate emancipation either unjust or impracticable, we do not admit to be a moral evil, nor censurable." And now, with both branches of the distinction before us, we proceed to offer the following objections:

1st. This method of treating the subject by distinguishing between lawful and unlawful slavery, is entirely out of the track of sound divines and moralists. They are in the habit of distinguishing between slavery and an equitable servitude, or as some of the more ancient writers sometimes express it, between perfect and imperfect servitude, the former of which they considered as unlawful; but never between slavery and slavery, unless it be for the purpose of showing how it may be more or less aggravated.

2d. This method of determining the question of the unlawfulness of slavery, can only tend to embarrass and obscure a matter otherwise exceedingly plain, by the introduction of unnecessary exceptions and distinctions. The protestors say, in substance, that slavery is unlawful, provided it be involuntary on the part of the slave, and selfish on the part of the master. Some, indeed, might think this concession entirely sufficient, and to be sure, if it could be fairly applied, we have no doubt that it would be found to embrace nearly all cases of slavery; but there is a much shorter and surer way of determining this matter. Slavery is always unlawful where it is unjust, and it is always unjust where the person enslaved has not forfeited his right to his liberty, and the privileges that accompany it. This is the plain truth, and why then involve the subject again in darkness and doubt, by introducing the supposition that the slave may be voluntary and the master disinterested.

3d. Those exceptions and distinctions contained in both branches of their distinction, will be found to be in a great measure ambiguous, and an attempt to apply them to practical cases would therefore be a source of endless dispute; it might almost always be plausibly urged on the side of power against right, that some of them existed in the case. Even a general glance at their definitions of *lawful and unlawful slavery*, will convince any person of the truth of this. But to look for a moment at one or two particulars; how shall we determine, for instance, whether the slave is voluntary or involuntary? How easily may his understanding, or rather his ignorance, be addressed by arguments which will induce him to bow his neck under the most galling yoke, and then he is *voluntary*? And for *this disinterested master*, if he be not a mere ideal being, found no where but in these reasons of protest, how are we to ascertain his identity? From his own professions, to be sure. And do the protestors suppose there will be no difficulty in giving credit to professions in themselves so utterly improbable? To glance at their account of lawful slavery, the second branch of the distinction, it is found to contain four or five things, separated by the disjunctive *or*, any one of which is of course allowed, on their plan, to prove slavery to be lawful. How is it to be determined whether "it might be injury and injustice to the slave," "or injustice to society," or whether "some cause might not exist," which interest and avarice might plausibly urge as an argument for rivetting the chains of the slave? In short, we think it must be evident, even from these brief hints, that the method proposed by the protestors for determining this question, will be the same thing in practice with an indefinite postponement, or involving it in perpetual doubt.

4th. Those exceptions and distinctions are so laid as to form a shield for the protection of slavery wherever it exists, under the protection of civil law, and where it has not such an establishment, it can hardly be supposed to exist at all, at least in civilised society. We may therefore say at once that they form a shield for slavery wherever it exists. We think this scarcely needs illustration. Look again at their definitions for a moment, particularly their account of what they take to be lawful slavery. Any body may see, that while it is particularly calculated for the meridian of our own slave-states, it will suit for any country on earth where slavery exists, or ever did exist. Thus, wherever the laws give their sanction to slavery, they must and they will oppose obstacles more or less to emancipation; and the longer slavery has been legalized, and the greater the increase of slaves, the obstacles to emancipation from law and "circumstances," from established habits, from apprehensions of "public danger," will be continually multiplied. And so, according to the doctrine of the protestors, the argument for slavery will not only be always valid in such cases, but be continually waxing

stronger and stronger. We would then ask the protestors, to what purpose is it to qualify their doctrine of the lawfulness of slavery, by saying that it is lawful under certain circumstances, when those circumstances which are supposed to make it lawful are almost always found co-existent more or less with the evil itself? Why not say at once that slavery is lawful wherever it is?

5th. While the circumstances assumed by the protestors may be very plausibly supposed to exist in our own country, and in all places where slavery obtains, as we have seen, the fact is after all that they are in a great measure gratuitously assumed, and will be found to be so, when we compare their statements with facts. And if so, they are so far mere theory, and not fairly applicable to this subject, in a practical view. Thus the voluntary slave and the disinterested master will, we think, be allowed to be, for the most part, merely ideal or theoretical beings. And if we look again at the assemblage of circumstances, in the second branch of their distinction, any one of which is to prove lawful slavery on their plan, it may well be doubted, indeed, whether these supposed circumstances, are in strict accordance with actual facts. Passing over the first case, on which we will say nothing at present, the second supposed case is, "when the civil laws put it out of the master's power to set him free." Is it strictly true that such cases exist in fact? We do not pretend to be accurately acquainted with the state of the laws in the southern section of the United States. It is known, indeed, that the laws of all slave holding countries are more or less unfavorable to emancipation; but the question is this, can it be said in strict truth, that the laws have put it beyond the power of the master to set his slave at liberty? Have they rendered it physically impossible for him to do so? We believe not. It is not true, after all, that emancipation is absolutely *prohibited* in any of the states. It is a fact, too, that in some of them, fifteen days is allowed the slave to make his escape; and in all of them, we believe, more or less time is allowed him before he can be legally seized and sold as a vagrant. The truth is, though the laws of the slave states will not allow the slaves to remain free at home, from considerations of policy and apprehension of public danger, they have no objection, and can have none, to his escape, with his master's consent, to a free state. And what if in some cases he might need the aid of his master to secure his escape, is it at all consistent with truth and candor to magnify this difficulty into an insuperable obstacle in the way of emancipation? Another case supposed by the protestors, in order to make out a case of lawful slavery, is, "when such freedom as could be granted, would be injury and injustice to the slave himself." Such a supposition sounds very strangely. We can easily conceive that giving the slave his freedom may be the *occasion* of injury, and perhaps injustice too, to the slave; but this could be no more an argument against it, if it be justly his due, than the apprehension of similar consequences would be against doing justice in other cases. But to suppose, as they are obliged to do, in order to make out a case of lawful slavery, that the bestowment of freedom is itself "injury and injustice to the slave," is to suppose what is self-contradictory, and therefore it must be purely ideal. The last case of what the protestors take to be lawful slavery, is, when the liberation of the slave might be dangerous to society. Now supposing for the present, as before, that this case would justify keeping him in bondage, it may well be doubted, indeed, if there is any truth in it, and whether this danger too, is not merely ideal. At any rate, it must be purely conjectural, and can never be known with certainty beforehand. Thus, on the whole, the protestors have furnished practical slave holders with an ideal hypothesis, which may be plausibly applied, indeed, to their case, but which, after all, does not strictly accord with the real state of the fact. What good purpose can this answer? It will only serve to administer a quietus to the conscience of the slave holder, by helping him to fancy that the case is different from what it really is, and will tend to mislead and deceive an honest inquirer after truth. Even supposing the truth of all the circumstances contained in this hypothesis, they utterly fail to prove what they intend, viz: that slavery in those cases is lawful. For it must still be recollected, that this is the *aroused object* for which they are adduced. To this there is, indeed, one exception. We have purposely passed it over heretofore, but it now comes in place to notice it. It stands at the head of the cases of what they take to be lawful slavery, for the apparent purpose of giving a character and an air of plausibility to the whole of them. And what is it? "Public authorities may hold a man in the condition of a slave for his crimes!" We are no way inclined to dispute this, but unhappily for the cause of the protestors, it is *nothing* at all to the purpose in hand. Our brethren certainly know that the question in debate wholly respects innocent persons—persons who are supposed to have "done nothing worthy of death or of bonds." How utterly impertinent, then, to tell us here, that it is lawful to enslave criminals or malefactors! This argument, indeed, will be found to operate much more strongly against their cause than for it: for if slavery is the appropriate punishment of the guilty, it cannot but be a violation of the law and light of nature, to apply it to the innocent. Our brethren must allow us in this case, as well as in others, to "discern

between the righteous and the wicked." But here we may remark, by the way, that this proves beyond dispute, (if it needed any proof,) that it is real, and not mere nominal slavery, that the protestors mean to defend; for who would think of adducing the lawfulness of enslaving a criminal as a proof that we may have servants on principles of common equity, who in fact are not slaves at all? We are surprised, indeed, that the protestors should have adduced a case so obviously irrelevant, and somewhat at a loss to account for it. The most probable conjecture is, they supposed if they made out one case which would be generally admitted to be a case of lawful slavery, it would not only give countenance to the supposition that there might be others, but give room to believe that slavery was not a violation of the law of nature, because there is one indubitable exception. If this was their object, they are, indeed, egregiously mistaken. For, first, this exception is of such a nature, as we have seen already, as only goes to establish the general principle of the unlawfulness of enslaving innocent persons. Secondly, It is, strictly speaking, no exception to the law at all; for the law is against enslaving persons unjustly. The protection of the innocent, therefore, from the curse of slavery, being the proper object of the law, the punishment of the guilty can form no exception to it. The sixth commandment allows of the killing of beasts and the execution of criminals by "public authorities." Will such exceptions as these prove that it is merely a positive statute, and forms no part of the law of nature? Surely not: for the law only means to forbid "the taking away of life unjustly," and so these are, strictly speaking, no exceptions to the law at all.

And now, having set aside this case as utterly irrelevant, we shall pursue our 6th argument, with respect to the others, that supposing the truth of all the other circumstances contained in this hypothesis, they utterly fail to prove what the protestors intend, viz: that slavery in those cases is lawful. For, the slave is supposed to be sometimes voluntary, and the master disinterested. These two things are implied in their definition of *unlawful slavery*, as the proper counterpart of it. We have before treated the voluntary slave and the disinterested master as most probably ideal, or imaginary beings, but we shall now join with the protestors in supposing them into existence, and summon them as witnesses of the lawfulness of slavery.

Now, if we were at liberty here to consider this voluntary slave apart from the *disinterested master*, we would say, is it still reasonable and just to hold him in this condition? No, surely, unless such a generous compliment of his person and liberties could be supposed to be made in justice to himself; otherwise it must be both ungenerous and unlawful to accept of it. This voluntary surrender must be supposed to be dictated either by ignorance or the pressure of inextricable difficulties; in either case, it would be as unlawful for a man to avail himself of it, as to take advantage of the ignorance or necessity of his neighbor in any other instance. And we would say, on the other hand, with respect to the master, that the very favorable supposition that is made with respect to him, is still more absurd, considered as a justification of slavery; for if the enslaving of an innocent person be a violation of the principles of justice, to do it from motives of benevolence, real or pretended, is to set benevolence in conflict with justice—is to do evil that good may come. But we are obliged by the supposition itself to consider the voluntary slave and the disinterested master here conjunctly. The slave makes a voluntary surrender of his person and services as the absolute property of this disinterested master, and *this disinterested master* accepts it for no "selfish purpose" whatever, he neither expects "gain, honor, nor pleasure from it." Now, while it requires a prodigious effort of fancy to keep these two characters in existence, when they are thus conjoined, or compounded, till we can form a judgment about them, we would ask, who is the slave here? If the term applies to either of them, it is obviously to the person who so generously charges himself with the care and keeping of another man, and perhaps his family too, *all for nothing*. The term, as applied to the other, would be evidently a misnomer; he is the only gainer by the bargain. Now as we are not concerned with the slavery of the master at all, and the only question before us is about the lawfulness of holding the other in slavery, and as he appears to be no slave, but a beneficiary, the whole spectacle for the purpose for which it is brought forward, turns out to be a mere hoax. It is no case of slavery at all. It is neither more nor less than one man agreeing to keep another for nothing—a case with which we have no concern whatever.

These ideal characters may now, we suppose, be allowed to vanish. It seems they can prove nothing for slavery. But what shall we say to the impossibility of emancipation, and to the supposition that emancipation may in some cases be "injury and injustice to the slave?" We say, if such cases really exist, we will allow, on the principle common to both acts, that they are conclusive reasons against insisting on emancipation in these cases, but no reason at all in favor of slavery. Because, there is a lawful medium. Let him be placed in the condition of a servant, upon principles of justice and equity, till his entire emancipation becomes both possible for the master to bestow and eligible for the servant to receive. The relation of master and servant is as really lawful as any of the relations of human life, and it forms a proper medium

between that relation of master and slave, which the Synod certainly meant to condemn, as a violation of the law of nature, and that immediate and entire freedom to which every one may not for the present be entitled, nor be in a condition to receive. This construction is in perfect accordance with the terms of the act, and in perfect harmony with its subsequent provisions.

With regard to public danger, it is necessary to speak with some caution, and to make some distinctions. We allow that those of any color or condition who threaten either private or public safety, should be disarmed, and even confined; but it is a vile perversion of this principle, to make it an argument for slavery in the usual practical sense of that word, for two reasons.

1st. Practical slavery is no rational means of defence even against those individuals who threaten the safety of the community: and,

2d. Even if it was, reason and justice will say, that it should be confined to the individual criminals.

What justice can there be in extending it to all of the same color and condition, and make it an argument for riveting the chains of slavery upon them with this distinctive proviso? We deny, then, that the mere apprehension of danger to society, can be any reason for the continuance of slavery, and so confounding the innocent with the guilty. On this point, we will take the opportunity to extract a few sentences from a note in Brown's Dictionary, under the article 'SERVANT,' by our venerable deceased Father, Dr. Anderson. In answer to the objection, "that if they were set free, they could hardly be restrained from disorders, which, on account of their number, might endanger the public peace," he says: "No apprehension of this kind can excuse our continuing in an unjust and inhuman practice. 'The fear of man bringeth a snare.' When the path of duty is plain, Christians should resolutely adhere to it, leaving the event to the merciful providence of God. Besides, though the negroes cease to be slaves, they will generally continue to be servants upon a more equitable footing, &c." Thus reasoned Dr. Anderson on this case, and he was viewing the matter too upon the largest scale, on which the objection has commonly greater weight. What would he have thought, if the plea had been set up for the members of our small community, that to set their slaves free would be "dangerous to society?" But Pharaoh and his people reasoned otherwise. "Come on, let us deal wisely with them; and he set task-masters over them;" and in this "wise" and prudent forecast, they persisted, as better than "the plain path of duty," till it brought them to the bottom of the Red sea.

Our 7th and last objection will lie against the whole plan adopted by the protestors, for determining the question of the lawfulness of slavery. It is not applicable to the subject under discussion. The question whether it be lawful to enslave innocent persons, (for it is not about criminals we are disputing,) is a question not of moral positive, but of moral natural law. This we think the protestors will hardly deny; and if so, it is not, like questions of the former kind, to be determined by a reference to any particular "circumstances," under which the action is supposed to be done, but simply by comparing it with the law. Circumstances may determine the moral character of actions sometimes, but they cannot alter the nature of things. Therefore, they never can justify a violation of the law of nature, whatever they may do to palliate it.

The whole plan of the protestors, then, is radically erroneous, and all the instances they pretend to adduce of "lawful slavery," are so many exceptions preposterously urged against the obligation of the law of nature, and the principles of eternal justice. The difficulties of emancipation, nay, even the impossibility of it in some cases, were it true, can be no proof that slavery is lawful. All that has been urged by the protestors, and all that can be said with truth by any body on these topics, can only prove that it is sometimes impossible, and sometimes, perhaps, improper, to set a man whom the law calls a slave, entirely free. They fall infinitely short of proving that there is or can be, either physical necessity or moral right, to hold him in the degraded and unlawful condition of a slave. But the protestors are willing to hear of no medium; hence, because the act condemns slavery absolutely, and refuses to tolerate it on any supposition, they assert that it requires instant and universal emancipation; and on the other hand they entrench themselves behind the difficulties of emancipation, as good arguments for the lawfulness of slavery. They and the Synod are proceeding upon different principles, and it is high time this question was settled. They assert there is no practicable medium; the Synod suppose there is, and believe that it meets all real difficulties, either moral or physical, that can be urged against a literal manumission in certain cases. Why are our brethren so extremely unwilling to yield this point? It is known, indeed, that the difficulties of emancipation are the universal refuge of slave-holders, and that this is the requiem which they always sing to their consciences on the subject; and it is as well known, that while they often affect a willingness to emancipate, they will not listen with patience a moment to the proposal of raising their slaves to the capacity of servants, upon principles of common equity between man and man. In their case, this is easily accounted for. To affect a wil-

lingness to emancipate, is a cheap compliment to their own magnanimity and sense of justice. They may safely affirm it, for the laws, they pretend at least, will not suffer them to make it good; but tell them to adopt this medium, and they are apt to reject it with contempt, apparently for no other reason but because they are told to do what the divine law requires, and no human law forbids, and therefore they have no room for evasion.

We are far from meaning to impute any such motive to the protestors. They are not interested and practical slave-holders, but they seem to have caught their mode of defence, without, perhaps, adverting to the interested and unprincipled source from which it is derived.

That the relation of master and servant, on equitable principles, is an honorable and lawful relation, recognized in the Scriptures, nobody will deny. Now it is true, that in many, perhaps most cases of actual slavery, moral justice would require more, even at present, than to place the slave in this condition. It may require his entire freedom; and if so, we contend, that where it is at all *practicable*, no apology should be listened to for not granting it; and it is reasonably hoped that in some one of the various ways pointed out by Synod, it will be almost always found practicable. It was easily foreseen, however, that there must be some exceptions to the practical application of the principle of emancipation—exceptions, some of which (the just claims of the master, for instance, in some cases,) would have precisely the same moral foundation they now have, if slavery were abolished by the laws of the south. Now here it becomes a serious moral question, how such cases are to be disposed of. On the principles of the Synod this is easily answered. Let them be placed on the footing of an equitable servitude, and their “masters render to them that which is just and equal.” But it is urged against this plan, that “moral justice requires more.” We answer, that in some of these cases, those for instance where the persons are not fairly entitled as yet to employ their time, &c., for their own benefit, and those who are not capable of using liberty, moral justice requires no more than this, no more at any rate than to secure them, if it can be done, against a “reversion to a state of slavery.” In other excepted cases it is supposable indeed that moral justice may require more, but of whom does it require it? Not perhaps of the master personally, and certainly not, if it is beyond his power, but of the community at large. But the point is here, moral justice will always require *this* at least, and require it of the *master personally* too. It is the primary business of the church to deal with him about those moral duties that are competent to him in his particular condition, and the consideration that moral justice might demand the entire freedom of a servant, is surely but a sorry argument for holding him as a slave.

But how are these cases to be disposed of on the principles of the protestors? They will not hear of any medium, of course all the difficulties and delays in the way of emancipation are with them so many arguments for the horrid alternative of slavery. Yet slavery is a moral evil by their own admission. But it is no moral evil they contend “in certain circumstances.” How so? These circumstances create a necessity, they pretend, sometimes a moral obligation, to adopt it. But if it was a moral evil in its own nature, (and this we think they will hardly deny,) a moral evil, but for this supposed necessity of adopting it, then this necessity would be nothing else than the necessity of adopting a moral evil, and the moral obligation to do so, can be nothing else than a moral obligation to break the moral law! Will they try to disguise this matter by having recourse to the philosophical phrase “*physical necessity?*” We must tell them there is no such thing in this case; besides, to talk of people being under a physical necessity to adopt or choose an alternative, is sheer nonsense, for “physical necessity” precludes all choice. How easily is all this avoided by adopting the principle common to both acts, viz: that it is always in the power of slave-holders either to set their slaves at liberty or “treat them with as much justice as if they were liberated.” A literal emancipation may be sometimes impossible and sometimes improper. But a virtual emancipation *at least* is always both possible and right. The protestors, however, will have it that their theory of the qualified lawfulness of slavery is apostolical. And accordingly they go on to tell us that, “they who hold that what is a moral evil in one case is a moral evil in any case, ought to rescue the Apostles from the censure necessarily involved in such a judgment.” Perhaps they ought, but we really know of nobody that holds this, in the unqualified manner in which they have stated it. Certainly we do not, at any rate, but we do hold, that whatever is a violation of moral natural law in one case, is a violation of it in every case. For instance, we believe it to be wrong to lie in any case, even if piety to God or disinterested benevolence to man were the professed object of it. We say the same thing of slave-holding; it is essentially unjust, and therefore it is a moral evil in all cases. We may be told too, perhaps, that “he must be a weak philosopher or divine” who thinks that a thing which is a moral evil in one case must necessarily be a moral evil in any case; and we will allow it, but we know it to be just as true, that he would be a very unsound and unsafe casuist, who would apply such a principle to defend a viola-

tion of the law of nature. "If it (slavery) must be a moral evil in any case, the Apostles were guilty of tolerating a sin, a known sin." Not so fast, brethren; you may not have proved, after all, that the Apostles have tolerated slavery.

We must remark here, that we may do well to be cautious how we admit this adventurous and bold assertion, for the following reasons:

1st. If the Apostles really tolerated slavery, it is reasonable to suppose they would have told us themselves the grounds and reason of their doing so, and not have left us to learn from other sources that certain circumstances existed at that time, and then leave us to form the ingenious supposition that these will serve to account for it. It is true, the protestors assure us, not only that the Apostles tolerated slavery, but that they had this reason for doing it. But the Apostles have not said so themselves. Our faith in this theory, then, (if we receive it,) must stand solely in the wisdom of men. Now we think it will be allowed to be a sound principle, that whatever cannot be proved from the Bible itself, independently of facts drawn from profane history, and theories founded on those facts, is not a doctrine of the Bible at all, and can form no part of the rule of faith and practice. Can this theory, that the Apostles tolerated slavery, and tolerated it on such grounds as are stated in these reasons of protest, be proved from the Bible, and from the Bible alone? We think no body will venture to say so. Whether the Apostles tolerated slavery or not, it is quite certain, we believe, that they have assigned no such reasons for doing so. The theory, then, is purely gratuitous; for though the existence of slavery, and of certain facts and circumstances, similar to those which obtain in modern times, may be admitted on the evidence of profane history, we have no ground whatever to apply them to a solution of the difficulties of this case. This theory then is not a doctrine of the Bible. It is nothing more, at best, than an ingenious supposition—a plausible conjecture.

2d. The circumstances urged by the protestors as a justification of slavery, have, we think, been shown to be wholly insufficient, or inadmissible, for that purpose; and if so, it will be very unsafe to impute to the Apostles the toleration of a practice, the defence of which is supposed to rest on the same ground.

3d. We think it will be found on examination, that if the passages adduced prove that the Apostles gave their sanction to slavery at all, they prove that they sanction it on general principles, independently of circumstances, and if so, this theory will not serve to defend them.

Let us now proceed to examine whether the Apostles have indeed, as the protestors suppose, given their sanction, even in this qualified sense, to slavery. They say the Apostle Paul instead of ordering Christian masters to emancipate their slaves immediately, however dangerous, unjust, difficult, or impracticable, on pain of exclusion, &c., *directs both masters and slaves how to discharge the duties of their respective places and relations.*" And in confirmation of their views they refer to the epistle to Philemon, and to 1 Tim. vi. 1—8.

Now we believe, indeed, that the Apostle does not order masters to emancipate their slaves in defiance of insuperable difficulties, moral and physical, whether these passages prove it or not. We believe the same thing of the Synod, whether it suits the purpose of the protestors or not; but the question is, does this admission prove that either of them tolerates slavery? Does it prove it of the Apostle? For though the protestors may find it all important to their cause to maintain that there is no practicable medium between slavery and emancipation *now*, are they sure there was none in the Apostle's days? If there was, (and who dare deny it?) it might be a wide mistake to take for granted that as often as the Apostle names masters and servants without speaking of emancipation, he must be understood as giving his sanction to slavery. A wide mistake, even if it be admitted that some of those servants were slaves in fact; for even if they were, they were servants of course, and no doubt many of them very properly so, he may have viewed them in reference to the duties he enjoins upon them, rather in this lawful and rational light, than as bound to obey, because they were considered by the Roman law the bona fide property of their masters. Are the protestors sure he did not? We think we can be perfectly sure he did, for this reason, amongst others, that to direct a *slave as such to obey*, would be quite superfluous, at least, for any other purpose than the prudent one of saving himself from corporeal punishment; to exhort him to obedience, as the Apostle does, "in singleness of heart," "as the servant of Christ," &c., would be quite absurd. A slave, as such, is indeed no subject of moral obligation at all, as respects the duty of obedience, and cannot properly be so: he is a mere subject of physical force.

It is perfectly clear that the Apostle viewed them as servants on some fair, rational, and moral ground, let the Roman law call them what it might. But why did he not insist on their emancipation, in its proper place? We say he does; but it is most unreasonable to require, as the protestors do, that he should insist on it always, and insist on it in spite of insuperable "obstacles," and insist on it so as to be silent about the duties of their present condition as servants, all on pain of being claimed as tolerating slavery out of deference to the Roman law, and circumstances growing out of it

Had the Apostle no other duties with respect to servants of all descriptions, but to insist on their emancipation? If he does not insist on their emancipation as an invariable rule, it only proves what nobody denies, that there were cases then, as well as now, in which duty did not call for the immediate and entire manumission of the slave, who might in the meantime be exhorted to do the duties of a *lawful servant*, but by no means that he meant to give his sanction to slavery in those cases, or any others.

Moreover, we think it will hardly be denied that whilst the Apostles enjoin upon servants the duties of their present condition, they are not forgetful of the natural rights of mankind. They enjoin upon masters not the "*charities of slavery*," as some would have it, but to "render to their servants that which is just and equal"—to render to all men their due; and they allow the servant or slave, if he may be made free, to use it rather; from all which it is reasonable to infer, not merely that they condemn slavery, but that they allowed the slave entire freedom whenever it could be justly claimed as his due?

Here we submit the following question: If any member of this Synod should preach in the Carolinas, on one of those texts which enjoins obedience upon servants, and pursue his subject according to the spirit of it, without saying a word about emancipation, would it be fair to infer that he in any way allowed of slavery as *at all* defensible, or to say, as the protestors do of Paul, that that man instead of ordering Christian masters to emancipate their slaves, directs both masters and slaves how to do the duties of their respective places and relations? How unreasonable! And yet it would be far more plausible than to draw such an inference from the Apostle's preaching; because there is no reason whatever to believe that servants all, or even generally, were slaves, amongst the Romans, and there is no conclusive evidence that *any* were held as *slaves* by Christians, while perhaps there are scarcely any servants in the Carolinas, but who are also slaves, both by the laws of the land, and in the eye of their masters. But the protestors claim the Apostle to their side, not merely from his silence about emancipation on those occasions, but they go on to assert, that "he directs both masters and slaves how to discharge the duties of their respective places and relations." Now if this assertion means any thing to their purpose, it must mean that he directs slaves and slave-holders, *as such*, to do the duties of that relation. But if this is really the case, it proves more than either they or we will be willing to admit. It proves that the Apostle gives his unqualified sanction to this relation as lawful and right in itself; for what more does he do to establish the lawfulness of any of the other relations of human life?

There is no place here, then, for the *theory* that the Apostle merely tolerates it out of regard to circumstances. It comes in too late to shield him from the imputation of giving to slavery his unqualified sanction. For who would imagine that when the Apostle directs husband and wife, parents and children, how to discharge the duties of those relations, he does not intend to recognise those relations as *absolutely lawful*, but only as so under present "circumstances?" We therefore believe the above assertion to be rash and unwarranted. We know, indeed, that the Apostles often enjoin upon masters and servants their respective duties, but why must it be taken for granted that they ever use the terms *κυριος* and *δουλος*, or even *δεσποτης* and *δουλος* in those cases in any unlawful sense, and then try to help the matter by gratuitously supposing, that certain "circumstances" rendered that sense of the terms lawful after all? But let us see how our reasoning will consist with the passages they have quoted. The epistle to Philemon is referred to in the first place. But where is the evidence that Onesimus was ever the slave of Philemon in the true sense of the name. We think it more than presumable that he was not; for the Apostle asks him to receive him, "not now as a servant, but above a servant, even as a brother beloved." The supposition that he was a slave before, would make the Apostle to express one of the faintest truisms imaginable here, not now as a slave, but above a slave, as a brother beloved, (not now as a beast, but *above a beast*.) That a brother beloved is indeed above a slave, (or beast of burden,) is indisputably true; but we should be sorry to envy any man the edification he could derive from such a truth. A brother is, indeed, a *contrast* to a slave, but it is not contrast but comparison the Apostle employs; for he says, "not now as a servant, but *above* a servant." But whatever he was before, it is true beyond dispute that the Apostle's moral sentiments and feelings would not allow Philemon to receive him in any other character than that of a "*brother*," a "*brother in the flesh*" too, as well as "in the Lord." But 1 Tim. vi. 1, 2, has been chiefly relied on by the apologists of slavery, to prove that the Apostle in some way recognizes the lawfulness of the relation, and urges the duties of it: yet how does this prove it? The Apostle addresses servants "*under the yoke*," and while he enjoins on them obedience, he supposes them, as the protestors believe, to have Christian masters. But the thing to be proved here in the first place, is, that a servant under the yoke must necessarily mean a slave. We think it has no reference to slaves at all, for the two following reasons:—

1st. Such a construction is, at least, unnecessary. The description "under the

yoke," like the term *δουλος* must be allowed to be at least as applicable to the inferior condition of servants in general, as descriptive of the peculiar condition of slaves, or, rather, much more so. For the term yoke in scripture, is usually descriptive of some just and reasonable authority, or of some relation, founded in nature and reason, unless it is joined to something else which determines it to be in an unfavorable sense, as when it is called a yoke of iron, a yoke of bondage, &c. Thus, a disciple's subjection to the word and authority of Christ, is called taking on his yoke, and married persons are said to be "yoked together." Here it is called a *yoke simply*, and there is nothing to determine the sense of it but its connection with the term *δουλοι*, as servants, but we can no more prove from this, that it means slaves, than we could prove from itself, that *δουλοι*, means slaves. Neither of these terms will prove slavery against the other, for this plain reason, that neither of them necessarily means it. How then shall we determine the matter? We answer if there is nothing in the context to determine it with certainty, it will surely be most reasonable to take for granted, that the Apostle uses both these terms in a sense that accords with the law of nature, since they do not necessarily mean any thing else; that he means by them nothing else than lawful servants: but,

2d. To suppose that the Apostle means slaves by the description under the yoke, would absurdly limit the exhortation itself to a *particular description* of servants, leaving it to be implied, that all others were exempted. Let as many servants as *are slaves* count their own masters, &c; other servants may do as they please. This would be a singularly unhappy construction, indeed, because *slaves as such*, as we have seen already, are not bound to obedience at all upon moral grounds. A *slave as such*, is not a creature recognised by the moral law, as bound to obey; he is under the law of physical force; yet this interpretation would absurdly mean, that slaves as such, and slaves exclusively too, are placed by the Apostle here, under a moral obligation to obey. We really think this decides the matter. But it will be asked, what then does the Apostle intend, by the description under the yoke, and is not this description tautological or redundant? We answer it is easy to assign a reasonable object for this description without supposing that it has any reference to slavery.

1st. It forms a proper description as we have seen of the inferior condition of servants as distinguished from other men, though it is no peculiar description of slaves as distinguished from other servants, and so it expresses the moral ground of their obedience.

2d. As it serves to distinguish the servant from another man, so it distinguishes the yoke of servitude from every other yoke; and, hence, the most natural rendering of the passage is, let as many as are under the yoke, being servants, count their own masters, &c. So the expression is far from being wrong upon our construction.

But since allowing, that the Apostle's description of the subjects of this exhortation is so laid, that it might include those who were slaves in the eye of the Roman as well as any other law, what does this prove for slavery, or against emancipation.—These slaves, so called, were servants too, many of them, no doubt, properly so for the present, in the eye of the moral law. And although the laws of men always do wrong in calling a man a slave, that will not prove that all whom it calls *slaves*, are entitled to be entirely free, or to be released from the obligations of *lawful servitude*. Indeed it may be reasonably supposed, that more of that class of mankind, than of almost any other, may be servants upon moral grounds. And, hence, as Dr. Anderson justly remarks, if they were all set free, they would "generally become servants upon a more equitable footing." But since we have proved that "servants under the yoke," is no description of slaves, we may safely admit that these servants and the believing masters here, are correlative. We think this doubtful, however, at any rate. Because it is not the copulative conjunction *κα*, but the adversative or disjunctive *δε* that is used in the 2d verse, and it should accordingly read, *but* those that have believing masters let them not &c., and so those servants that have believing masters do not appear to be the same, but to be in some respects contrasted or contra distinguished from those "under the yoke."

On the whole, we hope it is now pretty clear, that the protestors have no just ground for their assertion, in the sense of it that the Apostle *directs masters and slaves* how to discharge the duties of their *respective places and relations*, and quite as little for setting this in opposition to requiring emancipation. If both public and domestic slavery, and oppression, existed in the Apostles days, as no doubt they did, it is just as true that there was a lawful, reasonable and necessary authority, both in the one case and the other, to which it was proper to enjoin subjection. And therefore, when the Apostles direct servants to obey their masters, it would be just as absurd to imagine, that they give their sanction to slavery in any sense whatever, because some servants were slaves, and some masters slave-holders, as to believe that when they order any soul to be subject to the higher powers, they mean, through deference to "*circumstances*," to give their sanction to civil tyranny and public slavery, because some of these powers were in fact tyrannical. As none but the apologists

for domestic slavery, have ever put this construction on texts of the former kind ; so none but the advocates of the slavish doctrines of passive obedience and non-resistance, have ever given this interpretation to the latter.

We conclude then, that the Synod were justifiable in condemning slavery, and in condemning it *absolutely*; for it has appeared, we think, that the *qualified defence* which the protestors have tried to set up for this crying abomination, is neither rational nor scriptural; and it will follow from this too, that they are entirely defensible in insisting on a literal emancipation, if it is found that they have done so with a due regard to the actual circumstances of the case. But whither the Synod have done right or wrong, the protestors are quite clear that they have broke their faith with the "*Christian slave-holders*" in our communion. This is the charge which forms their 2d reason of protest. The proof of it is, "they have annulled the relation between *such masters and their slaves*, while the obstacles to emancipation are not diminished, but greatly increased." This argument proceeds upon the hypothesis that to annul the relation between master and slave, is the same thing with requiring emancipation, and requiring it just as far as that relation is annulled. And as the proper converse of this, so far as emancipation is not at present insisted on, whatever be the reason of it, so far the relation between master and slave is not annulled, but sanctioned for the present, because there is no medium they pretend, no practicable one at least between emancipation and slavery. We think we have said enough to prove the utter absurdity of this hypothesis, and we now give notice that we shall proceed hereafter in the way of taking for granted that it is false. Now if this is the case, it might be true, after all, that the old act as really, as instantly, and as universally annuls the relation between master and slave as the new one; even though it forbears to insist on a *literal* emancipation, "in those states where the liberation of slaves was, (or was supposed to be) rendered impracticable by existing laws." And who can doubt the truth of this, that will allow himself to look the old act fairly in the face? It is undeniably true that the act of 1811, after condemning slavery as a moral evil, proceeds to order, "that all persons belonging to our communion, having slaves in their possession, be directed to set them at liberty, *unless prohibited from doing so by the civil law*." Now, here we have the unlawfulness of slavery and the doctrine and duty of emancipation in opposition to it; so far then, there can be no mistake; but with regard to the latter, there is an exception admitted, "unless" &c.; but observe, this exception, has nothing to do with the doctrine of the unlawfulness of slavery; the Synod do not propose either to relinquish or modify that on any supposition whatever; it wholly respects emancipation, and what it takes to constitute an exception to their rule of emancipation, such an exception as will consist with the principles of the act itself, is put beyond all doubt by the next clause,— "in those states where the liberation of slaves is rendered *impracticable*." Now here it is clear again, that the Synod do not propose to recede from their rule of emancipation on any supposition, whatever, but that it might be found "*impracticable* in some states by existing laws." Now there is no need to move a question here, whether the Synod did right in taking for granted that it was, or might be impracticable for the cause they maintain, "by existing laws," they had a right, it will be allowed on all hands, to suppose it *impracticable* in some cases at any rate, and they mentioned what appeared to them the most probable and general cause of this *supposed* impracticability. But the whole question between us and the protestors, here, is about what way they disposed of those cases, whether the cases themselves were real or fanciful is all one, as to the argument. And here we will allow the protestors to speak first. Their version of the matter is this, that "while the act condemns slavery as a moral evil, it allows slave-holders to continue in communion so long as they perform certain specified duties to their slaves, and while emancipation is prohibited by state laws!"

Now as their complaint against the last act is, that it annuls the relation between master and slave, and as they effect to set the old act in opposition to this, there can be no question about what they mean here. They intend to say, that the old act left slavery just where it found it, in those cases where "emancipation was prohibited by the laws," saying that it passed a mere theoretical condemnation on it; in short, according to them, it condemned it in theory, but sanctioned it in practice, upon condition of the "slave-holder's" agreeing to perform "certain specified duties," to this species of property; such duties as are called in the south the "charities of slavery." Moreover, it must be observed that the condition on which the act agrees to forbear insisting on a literal emancipation, is not correctly stated, whether they designed it or not. For though the act says in the first instance, "prohibited by the civil law," it is explained in the next clause, of such a prohibition as rendered emancipation impracticable. But let the act itself now speak on this point.

"In those states where the liberation of slaves is rendered impracticable by existing laws, it is the duty of holders of slaves to *treat them with as much justice as if they were*

liberated," (to give them suitable food, &c.) "and when their services justly deserve it, to give them additional compensation."

Now here are two things: 1st. In general they are to treat them with as much justice as if they were free. This can surely mean nothing less than that where an actual emancipation was, or was supposed to be impossible, they were allowed to substitute, not slavery, as the protestors will have it, but a virtual for an actual emancipation. The slave's right to actual freedom is of course recognized, and all claim to hold him as slave property from that moment relinquished.

2d. This not only recognizes their right to humane treatment and religious instruction, which every man owes to his family and dependents, but among other pieces of "justice" which the act requires, one is, to pay them for their services. This was surely to allow them to possess the rights of freemen, and entirely neutralises and destroys the idea of proper slavery.

But now the protestors come forward, under cover of this act too, and attempt to protest these servants, who ought to have been, either actually or virtually free since 1811, back again into the character and condition of slaves, and complain that the Synod's faith has been violated, "by annulling the relation between them and their masters!" (proh pudor!) And what next? A claim of damages to be sure. We have every reason to expect this, according to their principles; for while they hold, what we fully admit, that the late act annuls the relation between master and slave, they also maintain, what to be sure we do not admit, that this is the same thing with requiring instant and universal emancipation, for they will remember they proved this against us by the 1st resolution, only because that resolution annuls this relation; and all this they say was done in violation of the old act, the charter under which, according to them, slave property has been held since 1811, by the "Christian slave-holders," as they call them, with whom we are connected. Now surely, if all this is true, they have good reason to come before the Synod with an argumentum ad hominem, at least for damages to their clients. You are sensible yourselves, brethren, that consistency requires something of this kind from you now—why this hesitating?—well it comes, but it comes in the following hypothetical shape: "But if Synod do make emancipation in all cases an absolute term of communion, they should, in justice to such members, allow them some compensation, and a reasonable time." But why this if? Can you have any doubt of it? You know you assumed it at the beginning, and told us it was the "principal thing you judged it necessary to protest against;" the thing but for which you would not have protested at all, and you proved it the same way you prove here that the Synod have overturned the old act, broke their faith with "Christian slave-holders," and incurred a claim of damages, viz: by annulling the relation between master and slave. Is it then doubtful, after all, whether condemning slavery as absolutely unlawful, and so annulling the relation between master and slave, is the same thing with requiring instant and universal emancipation, even at the expense of abolishing the relations of lawful servitude? May be there is a medium between these two things yet.

We are now done with the protestors on this point, but it may be proper, and perhaps necessary, to say something further here about the two acts and the difference between them. First, then, they are entirely the same in principle, as we have proved: second, they differ only in this, that whereas the old act, after placing all slaves held by our members in a state of virtual emancipation, and securing their right to be paid for their services, consents to leave them for the present in the hands of their employers, or masters, on the belief that existing laws, where slavery chiefly prevailed, rendered it "impracticable" to do more, at least in general cases: the new act takes up the matter here where the old one left it, proposes to carry on the actual and entire liberation of these servants to all the extent to which it can be carried consistently with the just rights of the master, and the inclination and circumstances of the servant himself. That such a design is in its own nature laudable and right, that it falls fairly within the province of the church, as a duty she owes both to masters and servants, so far as both may be members of the church; and that this is the proper limit of the matter, so far as the church is concerned, we think ought to be admitted; and by unbiassed minds, generally, will be admitted. And the provisions of the act will be allowed to be in strict accordance with this. Although this goes beyond the old act, that it is in perfect agreement with its principles on the subject of emancipation is easily seen. For the first act left the servants, it is clear, under the power of slave-holding laws, because and only because it was, or was supposed to be, impossible to extract them, i. e. it left them there only till their entire liberation should be found "practicable," otherwise it was evidently the intention of the framers of the act to have required emancipation absolutely, or at any rate without any other restrictions than those we have stated above to belong to the new act. The Synod had the right then, and it was plainly their duty too, at any future time after the passage of that act, to take up the matter again, and carry the actual liberation of those servants still farther, if they conceived

it to be practicable, by any provisions they could make on the subject. And it may be proper to remark, that the call to do so seemed to be very loud, when it was notorious, and openly avowed, that the circumstance of their having left those servants in the hands of their masters, in obedience to what they supposed an imperious necessity, was construed into an allowance to hold them in slavery.

Let us now proceed to the third reason in the protest:—"They protest against this act, because in requiring the instant emancipation of slaves, it requires church members to do something as the condition of continuing in communion, which is not in their power."

This, they say, the Synod do virtually admit, in the second and third directions, which suppose time and delay. Now what is it that the Synod "*admit*?" Not, surely that they require *instant* emancipation. That, the protestors are not asking them to admit now; they think they have proved it long ago, and are now taking it for granted; as of course they do not ask or expect them to "*admit*" that they are inconsistent with themselves, in requiring instant emancipation by the resolutions, and dispensing with it in the directions. No, but the thing they suppose the Synod to admit, by those directions, is, that to require instant emancipation is to require an impossibility. Then, surely, *they* will now *admit*, on their part, that they and the Synod are of one mind, unless they will insist that the Synod are requiring what they themselves own to be an impossibility. We will allow them their choice here. If they say they and the Synod are now agreed that *instant* emancipation is not required by the act, and that the directions prove this, then they stand before the Synod protesting against them for requiring a certain thing, and proving at the same time that they have not required it, and still protesting against them. If they say that they and the Synod are not now of one mind about this matter, then the charge they are bringing against the Synod, by their reasons of protest, is just this: that they are requiring what they themselves own to be an impossibility. Now if they choose the first of these, they stand convicted of the most glaring inconsistency; and if to escape this charge they cling to the second, they are offering to the Synod the most intolerable insult imaginable. On either supposition this reason of protest is entitled to no reply, so far as they attempt to sustain it by the directions.

But the second part of this reason of protest is fairly enough entitled to some notice. They say the "act requires in some cases things that are contrary to one another." The first resolution and the fourth, they think, are at war, because the first condemns slavery, and the fourth requires the master to maintain superannuated slaves. Direction third requires the consent of the slave in order to his freedom, which they suppose implies that he shall remain in slavery if he chooses. Direction fourth allows slaves to be retained for remuneration, &c. How the condition of persons so retained is to differ from that of slaves, they can soon tell, by looking into the old act, and agreeing to understand it in its most obvious sense. That there is a lawful medium between slavery and emancipation, and that that medium may be lawfully adopted, when nothing better can be done, we think will be acknowledged by all candid and impartial persons, who understand the subject. Although the protestors "*know*," and we know too, "that the laws in slave-holding states refuse to know a person of color in any other character than that of a slave," does not prove to us, that his master is obliged to know him in the same character, any more than the fact that the laws of the United States as regards the running of the mail on the Sabbath, will oblige us to know no difference between the Sabbath and another day.

The fourth reason of protest against the act is, "Because it requires Presbyteries and Sessions forthwith to carry into effect the intention of the first resolution, in all cases, without liberty to judge of the expediency, reasonableness, humanity, or justice of the immediate application of the requisition."

It will not be pretended by our protesting brethren, we suppose, that the directions of superior courts should ordinarily leave the inferior a liberty to judge of the "*expediency, reasonableness*," &c., of calling their members to account for doing what is "*clearly condemned by the law of God*." And you have said, "that you do not find fault with this act for saying" so of slavery. What, then, is the matter? You are willing to admit that it is right on any one of the three suppositions you mention. We will choose to assert the fact, notwithstanding your assertion, that "*it cannot be pretended*" that any one of them are true. We believe that the mere possession of slaves, (by which we suppose you mean holding men in slavery,) is as really a crime against the law of nature as murder and adultery, and we think you ought not to deny this, and still cleave to your theory of "*circumstances*," at the expense of dissipating your own concessions on this subject into mere theory, into empty air, as we have seen. And if you will agree to this, all will be well enough yet. You and the Synod will agree at once, and you will not ask a discretionary power to dispense with the moral law, nor even to delay to insist on your people to keep God's commandments. Every thing else in this reason has been materially answered above.

The fifth reason protests against the act because it will be, as they suppose, "highly injurious and unjust to the negroes themselves."

And how does this appear? Proceeding upon their old assumption that emancipation is to be both "instant" and universal, they think it will make terrible havoc. This phantom is got up again, is sent to the south under the authority of the Synod, where it raves with the fury of a demon, compelling men and women to emigrate, and with reckless indifference to the tears of husband and wife, parents and children, dissolving all the ties which bind them to their country, and to one another!

But since it is our proper business to reason, we are obliged to ask here, even at the expense of interrupting this tragic display of the horrors of emancipation, what has all this to do with the Synod's act? If it is meant for argument, we must tell the protestors that it proceeds entirely on a false assumption. There is no evidence for this assumption; there is every evidence against it; and the protestors have twice already betrayed their consciousness of its falsehood. Moreover, there is an express provision in the act, that no slave shall be compelled to emigrate. This must effectually prevent those direful scenes, which are here portrayed in such glowing colors.— We do not see it necessary to say any thing further on this topic, only for the purpose of correcting an injurious mistake into which they have here fallen. They say the slaves are chiefly interested in this matter. This we deny. We say it is their masters, who are, or ought to be, chiefly interested in it, as it is viewed by the Synod. As regards the slaves, it is only a natural evil, which it is not so directly and properly, the object of the church to attempt to remove, as of some philanthropic society. But as regards their masters, it is a moral evil, which it is the duty of the church to endeavor to put away. If the slaves were chiefly interested, no reason can be given why the Synod should concern themselves about the slaves of our own people more than those of others. This misapprehension of the Synod's object, prepares the way, however, for the charge of folly and fanaticism repeatedly insinuated in those reasons of protest.

There is yet another matter here, which may require a reply. They say that to require masters to give up their younger slaves will conflict with the fourth resolution, which requires them to support the aged and infirm, as it will disable the master even to support himself. It must be confessed, indeed, that the act makes no provision for this case; for it takes it for granted, that while it is a man's duty to support his family and dependents, he ought to do it only by honest means. We cannot allow that man-stealing is an honest means: and if our mercy and sympathy is appealed to to grant this, we oppose to it the claims of justice. "I the Lord love judgment and hate robbery for burnt offering."

The sixth reason protests against the act because it can, (as they say) effect very little good, though executed in its fullest extent, and will certainly produce much evil. The evils that must attend the execution of this act, according to them, were detailed under the preceding reason, and it must therefore, be the proper object of this one to prove that it will do little or no good. This they endeavor to show will be the case both with regard to emancipation and with regard to those who are not for the present to be emancipated. Now, if by "effecting very little good" the protestors mean that emancipation itself will have no good in it to balance the supposed great evils of that immediate, indiscriminate and universal emancipation against which they profess to have been all along protesting, then this reason is quite intelligible and entirely consistent with the preceding one. So much so, indeed, that we would naturally have expected that this and the preceding should have been conjoined into one, so as to run thus: that while this act for immediate, indiscriminate and universal emancipation, will do little or no good, it will be productive of the most serious evil. But when the protestors say the act will do very little good, this cannot be their meaning for two reasons.

1. They have maintained no such doctrine in this dispute, at any rate, as that emancipation would not be, in itself, good to the negroes. They have maintained, to be sure, that instant and universal emancipation would be a great evil, but that surely a restricted emancipation itself, would be no good, is by no means a fair inference from the other, nor have they given us any right to draw such an inference. But,

2. Their own declarations and reasonings will best explain what they mean by the act "doing very little good." "The benefits, (they say,) they (the negroes) will receive from it, will be very far short of what is probably expected by many who are in favor of the act." How so? Is it because emancipation itself will be a small benefit? No: but because, (as they say,) very few can be liberated, *even according to the act!*" And they go on to show, correctly enough, that the act contains at least three restrictions, in order to prove that "according to the act," "but a very few can be liberated." Now what shall we say to this? Why nothing to be sure, but that this act so unlimited and unrestrained on the subject of emancipation, in the judgment of the protestors, turns out to be an act with three restrictions, on the same subject, in the judgment of the same protestors, and that therefore they appear on the whole before this Sy-

mod in the character of men protesting against two views of this act, which are as distant and as opposite as the zenith and the nadir. As no ingenuity can reconcile these two things, we shall choose to hold them to their last assumption; for although we think it argues toward an opposite extreme, it is in reality much nearer the truth than the first, and accordingly we insist that their protest should now drop. It is a house divided against itself, and it has accordingly "come to desolation."

The second sense in which they suppose this act will *do no good*, is, that it will not ameliorate the condition of those who are to be for the present retained under the restrictions of this act with regard to emancipation. But as, according to their former assumption, none were to be retained, at any rate, "*all were to be instantly emancipated.*" If, therefore, they have any ground to protest against the Synod here, it is not for making inefficient provisions with respect to those, but for inconsistency in making any provision for them at all. But, 2dly, whatever is the object of this act, it must be absurd for those who stand opposed to the whole object and design of it to protest against its provisions, not as likely to affect that object, but because they will, as they suppose, defeat that object, through their inefficiency. As protestors it is perfectly clear, then, they can have no title to a reply. We may remark here, however, that it may be the duty of the Synod, for sake of the object they have in view in this act, and for the sake of all that are disposed to concur with them in their design, to review the provisions of it, and if they find them in any respect inefficient or inapplicable, to make whatever alterations they may think necessary. It is not the business of this committee to give any opinion on that subject, but only to answer objections, so far as they are proposed consistently with the character of protestors, and so far as those protestors are consistent with themselves.

The two remaining reasons have no necessary connection with either of those assumptions, and may therefore be entitled to some attention.

The seventh reason protests against the act because it enjoins the infraction of state laws, and unnecessarily exposes our members to their penalties. How so? Direction fifth enjoins Sessions to acquaint slaves with what Synod have now done in behalf of their natural rights. Do the laws of the south, then, forbid ministers and their Sessions to teach what is justly due to all men according to the Scriptures? If so, the case is plain. "Obey God rather than man." There might be some appearance of truth and justice in the above pretence, if it could be shown that the Synod have gone out of their sphere, as an ecclesiastical court, and, as mere politicians, encouraged the slaves to rise and assert their "natural rights." But this they have not done. What they have done in behalf of their natural rights, has been only in the way of applying the divine law to the case, in order to convince their masters that it is their duty before God, to "undo the heavy burden, to break every yoke, and let the oppressed go free."

This information, they say, would not only be useless to the slaves, but calculated to excite a spirit of insurrection. This is surely to reason after the flesh. How do the protestors know that this information would be useless to the slaves? The Apostle Paul thought otherwise, when he tells the slave, (1 Cor. vii. 21,) "If thou mayest," &c. He has no scruple from sedition laws to tell this to the slave himself, in a public epistle, to be read in the church. Will teaching what is due from man to man, according to the moral law, have any tendency to excite a spirit of insurrection? Or is it true that our own people, as well as others, are holding a class of human beings in such a condition that it is dangerous to tell them what justice and the law of nature requires, and to let them know that a certain branch of the Christian church concedes this justice to them?

But even admitting that such a consequence might incidentally follow, it could be no reason against compliance with a moral duty. "The fear of man bringeth a snare." But it may be said, one can still teach them the doctrines of the gospel, &c. To this we answer, that besides that it can never be lawful to keep back any part of divine truth from any class of mankind, it will be utterly in vain to pretend a concern for their souls, whilst we are trampling upon their bodies; to affect a desire to put them in possession of the blessings of Christianity, whilst, contrary to the principles of natural religion, we deny them the rights of men.

But such an infraction, they think, is forbidden by Romans xiii. 1—5, Titus iii. 1. Indeed? Then we desire to know how this can be reconciled with the forecited 1 Cor. vii., 21., if the powers that be, command slaves to be kept in profound ignorance of their natural rights, as we should think they must do in the south, from the reasoning of our brethren here?

But we now come to what is no doubt the strongest reason with the protestors. "The duty, to say the least, is doubtful, not imperious." We are far from thinking so, and we have given our reasons. But why is it doubtful? Is there any doubt that negroes are men, and that, abstractly considered, we owe the same duties to them which we owe to other men? No doubt of this: "But all that is in question it seems is only an alienable right." But waving all controversy here, about whether liberty

itself is an alienable right, surely the right of negroes, as well as others, to understand the law of nature, and to know that its principles are allowed to be applicable to them as well as others, is not an alienable right. But whether this right is alienable or unalienable, is all one to the controversy. It seems it is "counterbalanced" at any rate, "by rights as sacred," "the right of self-preservation, and the public safety." This counterbalancing system, it must be owned, is extremely convenient, and admits of a most extensive application. Who sees not that we may in this way excuse ourselves from the performance of any duty which we think accords not with our interest or our safety? We have only to put the duty in at one end of the scales, and our own concerns in the other, and we shall soon see that there is either a preponderance in favor of the latter; or which will just answer the purpose as well, there will be a perfect equipoise, as here; the scales will be "counterbalanced;" and a consequent state of perpetual dubiety will take place.

After all, we doubt whether this balance is not a mere human invention, and too much like that balance of deceit in the hand of Ephraim. (Hosea xii. 7.) And that he used it too, for a similar purpose, is evident from what immediately follows: "He loveth to oppress." With the leave of the protestors, we will substitute for it the balance of the sanctuary, and in those scales we will always find that the duties we owe to God and to one another, outweigh considerations of private interest and public safety; and that where we are ordered to obey the divine will, in opposition to what is apparently wise and safe for us, we have really a better remedy than what politicians think, viz., the one of doing our duty, trusting in God, and leaving the event to his wise and gracious disposal.

But, "such an infraction," they add, "may suit the zeal of the fanatic, but cannot command the respect of sober judgment." Why so? The plain reason is this. It disturbs the equilibrium here, an equilibrium adjusted too with the greatest nicety, and which appears to be the result of "sober," indeed, if not of very sound "judgment." To this we shall make no further reply. Impartial judges may, perhaps, doubt, after all, the right of the protestors to insinuate the charge of fanaticism against the Synod, in relation to this act, and to arrogate to themselves the exclusive claim to be men of "sober judgment."

The eighth and last reason protests against the act on account of what they call the precipitancy with which it was carried through the Synod.

This reason involves no principle whatever, and requires no reply. Those who may think it of any consequence to be correctly informed of the history of this act, will of course consult the Minutes of 1831, and then will correct the partial and imperfect representation of this matter by the protestors.

On a review of the ground we have gone over, we think it will be apparent, that whatever may be the defects in the details and provisions of the Synod's act, there is no fault whatever to be found with the doctrine of it, nor is it, when correctly represented, liable to any charge on the score of consistency. But while the protestors have entirely failed to establish these charges against the act, they have themselves fallen into the five following mistakes:

1. They have mistaken an absurd and extravagant caricature of the act for the act itself, and against this mistaken use of the object, a great part of their argument is levelled.

2. They fall into this mistake, and endeavor to support it all along, by a false hypothesis, viz: that there is no medium between slavery and an actual and literal emancipation; and hence they come to imagine that the Apostles are giving their sanction to slavery, when they are only laying down the duties of a lawful and reasonable servitude, according to the law of nature.

3. They adopt a false hypothesis about the lawfulness of slavery in certain circumstances; which they set up in opposition to the doctrine of the act, and, as we have seen, in contravention of the law of nature and the immutable principles of justice. This we take to be their *πρωτὴν ψευδός*, their radical error, and this we think clearly lies at the foundation of all the opposition the Synod have encountered on this subject, and so long as slave-holders themselves can shelter under this vain subterfuge, it will be impossible to bring them either to emancipate their slaves, or to treat them according to the principles of justice and equity, while they are retained in their service.

4. As they misrepresent the late act, so they mistake the act of 1811; and as we have seen, in affecting to oppose the Synod under the sanction of that act, they have taken ground on which that act refuses to spread its shield over them.

5. They misrepresent the character and object of the Synod with relation to the whole matter, as if they contemplated nothing higher than to do an act of kindness and humanity to the slaves, whereas they are more concerned to rescue their masters from the guilt of *slave-holding*.

6. As a natural consequence of these mistakes, they have imagined the act to be inconsistent when it was not, and attacking it with a misguided zeal, they have been

caught in their own snare, and fallen themselves into the most glaring inconsistency and absurdity.

And now, to conclude, we would hope our protesting brethren are, or may be yet, so far convinced of the truth of these things, as to be induced to relinquish their opposition, and concur with the Synod in their endeavors to abolish, within the pale of our communion, an abomination so offensive to God, so disgraceful to the Christian church, and to human nature itself.

JOSEPH SCROGGS,
JAMES MARTIN,
JOHN WALKER.

ART. II. *The Sin of Nadab and Abihu.*

(Continued from page 201.)

THE scriptures, we have seen, hold up the doom of Nadab and Abihu, as a solemn warning to the church to the end of time, to sanctify the Lord, in our drawing nigh to him according to the appointed order, and to glorify him, by keeping his ordinances "pure and entire." What a sword must have pierced through the soul of Aaron, when he saw those sons, whom he no doubt, fondly thought, would be a comfort to him in his declining years, and a blessing to the church, when he would be "gathered to his fathers," suddenly perishing before him! fire coming forth from the *mercy seat*, and in the very act of their sin, striking them down before the assembled thousands of Israel! monuments of the holy indignation of the God they had insulted, and thus proclaiming, by a voice more terrible than the thunders of heaven, that "the Lord will be sanctified in them that come nigh him, and before all the people will be glorified!" Had they died in *defence of the truth*, had they fallen by the hand of the *enemies of the truth*, for their zealous adherence to the commandments and institutions of the God of their fathers, Aaron might have gloried in the fall of his young sons. But ah! to see them struck down, blackened and loathsome corpses, sacrifices to the just displeasure of a holy God; to see them sinking in death beneath his angry frown, for their impiety and presumption, even if he might hope that the punishment went no further than death, must have wrung his heart with unutterable anguish. And did not Aaron deserve to be thus corrected, and thus see all his fond hopes blasted? He had himself, been guilty of a similar crime. He had himself innovated on the appointed institutions of Jehovah. Soon after the Lord had proclaimed his law in terrible majesty from Mount Sinai, when "he shined forth from Mount Paran, and came with ten thousands of his holy ones," when there were thunderings and lightnings, and a thick cloud upon the Mount; and when before the terrible voice of the eternal God, the three millions of Israel trembled, and with one united voice, and in the most solemn manner, thus covenanted with their God, "all that the Lord hath said will we do, and be obedient;" soon after this, yea while the glory of Jehovah still rested on the top of the mountain, where he made darkness his pavilion, these faithless people cry to Aaron, "Up, make us gods, which shall go before us; for as for this Moses, the man that brought us up out of the land of Egypt, we wot not what has become of him." Now observe, that the Israelites (and Aaron knew this) were not so brutalized, as to worship the work of their own hands, as if it could save them; they used it as a "medium of worship," a help to their devotions, in worshipping the true Jehovah, the God of Israel. This is evident, from the language of Aaron, "to-morrow is a feast to the Lord," (Exod. xxxii. 5.) Observe too, that the sacrifices offered before it, were those the Lord had appointed. Still this did not free them from the guilt of idolatry, the sin of *adding to God's institutions*, nor shelter them from the displeasure of him, whose worship they had thus polluted. Aaron appears to have made no objection, to the sinful request of this guilty people; and though he was then spared, from the terrible slaughter, which the Levites, as the executioners of divine justice, were commanded to make of their guilty brethren, when three thousand fell in their blood; yet, he lived to see his guilt written in the blood of his sons, to adore the mercy that had spared him, to confess, in humble submission, the justice of the fearful stroke, and the awful danger of *adding to or taking from the appointed ordinances of God*. He was forbidden even to bury his dead. He, and his other two sons, Eleazer and Ithamar, were forbidden to show any outward signs of mourning; and however troubled in spirit, they must go on, in the discharge of their duty, ministering for the living, while Mishael and Elzaphan, the sons of Uzziel the uncle of Aaron, were commanded to come near, and carry their brethren from before the sanctuary, out of the camp: thus reminding the bereaved relatives, that the glory of God, and the discharge of their duty to him, must be

dearer to them, than the nearest and dearest earthly friends, who now lay dead, and withering before them. "And Moses said unto Aaron, and unto Eleazer, and unto Ithamar, his sons, uncover not your heads, neither rend your clothes, lest ye die, and lest wrath come upon all the people: but let your brethren, the whole house of Israel, bewail the burning which the Lord hath kindled." As these monuments of divine indignation, were borne through the camp, to their graves, what must have been the feelings, of the thousands of Israel, as they looked on their lifeless bodies! What a solemn awe, must have filled every soul! And while with holy fear, they bewailed the burning which the Lord had kindled, must they not also have resolved, in the most scrupulous manner, to observe *all* his commandments, and ordinances, lest they too, should all likewise perish, and become burning monuments of his justice, in the fire of hell? "Then Moses said unto Aaron, this is it that the Lord spake, saying, I will be sanctified in them that come nigh me," &c. Moses here, probably, refers to Exodus xix. 22, and xxix. 43—44. Indeed, the language of the text, is the substance and language of the whole of God's law, commanding us to worship him with reverence and godly fear; to worship him, in all things, as he has appointed; not to trifle with his institutions, nor add to what an infinitely wise God has deemed sufficient; lest he add to us the plagues written in this book. But was not this language of Moses harsh and unfeeling? The poor father's heart was bleeding; might he not have expected sympathy from a brother, an only brother. "A brother is born for adversity," and Moses showed his reverence for his God, and his tenderness for his beloved brother, in the best way. He reminded his afflicted brother, that the judgment, though heavy, was deserved. His sons had insulted the holiness of God, had called in question his infinite wisdom, and acted as if they knew better how to worship him, than his own Spirit could prescribe. They did not "sanctify" God, by worshipping him according to the appointed way; they dishonored God by neglecting his institutions, and preferring their own inventions, and thus his holiness and glory, which they had attempted to sully, and his power, which they had braved, called for their destruction. Now, my brother, shall *your feelings* be spared, or God dishonored? The words of Moses to Aaron imply also that their death, as a signal display of divine justice, would vindicate God's holiness, fill all who heard of the judgment with salutary fear, and thus the name of the Lord would be glorified, and his holiness adored in the church, to the end of time: while those who innovated on his institutions afterwards, and thus sinned both against the word and against such judgments, would be left without excuse. "I will be sanctified in them that come nigh me." In our worshipping the holy God, we "come nigh" to him, and in this worship we must "sanctify" him, by reverential and adoring thoughts of his holiness, majesty, and power, by a strict and heartfelt obedience to all his commandments and ordinances: willing to be saved in his own way, to worship him according to his own appointment, and thus "glorify" him before all the people, by not preferring *our will* to his, but observing all his ordinances as he has delivered them, neither adding nor diminishing: thus showing our respect for his wisdom, our reverence for his *authority*, and our zeal for his glory.

Having made a few general remarks on the danger of innovating on the divinely appointed order of Jehovah's worship, of daring to offer common or strange fire in his service, and thus defile his holy institutions by inventions and additions of our own, we proceed now to mention some instances in which, at the present day, human inventions are forced into the worship of God, erroneous opinions taught in his name, and thus ministers and people become guilty of offering strange fire before the Lord.

And, first, the unsanctioned and sinful means employed in endeavoring to excite the animal feelings, and thus produce a *revival of religion*. And here, let not our views be mistaken. We are far from meaning to say aught against a *genuine* revival of religion. No. A real revival of "pure and undefiled religion," a revival produced by the Spirit of God, giving his blessing to the faithful preaching of *the truth*; a revival, such as was once seen, when, at the Reformation, the true doctrines of the Gospel that had so long been opposed, perverted, or buried, by antichristian Rome, were plainly and zealously defended and preached; a revival, such as was seen in Scotland from 1638 to 1650, when the word of the Lord had free course, and was glorified in the conviction and conversion of sinners, in the edification of saints, in the churches' walking together in the fear of the Lord, and in the comfort of the Holy Ghost; in ministers and people laboring and praying, not only that sinners might be gathered to Christ, not only that the church might be *large*, but also pure, that the king's daughter might be all glorious within, her clothing of wrought gold, that she might be brought unto the King in raiment of needle-work, with gladness and rejoicing; such a revival we would hail with joy; for such a revival we earnestly pray, and to all the instruments used by the Head of the church, in its advancement, we would bid "God speed." But a revival that consists in mere animal excitement, while *the truth* is not preached; a revival, produced by a system used to work on the animal feelings—a system, which pretends to make Christians in a way that would supersede the "plan of God's regenerating grace," with all its machinery of "anxious seats," and "protracted meetings," and all

accompanied by language not only erroneous, but even blasphemous,* such a revival, and such instruments, cannot be the work, nor receive the blessing, of the Holy Spirit. There can be no revival, no conversion of a soul to God, but through the truth, as an instrument, explained and applied by the Spirit, who never acts in quickening the "dead in trespasses and sins," without the word. If in what is termed a "revival," then, *the truth* is not preached; if the individuals said to be converted, are grossly ignorant of the truth; if its subjects do not receive the whole truth of the Bible, its predictions, its histories, its threatenings, its promises, its doctrines, its precepts, its every "iota," as true: if, while they may hold that some of the truths are more important than others, they do not hold that every truth, and every tittle is true, and necessary to be believed, and *that* because the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it; if it is a revival, in fine, that leads its advocates to be careless of steadfastness in the truth, to speak against those who bear a testimony for the truth, to disregard or oppose any one of the truths of the Bible, such a revival cannot be the work of the God of the Bible. We say again, then, that all those revivals and "anxious meetings," and excitements, where a love for the truth, a holy earnestness and watchfulness for the purity of the truth, are not their inseparable attendants, are not *real revivals*, are not blessings to the church, but a sad and affecting sign of the spread of error, the *withdrawing* of the Spirit, the impending of the desolating judgments of heaven. Without passing any judgment at present on the boasted revivals of the day, without deciding whether they are real or pretended, yet we do unhesitatingly say, that a system of excitement, destitute of the stamp of divine authority, the use of means un-sanctioned and unauthorised by the word of God, however successful they may *seem* to be; cannot rationally be expected to be accompanied by the blessing of the Spirit; nor will *apparent success* excuse the guilt of those who thus force their unauthorised inventions into the worship of the unchangeable God. He has appointed means of *his own* for the building up of his kingdom and the conversion of souls, the prayerful and persevering use of which, in simplicity and godly sincerity, he will own and bless. Still we must wait on God till the set time to favor and build up Zion is come; resting assured that in due season we shall reap, if we faint not. But if we use means which the Spirit has not prescribed; if we deviate into ways and inventions of our own, from the "good old way" marked out by Jehovah in the word, we cannot expect that he will own such defections by bestowing his blessing. The errors and inventions of men will never meet with the approbation of the God of truth. Tell us not that they do receive his blessing. Tell us not that these new inventions, these anxious seats and anxious rooms, this separating the anxious from the unconcerned, this calling upon

* What are we to think of language like the following, used by ministers in the Presbyterian church, at their "protracted meetings," and in urging sinners to come to *their anxious seats*. One of these "new measure men," in other words, one of those men who offer strange fire in God's service, and prefer their own inventions to his word; who act as if they *did not* believe that the word contains a *full and complete rule* of duty; thus addressed a large collection of people:—"Now I want you distinctly to understand, that all the Holy Spirit does in conversion, or regeneration, as they call it, is to convince the conscience that you are sinners. This he has done for you. Now the rest of the work you must do yourselves. Resolve to serve the Lord *this moment*, and if you will do it, rise up. This now, thank God, is all the regeneration we want." Another thus testifies, speaking of protracted meetings:—"Sinners are urged to rise, to take certain seats, to kneel, to go to certain places, and the like, with an earnestness which indicates that by so doing they are almost sure of being converted, and by refusing, almost sure of being lost." The Journal and Telegraph has the following language:—"We state the facts precisely as they were reported to us, by two excellent clergymen, who declared to us that they were eye witnesses of what they stated. One of them informed us, that at a protracted meeting at which he was present, addresses were made which brought out no less than 300 persons upon the anxious seat. A clergyman whose name is well known in the western part of this state, then arose, and declared to these persons, in so many words, that the Holy Ghost had done all for them that he ever would do, in having convinced them of sin; that the rest of the work they had to do for themselves; and requested that as fast as they gave their hearts to God, they would rise. Presently one arose, and another, and another; the minister meanwhile calling out, 'one, two; three, thirty, forty,' &c., glory to God! until the whole three hundred were actually upon their feet in token of their being converted.' The minister then said, 'The Holy Ghost tells me now, that you must all pray.' Upon which the whole three hundred men, women, and children, fell upon their knees and commenced praying audibly at the same time. Some of the language that was used by one of the clergymen was, if we understand the import of language, *downright blasphemy*; and that is the reason why we refrain from reporting it to our readers. The other clergyman to whom we have referred, has given us an account of a species of fanaticism which prevails to a considerable extent in his region, under the name of 'travail of soul.' The first step towards this, subsequently to conversion, is a state of perfect sanctification, to which the individuals suppose themselves to arrive by a sort of *extra effort* in the way of self-dedication. This prepares them for the 'travail of soul,' and the idea is nothing less, than that they actually participate in the agony of the Lord Jesus Christ for sinners. They fasten upon some individual, whose sins they desire to bear, and earnestly pray that the burden of his sins may be rolled off upon them; and when they suppose they see the burden coming, they feel, or profess to feel intense pain; and while it is actually upon them, they often faint, and writhe, and seem ready to sink under it; and when it passes off they give thanks to God, that a soul has been born into the kingdom. And though the individual for whom they have travailed may be sunk in all iniquity, they never pray for him afterwards, being fully assured, that sooner or later he will *actually* be converted. In some instances they have gone so far as to claim the power of working miracles, and in one case, at least, an individual solemnly declared that he had cast out a dumb devil, and that he saw it when it came out! It is understood that some who have fallen into this fanaticism, have hitherto been highly respectable, and what is still more deplorable, there are among them several ministers of the Gospel." (For the above quotations, see the Presbyterian June 20th, April 18th, 25th, 1832.) And all these errorists are holding communion with the Presbyterian church, to its remotest bounds; and all are embraced, by the false charity of the day, though they should sting the whole faith of the church, and the hopes of the believer, to death. To hear of such errors and blasphemies, is enough to make the very flesh tremble; and afford fearful evidence that they who forsake the standard of the word and offer "strange fire before the Lord," will be given up to strong delusions. See the terrible threatenings of the great I AM against the churches of Asia, *only* for not exercising discipline against certain errorists in their communion. Rev. ii., 13, 15, 20.

a certain class to stand up, or come forward to be prayed for; together with all the varied machinery used in attempting to excite a revival; and all, most affecting to relate, accompanied by *unscriptural representations of the truth*—tell us not that though unsanctioned by the Bible, that though they will not bear the appeal to the law and the testimony, that though when weighed in the balance of the sanctuary, they are found to be the light and empty inventions of men, yet still they succeed. They may *seem* to succeed for a season, they may *seem* to be countenanced by an apparent success; multitudes may be brought into the visible church, may become professors, but it does not follow of course that they become heirs of glory. We read of certain individuals, the ancient Pharisees, who while they rejected the word of God, loved their own *inventions and innovations on divine worship*, pretended to be uncommonly zealous and holy; and manifested as much anxiety to “fill their synagogues with proselytes,” as certain individuals around us; were as liberal in the use of unauthorised means, compassed sea and land to make one proselyte; and what then, when he was made? “Ye make him,” saith our Lord, “two-fold more the child of hell than yourselves.”

Now observe, the Lord does not condemn deep anxiety in ministers and people, in endeavoring to win souls. Oh no; they should labor, as it were, night and day, entreat sinners to be reconciled, earnestly, and instantly to flee from the coming wrath: but he condemns the unauthorised and unscriptural means used in making converts, by the Pharisees. And thus he will still frown upon unscriptural means used in filling churches. Tell us not, boast not then, of the success which has followed the use of these unauthorised means. The Pharisees had success, too, in the use of *their own inventions*, and it was a common saying of *theirs*, too, “that when one was made a proselyte, he became entirely like a new born babe.” We see, however, what a different estimate the Head of the church formed of them, and their converts, and their inventions. And even granting that all the converts made by the use of these unscriptural means *now*, are *real converts*; still, this will not clear those who thus innovate on God’s institutions, nor prove these inventions to be sinless. We know that Jehovah maketh even the *wrath* of men to praise him; but we also know, that this does not justify the angry man, nor excuse the revengeful, bloody persecutors of the truth, and people of God, because he has made their malevolent designs the means of blessing the church; the very “blood of the martyrs is the seed of the church.”

We have before shown, and let it ever be borne in mind, that numbers are no proof of the correctness of a principle or practice. Noah was right, though immense numbers, myriads, a world, was arrayed against him. Numbers added to a church by unscriptural means, instead of being a proof that the unsanctioned means are lawful, are rather a proof that multitudes are given up to strong delusions to believe a lie, because they receive not *the truth in the love of it*. A *real* revival of religion will often *thin* a church, separating the mere professor from the believer, the precious from the vile, the stony ground hearer, the worldly hearer from the doer of the word, the chaff from the wheat, the lovers of the truth from the friends of error.

“Demas hath forsaken us, having loved the present world.” “O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust”—the truths and ordinances of God, the precious treasure of the Gospel: keep it pure, and unadulterated by the profane babblings, and inventions of men; or, as the Vulgate Latin version reads, “profane newness of words,” contrary to the form of sound words which the Holy Ghost teacheth; and oppositions of science, *falsely* so called, boasted light and knowledge which is opposed to the truth; “which some professing have erred concerning the faith.”

If we forsake God, by leaving the direction of his word, have we not reason to fear that he will leave us to follow our own delusions, to be carried about by every wind of doctrine, to make shipwreck of the faith and the soul? And observe that the zeal, or the *good intentions* men may have in their human inventions and additions to God’s institutions, do not justify these pollutions of divine worship. Nadab and Abihu doubtless had good intentions in presenting incense to the true God, and it was right incense too, though the fire was not taken from the altar. Gideon had good intentions doubtless, in making an ephod: the Colossians, in subjection to “ordinances after the commandments and doctrines of men.” Yet, not one of them had the warrant of, nor was justifiable by, the word of God. The good intentions of men, we say then, will not excuse their inventions from the charge of idolatry and will worship, nor shield from the consequences of that fearful rebuke of an awful, jealous God, “Who hath required this at your hands?” If you go forward without the pillar of the word, you cannot but stumble and fall; if you enter the battle without the armor of God, “the sword of the Spirit,” you cannot but be conquered.

Secondly: We may mention another instance, in which at the present day, ministers and people are guilty of offering “strange fire before the Lord,” viz: in forcing psalms and hymns of human composition into the worship of God; and on this, as we cannot here enter into a full discussion of the question, we shall be brief.

The advocates of human psalmody have less warrant for their presumptuous innovations, than even Nadab and Abihu. After the solemn warning given us, by the sudden and fearful death of these young priests; after repeated injunctions and threatenings, uttered by God against every one who should dare to add to, or take from his word and ordinances; they pass by the "fire of the altar," the psalms spoken by the voice of Omnipotence, and sent from heaven, to "walk in the light of their own fire, and in the sparks that they have kindled." The "scripture psalms and hymns, and spiritual songs," which we are commanded to sing with grace in our hearts to the Lord, are all the word of God. Every word of them is pure—they are the fire of the altar, the sword of the Spirit, quick and powerful, sharper than a two-edged sword, piercing to the dividing asunder of the soul and spirit, discerning the thoughts and intents of the heart, staining the pride of human glory, driving the powers of darkness from the soul, opening the prison to them that are bound, and enabling the ransomed soul to sing in triumph, "he brought me up out of a horrible pit, out of the miry clay, and set my feet upon a rock." "Whom have I in heaven but thee, and there is none upon the earth that I desire besides thee!" The remark of the "pious and judicious Halyburton," in reference to his preaching, may with equal force be applied to the words of praise which we address to God. In his memoirs he observes; "that though God make use of the words of men for leading into the meaning of his own; yet it is the *very words of scripture* by which he conveys his influence into the heart; and that when he found the word had done good, it was usually *God's own word in the scripture* brought in, in his sermons."

Psalms of human composition are fire of our own, the polluted inventions of a rebellious people walking in a way not good, after *their own thoughts*."

We must engage in nothing in divine worship, for which we have not an express scripture warrant. The advocates of human psalmody urge, that they are not, in so many words, forbidden to sing psalms of human composition. So might Nadab and Abihu have urged, that they were not forbidden to use strange or common fire; but then they had no command, as we have seen, no warrant for what they did, and they died before the Lord; for their presumptuous innovation, on the appointed worship of the great and terrible God, there went out fire from the Lord and devoured them.—The Lord, we have seen, had sent down fire from heaven upon the altar of burnt offering, commanding that that fire, should be kept constantly burning there, and never go out. Now, though He had nowhere said, "in so many words," that this fire of the altar *alone*, should be used, and that every other kind of fire, was forbidden—(though men might deem the one as good for burning the sacrifice as the other,) yet, this was evidently implied. It was evidently the will of the Eternal God, that "his fire, should be used in his service," and not that his gift should be slighted, and a human invention preferred. Now apply this to the scripture psalms. As he sent fire from heaven, so from heaven he has given a "Book of Psalms" to be sung in his praise; plainly intimating, that it is his will, that this book of heaven, and *this alone*, must be used in this part of his worship, and that to throw that book aside, and take "fire," psalms of our own, in preference, is to insult the God of heaven, to call in question his infinite wisdom, and expose ourselves to his desolating judgments. Ask not then, as the guilty Nadab and Abihu probably asked—"why not this fire as well as that? (why not these psalms, as well as the scripture psalms?)" "will not this burn as well as that." It is from the *appointment of Jehovah*, that any part of his word, or ordinances is effectual in pulling down strong holds, in breaking hard hearts, and breathing into the dead in trespasses and sins, the breath of life. Men may deem their mawkish effusions, better poetry, and more calculated to "promote devotion," than the sublime and heavenly words of God himself; but though they may excite the animal feelings, they are not the *appointed* instrument for breaking the rock in pieces, they are our own, "torn, and lame, and sick; should I accept this of your hand? saith the Lord." No matter, though a man possessed all the wisdom of a Gabriel, though he could speak with the tongue of men and of angels, though his poetry, should be melody itself, and even exceed "*Watts' jingle*," as far as an angel's knowledge exceeds that of a worm of the dust; still, in divine worship, it has not the divine appointment, and it would fall as powerless on the heart of stone, as dew upon the adamant; it could no more raise the soul to God, than it could the dead from their graves; while the feelings it excited, might be as little connected with genuine godliness, as the idolatries and inventions of the Chinese.

We repeat that every part of divine worship, derives its efficacy from the divine appointment. Not that God is confined to these, but because they are the means he has in sovereignty appointed, and with which he is pleased to give his blessing. God doubtless could, in an extraordinary manner, renew and raise the soul to heaven, without the instrument of the word, without any means whatsoever; but he does not, and will not. Thus, in the natural world, it would be as easy for Jehovah, to cause the lightning of heaven to refresh the parched earth, and *water* to burn and consume it,

as it is for him to cause his rain to bless the "springing thereof," and his lightning to burn and destroy. It was owing to the divine appointment, that the waters of Jordan healed the Leprosy of Naaman the Syrian. *They had no more natural virtue, than Abana and Pharpha, rivers of Damascus, though those waters would never have removed the plague.* It was owing to this appointment, that the strange and apparently useless instrument, the sound of the ram's horn, levelled with the dust the walls of Jericho. It was owing to this appointment that the brazen serpent, erected by Moses in the wilderness, was effectual in healing the tormented, dying Israelites. When stung by the fiery serpents, if some one among them had formed a brazen serpent, handsomer, as he might think, than that formed according to the divine appointment, if every Israelite had made a brazen serpent for himself, they might have looked on, and hoped, till the fiery poison drunk up their spirits, and their eyes were glazed in death. When they looked to the brazen serpent Jehovah had commanded Moses to erect, then, and *then only*, did he promise, that whoever looked thereon should live. Even the death of Christ is effectual for the salvation of the dying soul, not merely from his infinite dignity and glory, not merely from his bleeding on the cross, and bearing all the sins of his people there; his death derived its efficacy also from the *appointment of the Father*, because God made him to be sin for us, and appointed that he should suffer in his people's stead, and that his death should go for theirs.

We might mention many more instances, in which, at the present day, ministers and people are guilty of offering strange fire before the Lord; guilty of holding and teaching for doctrines the commandments of men; proclaiming the ability of the sinner, while denying justification through the imputed righteousness of Christ, the fall and total depravity of human nature, salvation by the free and unmerited grace of God, and many other momentous truths: thus bearing aloft the standard of rebellion against the head of the church; thus neglecting the fire of the altar, the truths of revelation, for the fancies and inventions of men. But we hasten to close, with a few remarks on the duty of Christians, in this day of backsliding, solemnly to observe the injunction of Jehovah, to "contend earnestly for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints." This duty is especially necessary *now*, when error is breaking in upon the churches like a flood, and will be necessary, until the uncreated angel of the covenant shall lift up his hand to heaven, and swear by Him that liveth for ever and ever, that time shall be no longer: till, in the world of glory, *all* the doctrines, promises, mysteries, prophecies, every tittle of the book of God, shall be seen in the light of eternity to be indeed necessary, glorious, essential, and worthy of God. Till that last great day, there is not a doubt that error will exist, and truth, more or less, be hated and opposed. And till then, the friends of Christ must display the banner for the truth, testify against error, and armed with the weapons of the spiritual armory, stand fast in the faith, and courageously fight the battles of their Lord.

This contending earnestly for the truth, is the duty in which we should be found engaged, if we would be blessed with a genuine revival of religion. It is indeed said, that "contending for the truth may be carried too far," because, say errorists, it causes a decay in the spiritual life, it is *opposed* to revivals of religion. This foul slander on the word of God, is the offspring of that false zeal of the day, that hatred of the light, that mechanical sanctification which labors by its "anxious rooms and anxious seats," and the other usual external excitements unsanctioned by the word of God, to create a revival. Read the page of inspiration and the history of the church, and you will find that the men whose labors were blessed, and who were used as instruments by the Spirit, for effecting a *real* revival, a real reformation of religion, were men who loved *the truth*, who were willing to die in its defence, and whose lives were one continued scene of contending for the truth. Read the language of Paul, and John the beloved disciple. "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, I take you to record," &c.—(See Romans i. 16; Acts xx. 26; Gal. i. 18; 1 John iv. 1; 2 John x. 11.) Look again at the page of history, look at Luther and the reformers of the sixteenth century. Had they adopted the spirit of indifference to God's truths, which prevails so extensively in our day, they would never have been honored by the Spirit as instruments for effecting that glorious revival and reformation, from a worse than Egyptian darkness, the horrible blasphemies, the ridiculous superstitions, the soul-shackling and iniquitous system of the popish Antichrist.

Let it not be said, then, that contending for *the truth* may be carried too far. As well might it be said, that holy opposition to sin may be carried too far: sin, which has poisoned both body and soul, slain the accumulated dead of ages, changed this world into a Gogotha, and kindled the flames of hell. As well might it be said, that the beauty of *truth and holiness*, and the glories of eternity, may be too well described; and the danger of error too plainly pointed out: error, which leads the soul to trust in a refuge of lies, opposes the truth of God, makes Him a liar, exposes to the sword of his vengeance, and has written upon her path in "letters of fire," this path is the way to hell, going down to the chambers of death." Contending for the truth may be carried too far, because, say some, it destroys peace, it is not popular. No: but it is

a duty. If there is peace in error, it is a false peace, and it is a duty, it is a real charity, to rouse the sinner from his carnal security, to cut down by the "sword of the Spirit," the word of God, the *gourd* under which he imagines he can be sheltered from the storm of wrath, and to point him to the only refuge where true rest and peace can be found.

Contending for the truths of the gospel, in a gospel spirit, cannot be carried too far. The "pure word, the whole word, and nothing but the word," will be the watchword of the Christian, and though for his faithfulness many may deem him *contentious*, still he must do his duty, oppose error, and defend the truth, even at the risk of being called, like Jeremiah, *by the whole earth*, "a man of strife, and a man of contention." Is it not evident, that opposition to the *least* truth of God's word, is *antichristian*, and that the native tendency of the boasted liberality of the day, is to banish truth from the earth, consign the Bible to oblivion, and lead us to treat it as an idle dream, a book that may mean any thing or nothing? Is it not evident, that if we give up *one truth*, because some good people, some learned men, have neglected or denied it, that on this principle of *false* charity and accommodation, we must give up every truth of the blessed gospel?—for what truth, by an ungodly world, has not been denied or cavilled at? Is it *charity*, then, to flatter men in their errors, to shut their eyes to their danger when standing on the brink of a precipice? Is it love to the poor sinner thus to tell him that he need not believe *all* that Jehovah reveals, need not try to be and to do *all* that God commands? Is it real charity to souls, to fritter away the declarations of the gospel, to cut down the truths of the Bible, to square with the feelings of the carnal mind, to be faithless to certain truths of God's word, when to be thus faithless is to be *popular*? Is this *charity*, is this love to souls, love and faithfulness to Christ? No: it is the spirit of Satan, liar as he is, *stealing* an angel's form to deceive. It is palming upon the world the deadly delusion, that if a multitude do evil, the "number of the sinners is an apology for the sin;" that if a human invention in God's worship, or a neglect of some of God's truths, is only not unusual and *unpopular*, it is not criminal. It is breaking down men's regard for what Jehovah reveals, and leading them on to the brink of infidelity; for, "if a man may disbelieve *one* truth, and yet be *free from sin* in so doing, he may disbelieve two; and if two, four; and if four, ten; and if ten, half the Bible; and if half the Bible, the whole; and if a man may be a deist and yet be in a safe state, he may be an atheist and yet go to heaven."

Modern charity is very different from the charity of the Bible. Modern charity pretends to be an angel of light, while she is a lying spirit, an angel of darkness. Instead of "rejoicing in the truth," instead of bearing aloft the torch of truth, she would quench that light in eternal darkness. Her breath is poisonous and deadly; the truth cannot live in the atmosphere of modern charity. She inculcates an accursed indifference to the truth, and calls her conduct *liberal* and *benevolent*. She breathes her deadly flattery into the sinner's ear, tells him that if he is *sincere*, all will be well; that the truths he disregards are little, non-essential truths, and that good men, and great men, have neglected and denied them. She cares not for the truth, and therefore easily agrees to *bury* it, and go over its grave, and shake hands with error and infidelity. Thus this evil spirit acts, and then with an impudent front, thanks God she is no *bigot*, because she has trampled down the precious truth, and led ministers and people to be, like the unjust steward, liberal at another's expense, and prodigal of property not their own.

Say not, then, it is bigotry to be so particular about little things. If it is a truth of God's word, if it is an appointment of high heaven, it is *not* a little truth, it is not unimportant or non-essential. Little as men may deem it, it is God's word, and bears the stamp of his authority, and in neglecting it, you despise God, and dishonor Him, whose "image and superscription" it bears. Besides, Jehovah himself has laid it down as an incontrovertible maxim, "He that is faithful in that which is least, is faithful also in much; and he that is unjust in the least, is unjust also in much." He that is faithless in the defence of little, less momentous truths, will, in the hour of danger, be found faithless in those that are greater. Error is poison to the soul. By indulging the least error, opposing the least truth, churches and individuals imbibe a moral poison, which may issue in the withering of their graces, in the loss of souls, in the infliction of the judgments of heaven. "A little leaven," saith our Saviour, in direct reference to erroneous opinions, "leaveneth the whole lump." It is the duty then, not only of Christians individually, it should be the distinguishing characteristic of the church to defend the truth, by opposing error and sin. She should be a faithful and undaunted witness. She should study the preservation of the purity of the truth, in her doctrine, discipline, and worship; having ever in view the command of her Lord, "Stand ye in the ways and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls." When the church thus faithfully and fearlessly discharges her duty to her covenant God, and to a dying world, then, and then only, can she expect the blessing from her glorious Head, "comforting all her waste places; making her wilderness like Eden, her desert like the garden of

the Lord; causing her to look forth as the morning, fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners."

May we not see in the next place, cause of lamentation for the neglect of God's word. "Rivers of waters run down mine eyes, because they keep not thy law."—The grossest darkness, utter ignorance of the word, covers the greatest part of our unhappy world. Asia, we have seen, crouches beneath the diabolical delusions and falsehoods of Mahomet on the one hand, and a cruel and bloody idolatry on the other. Africa is a moral waste, a land of darkness, outrage and desolation. A great part of Europe, South America, the southern provinces of North America, are lying beneath the power of the Roman beast; while many Protestant churches, in these northern provinces, have drunk largely of the cup of this "mother of harlots." The islands of the sea are defiled by the most loathsome and bloody cruelties. Almost the whole body of the Jews, in the different parts of the world, continue to blaspheme Him, whom their father's slew. When turning from this affecting view, to Protestants, to churches *called* reformed, to those who profess to be governed by the word, we see a spirit of backsliding and apostacy from the truth extensively spread; while the bitterness of scorn and insult is heaped upon the few, who conscientiously endeavor to stem the torrent of impiety and error; and as covenanted to their God, to be found faithful. "For this our heart is faint; for these things our eyes are dim, because of the mountain of Zion which is desolate." "Why is his chariot so long in coming? Why tarry the wheels of his chariot? O Lord, how long? Forever? Spare thy people, O Lord, and give not thy heritage to reproach." Let it be our daily and earnest prayer then, that the chains of error and sin, which hold a guilty world in bondage, may be broken; and the heathen given to Jesus for an inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for a possession. "Ye that make mention of the Lord, keep not silence; and give him no rest, till he establish, and till he make Jerusalem a praise in the earth." Plead, that the dark cloud, the moral pestilence which covers and desolates this miserable earth, may be scattered by the breath of the Lord, the word of truth, the beams of the Sun of righteousness. Plead, that the triumphs of the cross may extend over the world, that divisions and corruptions of churches, speculations and inventions of men, may give place to the peace, and love, and *simplicity* of the gospel. Plead, that in our own favored country, the truth as it is in Jesus, may prosper and prevail; that sin and error of every kind may fall before the standard of heaven, the pillar of the word; and that hearkening to the commandments of the Lord, our peace may be as a river, and our righteousness as the waves of the sea. Plead, that the whole world, groaning beneath the power of the "old serpent the devil," agonized by the poison of sin, through which, he has filled it with lamentation, mourning and woe, may be rescued from his cruel grasp, and this kingdom of sin and death, become the kingdom of our Lord Christ. Plead, that the empire of Satan may soon be utterly destroyed before the sword of the Spirit, and souls, held in his galling fetters be set free, and by the torch of truth, be lighted to glory. Plead, that the banner of the truth may be carried forward till it waves in every land, and reigns in every heart, till the idolatries and cruelties of heathenism, the bloody and deluding systems of Mahomet and antichrist, fall before it; and the veil which covers the heart of the Jews be rent asunder, and they led to look by faith to Him, whom their fathers pierced, and mourn for that piercing; and adoring Him, as King of kings and Lord of lords, be brought "as an offering unto the Lord, out of all nations, upon horses, and in chariots," to the holy mountain the house of the Lord; and that amongst Protestant churches, the gospel may again appear in its purity, power, and glory. May the Lord hasten it in his time. Bow thy heavens O Lord and come down. O thou that dwellest between the cherubims, shine forth. Return, we beseech thee, O God of hosts; look down from heaven, and behold and visit this vine. Turn us again, O Lord God of hosts, cause thy face to shine, and we shall be saved.

ART. III. Notice of a Commentary on the Book of Psalms.

Commentaries on the Scripture, may in respect to their design, be divided into two classes: some are chiefly intended for the help of the ministry, and others for general use. It is proper that those of the former class should be learned, critical and voluminous; but those of the latter class to answer their end, should be brief, plain and practical. And as no part of the Scriptures, either is, or ought to be in more constant use among us than the Psalms, an explanation of them answering the latter description, is peculiarly desirable. The Psalms are not to be ranked among the portions of the word which contain many things hard to be understood. On the contrary, they are generally so plain that the greatest difficulty of the expositor is to find any thing to elucidate. Yet, though there be no obscurity in these, or in any part of the Scriptures, there is such a depth that we see the plainest things only in part; and there is still need to search them, and there is a great advantage in works which draw forth to our view the riches which they contain and direct us to the profitable use of these treasures.

The advantage of a plain and practical exposition of the Psalms, connected with the verse translation, appears to have been strongly impressed upon the mind of the late Mr. John M'Culloch, a pious and intelligent elder of the Associate Congregation of Philadelphia. Many years of his life were almost exclusively devoted to the preparation of such a work for the press, though he declined its publication previous to his decease. The manuscript is at present in my hands, and a considerable part of it has been perused with much satisfaction. The abilities of Mr. M'Culloch for such a performance are very generally known to the ministers, and to many other members of the Associate Church. This work had been prepared as early as the year 1813, and after corrections made during succeeding years, the whole was again transcribed in 1821, and appears to have received additional amendments till the termination of the writers valuable life.

The following is the title prefixed to the manuscript: "The Book of Psalms according to the version used in the Church of Scotland, with explanatory and practical observations."—After a short advertisement stating the design of the work, there is a preface of greater length containing a plain and pointed defence of the Psalms as suitable for the worship of God, and superior to every thing introduced in their place by human authority. The proposed plan of publishing, is similar to that of some editions of the Psalms already in use, with notes by Henry, Brown, and others. The verse translation is to be separated into paragraphs of convenient length, and the notes are to be intermingled. Some specimens of the work are now sent for the pages of the Monitor in order to ascertain whether the friends of the deceased would meet with encouragement to publish the whole. The following is the comment on the first three psalms, and may serve as a specimen of the manner in which the whole would be published, except that the verses of the Psalms are not printed, but are noted in figures at the places where they are to be introduced.

Psalm I.—This Psalm exhibits the character of the righteous and the wicked, as well as the final issue of their opposite principles and conduct. It shows us what is true wisdom and real happiness.

Verse 1—3. (from the Psalm Book.)—These verses describe the righteous man, both as to what he practises, and from what he abstains. A good man, though he may at times err from the path of rectitude, does not in general follow the company nor mix in the conversation of the "ungodly," who habitually disregard the divine law. He does not "stand in the way of sinners;" but avoids those immoral persons who make a constant and avowed practice of iniquity. He "sitteth not in the seat of the scornful;" nor occupies the place of such as teach infidel principles, make a mock at sin, or deride holiness. On the contrary the godly man "delights in the law of God." He esteems it to be holy, just and good. He embraces the whole doctrine of revelation, lives by faith upon the promises, and stands in awe of the threatenings of his God. His "meditation" on divine things is constant; he recalls them continually to his recollection, and finds them profitable to his soul. He makes the Bible his counsellor, and is governed by its decisions. It is precious to him as revealing a Saviour, and bringing life and immortality to light.—"Blessed is the man" of such a character; happy is he who is so employed. His soul shall "prosper," and grow in grace. The divine influences in an abundant measure descend upon him; and cause him to bring forth the fruits of holiness in all the duties he owes to God and man: The end of this course shall be everlasting life.

Verse 4, 5.—"But the ungodly are not so." They are not like the righteous in their disposition, behaviour, happiness nor end. They do not fear God nor regard his word; they are vain and unprofitable, worthless and injurious. Tossed and driven by every lust and every temptation, they are restless and unhappy.—Because of their evil principles and wicked practices they shall not "stand in the judgment" of their own consciences; nor in the judgment of good men. They shall not be admitted into the "congregation of the righteous" in heaven: but will be condemned in the great day of the Lord, when he shall render to every one according to his works.

Verse 6.—"The Lord knoweth the way of the godly" and of the wicked. The whole heart, words and actions of both are open before him. He loveth and approveth the "righteous;" they shall be admitted into the mansions of felicity. But the "ungodly" shall perish; driven away like chaff and burned with unquenchable fire.

Psalm II.—This Psalm primarily refers to David at his advancement to the throne of Israel; and foretells his victories over the surrounding nations. But it is ultimately and chiefly accomplished in Christ, as King in Zion.

Verse 1—6.—David met with much opposition in his way to the throne; and after he was crowned many nations leagued against him. But their hostility issued in their own ruin.—He was a type of Christ. In all ages of the world have kings and people assembled openly and in "rage," or have taken secret and crafty "counsel against Jehovah and his anointed." Egypt and Babylon; Rome, Pagan and Anti-Christian; Herod, Pilate and the people of the Jews; Mahomet and his followers; the immoral and profane, have attempted to frustrate the divine purposes concerning the exaltation of Messiah, and the salvation of his church. They said, who is the Lord, that we should obey him? We will not have this man to reign over us. "They broke his bands and cast away his cords," rejected his laws and would not submit to his government. They rose in open rebellion against him. "Why did they rage?" Enmity of heart against God, truth and holiness, urged them to resist and reject the benevolent plans of the Deity for the salvation of men by Messiah, the Lord Christ. But their opposition was in vain. The Lord is "in heaven" observing all their impious plans, and all their malicious efforts. He holds them as it were in derision; for folly and weakness, as well as wickedness, marked their conduct. They could not frustrate his purpose, nor delay its execution. The victory over them was easy. He only "spoke to them in wrath, and vexed them in displeasure," and immediate ruin was the consequence. What signal vengeance has

overtaken persecuting princes and nations? Pharaoh and Nebuchadnezzar, Herod and Pilate, Nero and Julian, with the whole nation of the Jews are monuments of the divine indignation. So shall perish all the enemies of the Lord and his Christ.

Verse 7—9.—The persons in Trinity are equal in power and glory. But in the economy of redemption they sustain distinct characters.—The Father is represented in scripture as a sovereign offended by the sin of man, yet substituting his Son in the room of an elect world. In punishing him he sustained the honors of Deity as righteous and just, vindicated the holiness of his law, and made an honorable way for mercy to fallen men. The Son engaged to assume human nature, to obey, suffer and die for his people. In this way he brings glory to God, to men salvation, and gets an honorable reward to himself. The Holy Spirit applies the blessings purchased by Christ to the souls of men, and makes them meet for heaven. Harmonious in the council of peace, and united in executing the plan of redemption, are the persons in Trinity. In these verses then we have the counsels of heaven opened, and the sovereign "decree" made from eternity "declared" by him who is the messenger of the covenant.—The Son-ship of Christ is co-eval with the decree. It is like the Father from everlasting.—But being obscured during his humiliation, it was particularly manifested at his resurrection. As a Son, the heir of all things, he then publicly entered upon the possession of the "inheritance," which, as the reward of his obedience, was promised him by the Father. He "asked, and the heathen were given to him." Innumerable multitudes have submitted to his government, and acknowledged him as their Saviour and Lord. The proudest of his enemies who refused his mercy have been punished; and by the "iron rod" of his wrath "broken like a potter's vessel."—At the last decisive day, the Sonship of Christ, and his divine power as Judge of all, will be evident to an assembled world. Then from the throne of his glory he will pass the irrevocable sentence, advancing his people to eternal bliss, and consigning his enemies to the abodes of despair.

Verse 10—12.—We have here the call of the gospel. To "kiss the Son" is to believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, to love and to obey him. Since the Son of God is unalterably established on the mediatorial throne, kings, rulers and judges of the earth are called to submit to him as their superior Lord; and give him religious worship and adoration. This is their wisdom and their duty. It is the only way to escape the divine indignation.—Messiah need not put forth all his strength to destroy his enemies. If "his wrath is kindled but a little, they perish!" instantly and forever. "Blessed" then, unspeakably happy "are they that put their trust in him;" embracing him as their Redeemer. Such shall be happy in his presence forevermore.

Psalm III.—A Psalm of David when he fled from Absalom his son.

The faith, patience and prayers of David under a very great affliction are here recorded.

Verse 1—4.—When David committed his great sin in the matter of Uriah and Bathsheba, the Lord threatened to punish him, 2 Sam. xii. 10, 11. The rebellion of Absalom was a signal part of the chastisement. Sensible of the divine goodness in pardoning his sin, as to its eternal consequences, David took the temporal punishment kindly at the hand of his God. He murmured not; and by this Psalm it appears that his prayers were fervent, and his faith and hope in lively exercise. Enemies, indeed were numerous, and their language insulting. "Many said, there is no help for him in God." For his crime the Lord has cast him off, and we shall prevail against him. But David knew whom he had believed; and that the divine purpose and promise, with respect to his possession of the throne, and his eternal salvation were unalterable. He therefore firmly trusted, that God who was his "glory," whose service was his delight, whose favor constituted his happiness, and who had hitherto sustained him, would not only protect him as a "shield" during the conflict with his foes, but "lift his head" from its present degraded state, and restore his kingdom with increased security and honor. To his faith he added prayer. He "cried" and he knew that "the Lord heard him." From "his holy hill" from his throne in heaven, God had sent an "answer." Orders were issued from the Sovereign of the universe in his favor. This secured him victory, final and complete. Selah. Mark the faith of David, and the faithfulness of God.

Verse 5—7.—David having poured out his soul in prayer, had his mind quieted, and his soul refreshed. Being confident of the divine protection, though pursued by his deadly enemies, he lays down in peace, sleeps safely, and awakes with God. He renews prayer, and hope anticipates complete deliverance. By faith he sees his foes "struck" with a deadly blow, their "teeth broken," their power gone, and their wicked plots ending in disgrace and ruin.

Verse 8.—David ends his Psalm with thanksgiving. "Salvation belongeth to the Lord." It was the divine goodness which saved him from his enemies; and to God he gives the glory. Eternal salvation is from the Lord. He is the author of it, he completes it, he bestows it. It is a free, full and sure salvation. It is a deliverance from every evil, and it includes every blessing. It is every way worthy of God. To him be the praise.

The word "Selah" which occurs in the second verse of this Psalm is about seventy times used in the Book of Psalms, and thrice in Habakkuk. Some suppose it is only a note of music, intended to raise the voice, to lengthen the tune by repeating, or to pause. But it is always added to a remarkable passage, and seems to import an *assertion* of a fact or truth, with *admiration* thereof; and so has a meaning similar to "Verily" or "Amen" used by our Lord in the gospel of John. Selah signifies *exaltation* or *lifting up*, and is allied to a word which signifies *to prostrate*, or *lay low*. These two meanings agree; for with humble minds we ought to extol the great Jehovah. Selah has also allusion to another word which signifies *to gather* or *heap together*; thereby intimating that we ought to collect in our minds what has been said, deeply meditate on it, believe the divine declarations, mark the decisions of God in his word, and cheerfully obey his will.

The above it is supposed will be sufficient as a specimen of the plan and merits of this exposition; and it would be a favor to the writer of this article, and to the friends of the deceased, to learn through the medium of the Monitor or otherwise, whether there is probability that the publication of the whole work would remunerate such as might undertake it. T. B.

ART. IV. *Presbyterian Secession Synod, (Ireland.)*

The Presbyterian Secession Synod, met in Colerian, on Tuesday, the 2d of July last, and was opened by the Rev. Thomas Reid, of Randalstown, Moderator, who preached from Acts xx. 24.

The Rev. Joseph Lowry was chosen Moderator. The Synod spent the evening of Tuesday in devotional exercises, and an hour every morning, from 6 to 7, was set apart for prayer, praise, and reading portions of scripture, and members were appointed to conduct these religious exercises. Such exercises have an excellent effect: they give a spirituality and brotherliness of feeling to the mind, and counteract that keenness of speech and feeling to which all deliberative assemblies are liable, where freedom of speech is maintained, and where men have the courage to assert their honest judgments, free from the yoke of lordly domination.

On the reading of the reports of Presbyteries, such circumstances transpired in discussions raised by certain members, as induced the Synod to send deputations to visit the congregations of Sixmilecross, Newry, and Bellaghy. This proceeding gave rise to a spirited discussion, and it is confidently expected that much good will result from it to Presbyteries, as well as ministers and congregations.

Some painful cases of discipline came before the Synod; and after patient investigation, it was found necessary to suspend and disannex Mr. Longmore, of Castleblaney, to degrade Mr. Harkness, of Sandholes, and to leave Mr. Thomas, of Dunbo, under "suspension *sine die*." Here were three additional examples of the wicked and pernicious system of indulging in spirituous liquors—a system which has in America, Scotland, and Ireland, invaded the pulpit of Jesus Christ, and dragged its victims from the very altar of God; an anti-Christ to which the Temperance Society has given a brain-blow, a "deadly wound," we hope never to be "healed." Some have said, in such cases the Synod have acted harshly. The Synod in such cases act justly—justly and faithfully. Error in principle, and immorality in practice, they will not tolerate among them. The "wicked person" they are determined to "put away," in obedience to that law of Christ, 1 Cor. v. 13, and to aspire after the commendation given to the Church at Ephesus, "Thou canst not bear them which are evil."

The Synod was occupied the best part of a day with Mr. Bridge's case. One-third of the Congregation of Castle Caulfield adhere to Mr. Bridge; about two-thirds are opposed to him, and have called Mr. Acheson, an excellent young preacher, to be their minister, in the room of Mr. M'Clatchy, who emigrated to America. This case has been for years before the Synod. The Synod at first decided that Mr. Bridge should be disannexed, on the principle that his adherents might retire with him, and form a separate congregation. They were, however, afterwards reasoned into the conclusion of re-considering the case, and a committee was appointed to prepare a proposition on the subject. The matter was issued by the Synod, unannouncedly adopting the plan proposed by the Committee. Mr. Bridge was allowed one half of the bounty. Mr. Acheson's ordination was directed to be proceeded with; and instead of dividing the congregation, it was judged wise to try the possibility of uniting the two parties.

On Thursday the Home Mission occupied a large share of deliberation. The Report was read by the Secretary, the Rev. John Coulter. Such was the spirit with which the Home Mission was taken up, that a number of ministers subscribed on the spot to the amount of £56. It was recommended that a Missionary Society should be established in every congregation. This plan was adopted during the past year by the Newry congregation, with such spirit and success, that £15 were handed in to the Treasurer of the HOME MISSION.

On Saturday, the Rev. Mr. Bryson carried a motion in favor of the equalization of the bounty, and a committee was appointed to procure that desirable change.

A committee had been appointed the previous year, to prepare a pastoral address. The draught of a proposed address was read by Mr. Lowry, the moderator; this was approved of generally, returned to the committee for revision, and ordered to be printed and distributed.

The committee appointed to consider the subject of the education of students for the ministry, made their report. With the view of securing at once, an able, an educated, and a spiritual ministry, the Synod directed presbyteries to give an increased attention to the examination of students, previously to their entering college. In addition to this, a Synodical committee, consisting of two ministers and elders from each presbytery, was appointed to examine all students before their admission to the divinity class, and judge with regard to their mental abilities, their literary attainments, and their religious character. It was considered necessary to specify, that pains should be taken to disabuse the public mind of the notion, that because a student once finds his way to college, a kind of pledge is given, that however incompetent, he should be carried through to the ministry.

A committee had been appointed to draw up an expression of the mind of the Synod, respecting national education. A declaration prepared by the committee was adopted, condemning the employment of compulsion, with the view of disseminating scriptural education, and recommending the members not to countenance any plan, that does not secure to parents the free use of the scriptures for their children.

The 16th November next, being the centenary of the Secession, it was agreed that it should be observed as a day of thanksgiving by all the churches in connexion with the Synod.

The Rev. Mr. Rentoul, Sen., gave notice of a motion for next year, for the appointment of the Rev. R. Wilson, of Belfast, to be Professor of Biblical Criticism.

A letter was read from the Associate Reformed Synod of the West, America, expressing their christian regard for the Secession Church in this country, and holding out encouragement to young preachers of a right spirit, to emigrate. A committee was appointed to return a friendly reply.

The Synod also agreed that application should be made to Parliament, for a law, extending the privilege of making oath with uplifted hand, instead of book-kissing, to criminal as well as civil cases.

The Synod was closed with prayer, to meet in Moneymore, on the first Tuesday of July next.—*Christian Freeman*.

EFFECTS OF SUPERSTITION.—A crew of Greek pirates were condemned and executed at Malta for robbery upon the high seas. It appeared at their trial that, in plundering a certain vessel, while they seized every vegetable article of food on board, a barrel of fish was left untouched. The court demanded the reason. The pirates replied, that, it being lent when they robbed the vessel, the use of fish was then prohibited by the Greek Church; and God forbid that they should be guilty of breaking their Church laws! During a long course of piracy, their hands had not remained unstained with innocent blood, but they were too religious to eat fish in lent.—*S. S. Journal*.

ROMANISM.—Even those who are best acquainted with the weakness of the human mind, can form no idea of the fanaticism of the Portuguese, and the advantages taken of it by the priests to favor the cause of Don Miguel. The audacity of the monks exceeds the credulity of the people, whom they deceive by their frauds. Captain Grosos, who has just arrived here from Lisbon, has related to us an instance which cannot be called otherwise than impious. A priest was preaching at Elvas. After having in the florid language of the east, exalted the virtues of Don Miguel, he concluded his discourse by raising a wooden figure of Christ, which was purposely placed near him, and exclaimed, 'Answer, O Lord! is not Don Miguel your beloved archangel St. Michael, sent by you upon the earth to save this kingdom, and trample heresy under his feet?' This wooden Christ, it will be easily imagined, being in the hands of the monk, did not remain insensible to the appeal, and, though unable to speak, gave an affirmative answer by a dignified nod of the head. The preacher, availing himself of this happy condescension, continued, 'I thank thee, O Lord! for having aided my endeavors to persuade this unbelieving people to listen to the voice of truth, and that thou hast deigned to reveal it through me as thine organ. This, however, O Lord! is insufficient to conquer such great impiety. Finish thy divine work—speak again, O Lord! and say if it be not true that Don Miguel is a king worthy to reign over Portugal! Here followed another assenting nod. The audience, on this second miracle, gave themselves up to the utmost enthusiasm, and uttered a general cry of admiration. The monk, wishing to take a farther advantage of the feeling he had excited, again addressed the image, and said—'Is, it not true, O Lord! that we ought to unite all our efforts to insure peaceable possession of the throne to a king so holy, by expelling the unworthy Don Pedro, and exterminating the enemies of the state, and of our holy religion?' The Christ had become wearied by the repeated questions of his minister, and made no sign. 'Answer, O Lord! answer, I pray thee?' Finding the image immovable, the priest became enraged, and rushed from the pulpit in a state approaching to madness. The string which had served to perform this mummery had unexpectedly broken, and no mover of the antics of Punch could have been more disconcerted at finding his puppets immovable, than was the monk at this disappointment.—*Journal du Havre*.

PARENTAL FAULT-FINDING.—*Do not be continually finding fault.* It is at times necessary to censure and to punish. But very much may be done by encouraging children when they do well. Be even more careful to express your approbation of good conduct, than your disapprobation of bad. Nothing can more discourage a child than a spirit of incessant fault-finding on the part of its parent. And hardly any thing can exert a more injurious influence upon the disposition, both of the parent and the child. There are two great motives influencing human actions; hope and fear. Both of these are at times necessary. But who would not prefer to have her child influenced to good conduct by the desire of pleasing, rather than by the fear of offending? If a mother never expresses her gratification when her children do well, and is always censuring when she sees any thing amiss, they are discouraged and unhappy. They feel that there is no use in trying to please. Their dispositions become hardened and soured by this ceaseless fretting. At last, finding that whether they do well or ill, they are equally found fault with, they relinquish all efforts to please, and become headless of reproaches.

But let a mother approve of a child's conduct whenever she can. Let her show that *su* good behaviour makes her sincerely happy. Let her reward him for his efforts to please, by smiles and affection. In this way she will cherish in her child's heart some of the noblest and most desirable feelings of our nature. She will cultivate in him an amiable disposition and a cheerful spirit. Your child has been, during the day, very pleasant and obedient. Just before putting him asleep for the night, you take his hand and say, "My son, you have been a very good boy to-day. It makes me very happy to see you so kind and obedient. God loves little children who are dutiful to their parents, and he promises to make them happy." ~~The~~ approbation from his mother is to him a great reward. And when, with a more than ordinarily affectionate tone, you say, "good night, my dear son," he leaves the room with his little heart full of feeling. And when he closes his eyes for sleep, he is happy and resolves that he will always try to do his duty.—*Mother at Home*.

THE
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,

AND

EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

MARCH, 1834.

ART. I. *The Hireling Priest.*

“ Thus and thus dealeth Micah with me, and hath hired me, and I am his priest.”
Judges xviii. 4.

THE whole book of Judges goes to illustrate what we find in the second chapter—that when Joshua and all that generation were dead, there arose another generation that knew not the Lord, nor yet the works that he had done for Israel. And they forsook the Lord, and provoked him to anger; and he forsook them; though not utterly, but raised up saviours for them, from time to time, who saved them from their enemies. This last remark is first illustrated, by the sketch that is given us through the first sixteen chapters, of the different Judges that appeared—the occasion of their being raised up and the deliverance effected by them; which brings down their history to the days of Samuel. The remaining five chapters, however, are not a continuation in the order of time, but a returning to take up the other part of the description and show that the generation spoken of were indeed ignorant of God. The time, therefore, of all the events recorded in these chapters, we are to consider to have been the very first age after Joshua.

The first proof of the ungodliness of the generation is taken from the state of family religion; (chap. xvii. 1—7,) which presents us a most deplorable picture indeed. The parent, with care and expense, leading her son into idolatry; uttering a curse, or a blessing, with equal readiness and irreverence, &c. The son, improving on the lesson, had a house of gods, ephod and teraphim, and that the apostacy might continue to after generations, he engages his son also in it with him; “he consecrated one of his sons and he became his priest.” But as this particular is not so directly our object, we shall not dwell upon it.

The next specimen is taken from the state of the ministry; and this priest is brought forward; and that, no doubt, because he was a very fair instance of the great majority in his day. The first question we would naturally ask of him would be that asked by Micah, “Whence comest thou?” He answers, “I am a Levite of Bethlehem-Judah, and I go to sojourn where I may find a place.” According to the divine appointment the Priests and Levites had cities and suburbs in all the tribes of Israel; besides tithes and gifts and various items of income, which amounted to an abundant and honorable support. Moreover their families were so distributed over the country that people might every where conveniently attend on them for instruction; and there was no need of

any one travelling any distance for that purpose. But this Levite appears either totally ignorant, or, more probably, regardless of that arrangement; rambling wherever his inclination directed, one time at Bethlehem-Judah, (which was no city of Priests or Levites;) and from verse 3 of this chap., it seems he was known to the men of Dan, having probably been in their tribe some time; now we find him in mount Ephraim and going, he cared not whither if only he could find a place to suit him. *Note.* Those who will conscientiously keep the place in which God has set them, may confidently expect that their place shall still keep them. He has given his word for it. (Ps. xxxvii. 3.) Trust in the Lord and do good, so shalt thou dwell in the land, and verily thou shalt be fed; whether your place be high or low, public or private. God has not, indeed, promised that you shall never suffer from poverty or other difficulties in your place; but what will more than counterbalance all hardships, he says, "I will never leave thee, no, nor forsake thee." Blessed are they who rely on his word; they shall not be disappointed; "Lord thou hast been our dwelling place." But if any would rather look out a place for themselves, it is no wonder if they are unsettled and uncertain, and often altogether without a place like this Levite; and without doubt they will never better themselves, when all things are fairly considered.

Let us see how this man succeeded; whether he increased his profits much or not. The bargain is stated, (Ch. xvii. 10,) And Micah said unto him, Dwell with me and be to me a father and a priest, and I will give thee ten shekels of silver by the year, and a suit of apparel and thy victuals. So the Levite went in. Instead of that plentiful and independent maintenance which might keep the ministers of religion unincumbered with worldly cares and business, settled by God's law, this paltry sum is more like the hire of the lowest servant. Ten shekels of silver, according to the best estimates would not be much different from five dollars in money, a suit of clothes and his victuals. The imagination can scarcely help painting this as the very terms, or not quite so good, as the prodigal engaged in to feed swine. *Note.* A priest in his proper place and character is the most dignified and valuable member of society, but when he goes out of that there is none more mean and despicable; God's faithful servants may receive very little temporal compensation for their labor, but *his blessing*, and a *good conscience* with it, makes it more and better than the wealth of the wicked. Whereas he that would leave God's work, and hire to man, whether he get much or little, can have neither of these, and so gives up by far the greatest part of his reward; and moreover puts himself under the feet of those whom he might have under him.

But there is another point of the story here to be noticed. The Levite went in to be a *priest* to Micah. The Levites had a service appointed them in the house of God, to wait on the sons of Aaron the priests; but were peremptorily prohibited from exercising any part of the priest's office; they were not so much as to look when the sons of Aaron covered the holy things, at the removals of the tabernacle. And when Korah and his company, (who were Levites,) urged their pretensions to the priesthood, it provoked God to make them examples of his displeasure, for the warning of all after ages; and the memorial of this was still preserved by the two hundred and fifty brazen plates made of the censers covering the altar; but all this was of no account at all with this Levite. Micah's offer suited him and he makes no objection to be his *priest*. *Note.* One step in error prepares the way for another; and defection in smaller matters leads on to greater corruptions, proceeding imperceptibly till men are landed in total and confirmed apostacy. So it was with this Levite. First, he left his place appointed of God, and now the place he

had looked up for himself, has this condition, that he must go another step and intrude into the priesthood, a work and character to which he was never called of God. But he is in a manner shut up to do this or not obtain the situation: which to be sure would be no very great dilemma to a man of correct understanding and tender conscience; but perhaps seemed to him a nice point to decide. Or more likely, as he had long lived in the violation of at least one order of God's house, this other would be no great trouble either. There is in all sin, and it would seem more especially in the sin of backsliding a deceitfulness to harden the conscience; therefore let us take heed lest any of us be hardened through the deceitfulness of sin. Let us keep close to the appointment of God in all things. Let us endeavor to have our minds, constantly impressed with the value of every jot and tittle that is his, as involving his honor, and stamped with his authority.

But now we might inquire if there is nothing to be said in defence, or as a palliation of the Levite's conduct in this matter. It was a time when religion was very low, and as always at such times the people would express their indifference to it by neglecting the ministers of religion, withholding that support which was their due according to the law; so that he might be compelled to betake himself to some other means for obtaining a livelihood. This situation with Micah had, no doubt, objections to it. He had images in his house and a priest of his own making. It was also disorderly for a Levite to be a priest, and disorderly to set up any system of public worship, in any other place or of any other form than that of God's appointment, for the tabernacle, which was at Shiloh; but it may be observed that Micah does not appear to have intended his establishment as an opposition to the tabernacle service. He had no altar or offerings, or other imitations of the divine institutions. His plan was rather for family worship, or, at most, an accommodation to his neighborhood, as a private society; and though he had images yet he acknowledged the only true God as the object of worship. (Ch. xvii. 13.) Now I know that *the Lord* or Jehovah will do me good, seeing I have a Levite for my priest. I suppose he meant no more by the images than as ornaments to the place of his worship, or representations of better things, that might help to fix the attention, and be aids to devotion; like the pictures that are now put into our Bibles, or the organs and fiddles in some churches. The arguments that would defend the one, would certainly support the other. But more than all, the offer made to the Levite, was that he might be a *father* to Micah, as well as a priest; that is that he might instruct and direct him in all things, taking a fatherly care and oversight of him, which would give him great advantage and influence to have whatever was disorderly reformed. This is perhaps the utmost stretch that can be made, to give a favorable view of the case; but all will not be any excuse. For, first, if indeed compelled to leave the public service of the sanctuary, for want of support; there were other means of subsistence, both lawful and honorable. But honest poverty, in God's work, was much rather to be chosen still; and as we before noticed, faith in the promise was never suffered to starve. Again, all these things noticed as disorderly in Micah's system, were so directly contrary to God's command, that no countenance or toleration was to be shown to him; he ought to have been put to death; and every one who knew of his crime, and did not take measures to have the law put in force were partakers with him. (Deut. xiii. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, &c.) *Note.* Forbearance or toleration of what is contrary to the word of God, is actual rebellion against him. While there is no feature of the christian character more amiable than a forbearing and forgiving spirit, there is a limited sphere within which it is to be exercised, and beyond which nothing can be more mischievous; the

weaknesses of brethren either of natural faculties and dispositions, or of spiritual attainments, knowledge, faith and the like are proper subjects of forbearance; and their faults in all matters of a personal kind call for the exercise of forgiveness, but in things opposite to the divine word, forbearance is sinful neglect, and forgiveness is contumacy, which in all ages has been the very flood-gate by which corruption and ruin have come in on the church. It was so in the period here referred to in the church of Israel; if the law against enticers to idolatry had been promptly executed it would have purged that evil, which was now taking root and growing, and did grow, to the ruin of church and nation. So has it been also in all christian churches, and so will it be; if defection is not crushed in its first bud, it will quickly crush true religion in its fruits and ultimately in its form.

As for the prospect the Levite might have of doing good through his influence as a father to Micah, the answer is briefly this, it is utterly unwarrantable to do evil that good may come; too dangerous an experiment to join the erroneous in their corruptions, and knowingly to cast ourselves into the mire, under pretense of a design to pull others out. Such plans generally misgive and only increase the evil they seek to cure. What speed did he come? (Ch. xvii. 11, 12.) "And the young man was with him as one of his sons. And Micah consecrated the Levite." Here is altogether another order of things: instead of being a father, he becomes like one of his sons, wholly under his authority and at his direction. And Micah consecrated the Levite; the institution of God in the matter is turned completely upside down; the scholar becomes the teacher, and a private member assumes to be head of the church, vested with the power of consecrating to the office of priest. Yet all this does not disturb the Levite. It is said he was content to dwell with the man. *Note.* When a man is once out of God's way, every step he takes is a new transgression till he turn to come back again to his duty. So it was both with Micah and this Levite. Micah first thought to have place of worship at home, to save the labor of going to Shiloh. In order to this, some sacred utensils were necessary; so he got an ephod, teraphim and images. He must also have a priest; so he violated another divine institution for it, and consecrated one of his sons, and next tempted this Levite to transgress, and become a priest. Now the Levite has gone this far and if he will be a priest he must submit to Micah's consecration. And if he will dwell in Micah's house, he must be like one of Micah's sons. If he look to Micah for his victuals and clothes, he must be under Micah's authority and direction. If a man begin to let go right and truth, in one point, he has but a slack hold of any; and is in a fair way to lose all. He that is not faithful in that which is least, will not be faithful in that which is greatest. This case I suppose is the origin and model of patronage, at least it is a very correct example of it and its effects.

Now Micah and his priest are settled together. Shall we yet entertain a charitable hope of our Levite? That he might be a pious well meaning man, though greatly led astray? Let us enquire. How long they lived in harmony we are not told. The next notice of consequence that we have of him is, (ch. xviii. 20,) where we read that the men of Dan, having plundered Micah's house of the ephod and the graven image, and the teraphim, and molten image, proposed to him to go with them and be to them a father and a priest. And it is said "the priest's heart was glad, and he took the ephod and the teraphim and the graven image, and went into the midst of the people." Alas! we must utterly give him up; this puts the finishing stroke to his character; the blackest ingratitude, the most shameless dishonesty, the meanest mercenary spirit, a total want of principle, all appear here together. But in the midst of all this we cannot

but observe God's retributive justice to Micah. He stole the silver of the images from his own mother; and now they are stolen from him. With the same measure he had meted, it was now measured to him again. And though we have no evidence that he had merited such treatment from the Levite, yet he certainly could not expect any better—for, *Note.* A man that can regardlessly trample over the order of God's house, cannot be expected to pay much respect to men's rights. He that is not faithful to God, will not likely be so to men. He that can make merchandize of the doctrines and truths of God, setting little value on them, can give no evidence or security that he will not perpetrate any immorality when the temptation to it offers. For if a man is not shocked at doctrinal error, he can have no unconquerable abhorrence at practical error. They are closely connected; as the tree is, so is its fruit. An evil tree will bring forth corrupt fruit, so unsound principles must produce unholy practices.

There is only one enquiry more we need make concerning this worthless Levite, and that is, Who was he? From the preceding account we might clude he was the very vilest of the tribe. Some such lawless vagabond as could not be tolerated in the sober and orderly community, and therefore we find him wandering from place to place, as we have seen. And if this were the case, it would not be just to judge the whole by him. The first hint we have, as to his family, is in ch. xvii. 7, where he is said to be of Bethlehem-judah, of the family of Judah. This cannot mean that he was of Judah by descent, for then he could not be a Levite; but it is either to distinguish Bethlehem, where he dwelt, in the tribe of Judah, from another city of the same name in the tribe of Zebulun, (Joshua xix. 15,) or rather to say that he was of that family of Levites whose cities were given them in the tribe of Judah, that was the family of the Kohathites, and the first order of them also. (Joshua xxi. 9, 10.) Perhaps, then, this Levite was of that honorable and dignified family. But we are told, (Judges xviii. 30,) that Jonathan, the son of Gershom, the son of Manasseh, he and his sons, were priests to the tribe of Dan, until the day of the captivity of the land. This is evidently the same man spoken of through that and the preceding chapter, and he is here said to be the grandson of Manasseh. And we may remark as before, if he had descended of Manasseh he could not have been a Levite. Moreover, Manasseh had no son called Gershom; but the Jewish critics mark the word Manasseh as faulty in one letter, and leaving out that letter, it would read the "son of Moses;" we know he had a son called Gershom, and that his grandson might now be living is very probable, for at this time Phinehas, the grandson of Aaron his brother, was standing before the ark of the Lord. (Ch. xx. 28.) We know also that the sons of Moses were nothing more than other Levites, that they were Kohathites, and might probably be ranked next to the sons of Aaron, and this agrees with what we have remarked of this Levite's original place in Judah. Farther, if this were so, it might have been a ground of his more readily assuming the priesthood, overlooking the divine appointment, he would reason that Moses being as honorable and priestly a person as Aaron, his grandsons had as good a title to the office as the grandsons of Aaron. This would also make him a most suitable person to represent the state of religion in the generation, in its most favorable aspect, if any such it had; and considering what a picture we have in him, how strikingly, how completely does it demonstrate the charge laid at the beginning, "that there arose a generation who knew not the Lord," &c. Is it possible that this is where we find the grandson of that man of God, who was faithful in all his house? That saint who had very few equals, and never had a superior among men, for meekness, holiness, public spirit, and zeal for God's honor; whose last days were

occupied in repeating his many earnest exhortations to Israel, to observe and keep all the commandments, ordinances and statutes of the Lord their God, that it might be well with them? There is, indeed, too much evidence that so it was. *Note.*—Godly parents have not always godly children; grace does not run in the blood, “which were born *not of blood*, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.” Relationship to great and godly persons is indeed an honor and blessing, as it brings us more particularly within reach of such precious promises as that in *Psalms ciii. 17.* The mercy of the Lord is from everlasting to everlasting on them that fear him, and *his righteousness unto children’s children.* If we well prove ourselves to be their children, laying claim by faith to the word of promise, this is a good argument and plea with God, So we find the Psalmist uses it: “I am thy servant, the son of thy handmaid.” Yet such relationship can do nothing of itself to sanctify the nature; it was the miserable mistake of the Jews, particularly in the days of our Lord, to think so. Because they were Abraham’s seed, therefore they thought they were by nature better, holier than others, and entitled to the favor of God. But on the other hand it is a great aggravation of the sin of backsliding, and so it forms one of the darkest traits in the history of this Levite.

Application. 1. This is the only place in the whole Bible, where mention is made of a *hired priest*, and the very fact, independent of his private moral character, is set down as one of the grossest marks of a very corrupt time in the church. Can it be, then, that such a thing is to be found in the present very enlightened Christian age? There is, and that not in one instance only, but hundreds. There are many parts of our land where scarcely any other order is known. Nothing more common than ministers going out with an errand, that might as well be expressed in the Levite’s very words: “I go to sojourn where I may find a place.” And whoever offers a few shekels of silver, to a tolerable amount, may have a bargain with as little form and ceremony as was that of the Levite. Is not this as gross a violation of God’s institution as that was? God has appointed an order to be observed in the gospel church as well as under the law. He is a God of order and not of confusion. What then shall we say of those churches who by their public standards declare their belief that the presbyterial form of church government is of divine appointment, and who call themselves by that name emphatically; as if none else had any right to it, yet suffering this practice to be and to abound among them without restraint? And they are but one degree better, if so much, whose removals and settlements are first determined and concluded on with themselves; and the intervention of church courts is sought as a mere form and ceremony to sanction what was in reality done before. We mean not by this to aim a stroke at any individual, or congregation, but refer to what is open before the eyes of all who will candidly consider the present state of the visible church. They cannot but observe a spirit of disregard of church order and government almost every where manifested in a greater or less degree, a spirit of insubordination, restlessness and wilfulness, both in ministers and people, that will fully support our remark of the former.

2. How much are our hired priests better than this Levite as to principles and piety? Do we not find them taking their authority from societies which are not in the form or capacity of any church court known in the Scriptures? They might as well have Micah’s consecration of the Levite. Do we not find them ready to use almost any form of worship that is the choice of those by whom they are hired? The Scripture *Psalms* where they only are allowed, and human compositions where the people wish them; no objection to an organ, flute, or bass-viol, if it is there,

(and Micah's images have just as good a right) but would be strenuous if it cannot be had. Do we not see them holding communion with the most opposite doctrines? Well enough suited with presbyterial church government, and nothing against Independency. This year they are one with sound Calvinists, next year they have to look to some wealthy Hopkinsians for their few shekels of silver, and so have no fault to find with their doctrine, and the year following they are "content to dwell with" the grossest Arminians. Does not this prove to a certainty that they have no principle of their own on any of all these points? They have no choice between a doctrine and its opposite; that is between truth and error. And what shall we say of whole churches who knowingly tolerate, countenance and encourage the practice, by crying down distinctions? The whole is chargeable with the sin of such individuals.

3. What does all this prove as respects this generation, but just what was there proved, viz: that there has arisen a generation that knows not the Lord, nor yet the works that he has done for his church? This no doubt will be condemned and rejected with indignation by many, as a most uncharitable and unjust sentence. But, let it not be utterly put down till it be examined and convicted of falsehood. When this is said of Israel, we do not apprehend that it intends the whole and every one who lived in that period, that they had all apostatised from the true knowledge of God. On the contrary we know there still was a remnant of hidden ones; which even in that exceedingly corrupt time in which Elijah lived, was to the number of seven thousand. The charge is laid against the prevailing party, which was probably the great majority, and therefore gave the character to the generation. And to this same extent do we consider it applicable to the present generation. Again, when it is said even of the corrupt part, that they "knew not the Lord," it cannot mean that they had lost all literal knowledge and regard for the things of God, for we see that Micah was at great pains and expense to establish the worship of God, religion seemed to be the great object of his care and attention. This Levite also was wholly devoting himself to the service of religion; and the Danites spoken of chap. xviii. 5, were by no means forgetful. Yet all this does not exempt them from the charge of not knowing the Lord. So in vain will any one plead the abounding of knowledge and the means of knowledge, tracts, Sunday schools, Bible societies, missionaries, &c., the remarkable zeal, activity, and devotedness of many, and the boundless liberality of others to benevolent objects, as a proof that such a charge cannot lie against the present generation; for unless something better and of another kind can be brought forward, it will not clear us; for it is manifest that the charge is founded on another ground, namely, that they trampled on his authority, in the doctrine and order of his house. They had not faith in his institutions, nor reverence for them, nor love to them as involving his honor, and being the appointed means of his people's communion with him. They quite disregard the many threatenings, cautions, and peremptory injunctions to observe every tittle; and this is what God holds as proof that they knew him not. But if these things will amount to so much, surely the particulars we have noticed in our own time cannot fail of supporting the same charge against us. And if any thing is needed to make it more clear, the application of the other part of the charge will do so. It is, "they knew not the works that God had done for his church." The works there particularly referred to, are no doubt all those displays of God's power and goodness in behalf of Israel, from their coming out of Egypt to their settlement in Canaan, but equally applicable to every display he has given of himself for his church in any age or nation. Now the only instance to which we shall refer for our present purpose, is that of the Reformation from popery—a work of

God no less great and glorious, (though of another kind,) than the bringing of Israel out of Egypt. By his right hand of power, and his outstretched arm, he brought out his church from the darkness and tyranny of Roman Antichrist. He led her through fire and water; every point of the doctrine, worship and government of his house was obtained for her at the price of the blood of saints; yet he wrought marvellously for the support of his faithful witnesses, and for the furtherance of his cause. In particular his hand was manifest in strengthening his servants for that deadly struggle with perjured tyrants in Scotland, from the year 1650 to 1688, as also previous to 1638, maintaining the order of worship and form of church government which is enjoined in the word. Now there is nothing more manifest than that the great mass of professors of religion in the present day, are literally ignorant of that work which God wrought for his church, the fruits of which they are now reaping in that peace and liberty, civil and religious, which we enjoy. Many also who have a historical knowledge of the facts, disown God's hand in them, sneer at the bigotry of those who suffered for the sake of God's truth, (of whom the world was not worthy,) and show their utter ingratitude and disesteem of God's work, by undervaluing, classing with non-essentials and trifles the very points which he then so eminently owned and honored his servants in maintaining; I mean the purity of worship and government, which is contemptuously trampled on by hireling priests. And the full bent of the generation is to break down at once with axes and hammers, the carved work of his sanctuary, which was then with such labor and expense built up. Now, in one word, to despise the doings of the Lord is to despise himself. These remarks, therefore, instead of irritating any one, should stir up every one to a serious consideration of the matter. Is it indeed the sentence of God in his word, that we are a generation that know not the Lord, nor the works that he has done for his church? Let us search and try our ways, and turn again to the Lord from whom we have deeply revolted.

M. H.

ART. II. *The Sin of Nadab and Abihu.*

(Continued from page 201.)

Leviticus chap. x. verse 3, last clause: "And Aaron held his peace."

In this brief and impressive passage, the Spirit sets before us the deep and humble submission of Aaron, under one of the heaviest calamities that ever wrung the heart of a parent. His two sons, we have seen, were cut down before his face; cut down in judgment by the thunderbolt of heaven, in the act of their guilt, in the very moment of their unhalloved and irreverent approach into the tremendous presence of the Lord of Glory. Aaron their afflicted father, under this sad and terrible stroke, was silent, not in sullenness, or indifference, but acknowledging that the stroke was just, the doom deserved. He was dumb, he "opened not his mouth, because the Lord did it." He knew, as his affectionate brother had reminded him, that thus the glory of God was signally displayed, and a solemn warning given to every soul, of the awful danger of not sanctifying God's name in drawing nigh to him according to the appointed order; in not worshipping him with reverence and godly fear. Thus, though the heart of the father was ready to sink under this heavy judgment, yet love to a covenant God, zeal for his honor, and the remembrance of his own past guilt, led him to bow under the hand of the Lord,

in the spirit which actuated Eli under a similar calamity: "It is the Lord, let him do what seemeth him good." Such a terrible mark of God's displeasure was a heavy stain on Aaron and his family; but his sons had attempted to stain God's glory and pollute his worship, and Aaron, in the spirit of an Abraham, was willing that his sons should be the sacrifice; was willing to bear this reproach, to suffer this fearful blow, that the honor of that God, his guilty children had insulted, and his worship which they had polluted, might be upheld in their purity, and the name of God be sanctified to latest generations. Christian, are you willing that God should be thus glorified in you and yours? None of the people of God are exempt from affliction. Where is the family that sorrow has never entered, that death has never desolated? Let every Christian remember this. Trials you must expect to meet with; the waters of affliction you must pass through, before you reach the heavenly Canaan; the rivers of sorrow and the raging flame you must encounter, ere you reach your Father's house in peace. Desolating judgments may pass over you and yours, may sweep away your dearest comforts; yet bow with this afflicted servant of God in deep submission; like him glorify God in the fire, "and the peace of God, which passeth all understanding, shall keep your hearts and minds through Christ Jesus." His almighty arm shall be underneath to support you, to bring good out of apparent evil, and lead you in safety to that city of our God, where the heart shall never more be wrung with anguish, nor the eye dimmed with tears.

"Behold, I send an angel before thee, to keep thee in the way, and to bring thee into the place which I have prepared." "Fear not for I am with thee. The eternal God is thy refuge, and underneath are the everlasting arms."

What is proposed in making a few practical remarks from these words, is to consider, in the first place, The design of God in the afflictions of his people. Secondly, What is implied in being silent under afflictions.

Afflictions spring not from the dust, they come not by chance. "Shall there be evil in the city and the Lord hath not done it?" "Evil came down from the Lord unto the gate of Jerusalem." The design of God in these afflictions is the good of his people. The fruit of their sharp and fiery trials is to take away their sins, to sanctify their souls, and ripen them for glory. Though no chastening, for the present, seemeth to be joyous, but grievous, nevertheless afterward, to the redeemed, "it yieldeth the peaceable fruits of righteousness;" softening their hearts, humbling their spirits, pointing to the glory to be revealed, and enabling to say, we glory in tribulation also, "knowing that our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory."

In considering, then, the design of God in the afflictions of his people, we observe,

1st. That they are sent in wisdom. Though the way of God is often in the sea, and his path in the deep waters, and his judgments incomprehensible to worms of the dust, yet shall he make all things work together for good to them that love God. "We have had fathers of our flesh, who for a few days chastened us after their own pleasure, but He for our profit, that we might be partakers of his holiness." Lamentation, mourning, and woe have covered the earth, have entered every family, and wrung every heart. Changes and trials are perhaps even now, reader, commissioned against you. Perhaps God, in his mysterious Providence, may send upon you sickness, "vexation, and rebuke,"—may cause you to pass through overwhelming scenes of calamity and distress. Parents, He may visit you soon with a trial like that of the afflicted Aaron.—

The arrow of death is perhaps on the wing to pierce your nearest and dearest; your beloved child may be struck down in death before you, ere tomorrow dawns; you may soon have to weep over the graves of *all*. Children, your parents may, in a moment, by the hand of death, be taken away from you. Husband, your beloved wife may soon be torn from you. In deadly disease, in the feeble frame and failing eye, He may send the sad and terrible message to you once sent to Ezekiel from the throne:—"Son of man, behold I take away from thee the desire of thine eyes with a stroke." Wife, you too may soon be called to witness the dying struggles of your husband, your companion, your guardian, your earthly all; and your heart left to bleed in anguish over his loss. But in these, and in every other trial, while forced to say in the bitterness of sorrow, "how unsearchable are God's judgments, and his ways past finding out;" yet remember that your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of these things. "His eyes are upon the ways of men." And while his eye beheld all these waves of affliction rushing upon you, and while his power in a moment could have arrested them, could have chained the king of terrors, could have commanded away the arrow of death from you and yours, and blessed you with peace, and joy, and health, and plenty; yet he knows better what is for your good. Uninterrupted prosperity would make us forget our duty, and our God. He mercifully sends us afflictions to humble our pride, to quench our lusts, to teach us the vanity of the world, to detach our hearts from its perishing possessions, and lead us to seek the eternal riches of heaven. He cuts down our comforts, he calls away children, parents and friends, that we may not make idols of them, and lean upon broken reeds, instead of the Rock of Ages. He sends us fiery trials, to make us dissatisfied with this waste, howling wilderness, to drive us from a place that is soon to be "burned up." You cannot doubt of the merciful design of these trials, when you remember that they are all ordered by Him, who has so loved you as to give his eternal Son to a death of agony and shame for your redemption; and think you he would leave those who are so dear to him, the purchase of the blood of his Son, exposed to affliction and woe? Think you he would suffer them to feel one pang, to groan in anguish beneath one afflictive stroke, more than was for their good? In these dark and inscrutable providences, you hear a voice from the throne of your heavenly Father, saying, "What I do thou knowest not now, but thou shalt know hereafter." He led the patriarchs and prophets of old, he leads his people still, through a waste, howling wilderness, through storms and tempests of sorrow, through affliction, darkness and death, to his "holy habitation." The Bible, the statute book of heaven, the charter of your hopes, plainly tells you, that through much tribulation, you must enter the kingdom of heaven. We cannot enter the land of promise but through the desert, the vale of tears, the waters of affliction, the Jordan of death. And be it remembered, Christians, that these afflictions to which we are appointed, and which are not to be escaped, are *all deserved*; and therefore we are bound to own, not only the wisdom, but the justice of God, in them. The Lord afflicteth not willingly. He has no pleasure in the destruction and death of the sons of men. "Now, therefore, our God, the great, the mighty, and the terrible God, thou art just in all that is brought upon us, for we have done wickedly." While, then, we humbly bend, and adore, under the heaviest strokes which infinite Wisdom sees to be necessary for us, let us also rejoice that he will lead in safety through all, will open a way through the great deeps, for his "ransomed to pass over," and bring to where, in the light of heaven, we shall see that infinite wisdom directed, and infinite *mercy* ordered, every affliction that fell upon us, every dark and trying providence that beset our path; and where, in

adoring wonder and love, we shall sing in triumph "He hath done all things well: Great and marvellous are thy works, Lord God Almighty; *just and true* are thy ways, thou King of Saints."

2dly. We observe then, in the second place, that afflictions are sent to God's people in mercy and love. "For whom the Lord loveth, He correcteth; even as a father the son in whom he delighteth." Remembering then, the affliction and the misery, the wormwood and the gall, remembering the days of bitterness, the nights of heaviness and sorrow, through which you have passed, the agonizing woes with which you have been forced to struggle, the sad bereavements you have been called to bear; remembering them all, can you not say, that they are all the chastisements of love, that mercy was seen and felt in all? What would have been your situation at this moment, if you had never been blessed with affliction, never entered into the furnace, but left to the poisoning, soul-hardening influence of uninterrupted prosperity? Your most overwhelming afflictions are amongst your most precious privileges. They bring you to the throne of mercy, they sweeten your communion with a covenant God, they lead you to glory in that cross which has purchased heaven for the soul, to flee to that blood for pardon and support, which has made every trial a messenger of mercy. Our sin is the real cause of our suffering. Our sin makes affliction necessary. To all the trials and vexations of life, it is sin that gives the sting; into every cup of wo, it is sin infuses the bitterness. And this is the merciful intention of these trials, to take away sin, and fill us with love to God. "O hear ye the rod then, and who hath appointed it." The cup which my Father hath given me, shall I not drink it? In all your afflictions, he is afflicted; the "Angel of his Presence" will save you. The "Angel of his Presence," rules the raging of the storm, sitteth upon the floods of sorrow, to check their fury, and amid their raging, to bless his people with peace. In his love, and in his pity, he redeemed you from death by his blood; in mercy and love, he will defend you in the hour of danger, and even when the "floods lift up their waves," when the fury of the storm is dreadful, and death seems inevitable, will enable you to triumph. "The Lord reigneth: The Lord on high is mightier than the noise of many waters, yea, than the mighty waves of the sea." "God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble. Therefore will we not fear, though the earth be removed, and though the mountains be carried into the midst of the sea: Though the waters thereof roar and be troubled, though the mountains shake with the swelling thereof: The Lord of Hosts is with us; the God of Jacob is our refuge." Listen then, to the voice of the God of mercy, who in tenderness, love and wisdom, visits you with afflictions. "For the iniquity of his covetousness, was I wrath with him and smote him," yet 'I will not contend for ever—I will restore comforts unto him, and to his mourners.'" "In a little wrath, I hid my face from thee for a moment; but with everlasting kindness will I have mercy on thee, saith the Lord thy Redeemer. O thou afflicted, tossed with tempest and not comforted! behold, I will lay thy stones with fair colours, and lay thy foundations with sapphires. And I will make thy windows of agates, and thy gates of carbuncles, and all thy borders of pleasant stones." My kindness shall not depart from thee, terror shall not "come near thee—no weapon formed against thee shall prosper; and every tongue that shall rise against thee in judgment thou shalt condemn. This is the heritage of the servants of the Lord, and their righteousness is of me, saith the Lord."

3dly. In the third place, we observe, that afflictions of themselves, are not a mark of God's hatred, nor any proof of peculiar guilt. This has often been the erroneous supposition of the people of God themselves, envying the prosperity of the wicked. Thus *they* erred, who supposed

that those Galileans, whose blood Pilate mingled with their sacrifices, were sinners above *all* the Galileans, because they suffered such things: and that those eighteen, upon whom the tower of Siloam fell, were sinners above all men that dwelt in Jerusalem; "I tell you nay," says the searcher of hearts, "but except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish." Thus the friends of Job falsely judged, and wounded the heart of him, whom the hand of God had touched: ascribing his overwhelming trials, to his peculiar guilt. "Remember," say they, "who ever perished being innocent, or where were the righteous cut off?" The Lord of Hosts, who knows what we all are, tells us that Job was his servant, that there was not his like upon the earth: Yet the arrows of the Almighty pierced him, the terrors of God were set as in battle array against him, while the foul accuser receives permission to bring upon him sudden and fearful woes; stroke following stroke, and desolation advancing upon desolation, till in one day, the richest man of the East, was reduced to a beggared, childless, loathsome state. And yet Job was the favorite, and friend of Almighty God. The abandoned and profane, whom God hateth, were probably "taking the timbrel and harp, and rejoicing at the sound of the organ;" while this servant of the Lord, this friend of the poor and fatherless, was bound in the cords of affliction; bowed to the dust under calamities the most severe, smitten from head to foot with sore boils, a burden to himself, and forced to cry out "my kinsfolk have failed, and my familiar friends have forgotten me: I called my servant, and he gave me no answer:—and they whom I loved are turned against me. My bone cleaveth to my skin and to my flesh, and I am escaped with the skin of my teeth. Have pity upon me, have pity upon me, O ye my friends; for the hand of God hath touched me." Thus harshly, and unjustly, did the disciples of our Lord themselves judge, when they asked him, saying, "master, who did sin, this man or his parents, that he was born blind?" And thus the heathen inhabitants of Malta judged of Paul, when they saw the viper coming out of the heat, and fastening on his hand; "no doubt," said they among themselves, "this man is a murderer, whom, though he hath escaped the sea, yet vengeance suffereth not to live." Beware of this erroneous and cruel way of judging of the afflictions of others. *Who were they*, that because of his amazing woes, esteemed the "man of sorrows," stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted for his own guilt; and who, in the bitterness of their malice and rage said, "God hath forsaken him, persecute and take him?" How would such a way of judging, lead us to estimate the sufferings of those saints of the most high, who had trial of cruel mockings, and scourging; who were stoned, sawn asunder, and slain with the sword? Take heed how you censure the poor sufferer. The father does not *hate* the child whom he chastises; it is not cruelty, that leads him to force his child to swallow the bitter medicine. No, it is love, a proof of his real, wise, deep and heartfelt affection. And thus, our heavenly Father shows his love to us, in the afflictions with which he visits, in the bitter trials, with which the great Physician purifies our souls. Christians, your sorrows and afflictions are not the wound of an enemy, but the necessary discipline of our best friend:—"for whom the Lord loveth, he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth. We have had fathers of our flesh which corrected us, and we gave them reverence: shall we not much rather be in subjection unto the Father of spirits, and live."

II. It was proposed to consider, under the second general division, what is implied in being silent under afflictions. And here we would observe, that it does not imply a carelessness or insensibility, under the chastising hand of God. Thus to make light of his visitations, thus to refuse to listen to the voice of the rod, thus to be careless and unfeeling; "eating

flesh and drinking wine," when Almighty God is calling to "weeping and to mourning," for sin; thus to act on the principles of the ignorant and unfeeling Stoics, as though we thought that pain is no pain, that affliction is no affliction; or say, with the brutalized Epicurean, "let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we shall die," is a sin, which will cause the "arrows of Jehovah's quiver to enter into the reins," and fill them with bitterness and sorrow of heart; it is a sin which calls for desolating judgments. "O Lord, thou has stricken them, but they have not grieved; thou hast consumed them, but they have refused to receive correction; they have made their faces harder than a rock; they have refused to return:—Wherefore a lion out of the forest shall slay them, and a wolf of the evenings shall spoil them, a leopard shall watch over their cities; every one that goeth out thence shall be torn in pieces." No chastening, even to the believer, seemeth to be joyous, but grievous. The afflictions that wring the heart with anguish, the Christian feels as keenly as other men, and the word of his heavenly Father, does not forbid him to mourn and weep. While he is exhorted not to faint under the rebukes of his best friend, he is also solemnly commanded "not to *despise* the chastening of the Lord." (Heb. xii. 5.) We must neither sink in despondency and murmuring under the hand of God, nor yet make light of his rebukes. Job felt his afflictions to be awfully severe, and even when confessing in deep submission the justice of the stroke, that the Lord had only taken what he had given—what was the Lord's, and not his; yet in his woful and bereaved condition cries out, "The arrows of the Almighty are within me, the poison whereof drinketh up my spirit. I am made to possess months of vanity, and wearisome nights are appointed to me. My friends scorn me; but mine eye poureth out tears unto God." And thus David, even when justly suffering for his guilt under the chastening hand of God, earnestly pleads, "Remove thy stroke away from me; I am consumed by the blow of thy hand. Spare me, that I may recover strength before I go hence, and be no more." The "faithful Abraham," when his beloved wife died at Kirjatharba, "came to mourn for Sarah, and to weep for her." They are said to be "devout men," who "carried Stephen to his burial and made great lamentation over him." But while the Scriptures allow us to feel our afflictions, and when stricken to grieve, while He who for us suffered all the sinless infirmities of our nature, who wept at the grave of Lazarus, and who cried out under his agony, when his *soul* was about to be made an *offering for our sin*, (Mat. xxvi, 39,) while he does not forbid us to weep, he does forbid us to shed tears of murmuring, or despair; to cherish that sorrow which worketh death.

We observe, then, in the first place, that to be silent under afflictions implies that we own the hand of God in them, and confess their justice. We must say, under the heaviest strokes of the rod, with David, "I was dumb, I opened not my mouth," in a way of murmuring, because thou didst it: and confess, with the dying Hezekiah, "He hath both spoken unto me, and himself hath done it," &c. We must beware of feeling or thinking, much less daring to say, with the peevish Jonah, when a gourd is withered, a comfort withdrawn, an affliction sent, or a worm prepared by God, to blast even *all* our earthly hopes, "I do well to be angry." Oh no; let us rather say, with Eli, as in the passage formerly quoted, "It is the Lord," and confess, with Job, "Behold, he breaketh down, and it cannot be built again; he taketh away, who can hinder him? Who will say unto him, what doest thou?"

2dly. Silence under afflictions implies that we bear them patiently, as deserved, as intended for our good, and the glory of God. When we reflect on our guilt, on our numberless transgressions, on our abuse of mer-

cies, our ingratitude for the countless blessings Jehovah has poured upon us; we may well wonder that he spares us for a day, for a moment; we may well wonder that he does not commission the stars in their courses to fight against us; the air we breathe to blast us with death; the earth, polluted and burdened by our guilt, to open and swallow us up. And shall we complain, then, when for our good, and in tenderness and love he sends afflictions? Shall we complain because the waters of life are troubled that the soul may be healed? Shall we complain of trials intended to wean us from the world, to lead us to bring forth the "peaceable fruits of righteousness?" the effect of which, under the blessing of God, will be, "quietness and assurance forever," in the house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. Remember, also, as Moses reminded Aaron, these trials shall be made subservient, not only to your good, but to the glory of God. There is not an event in the universe of God, not a leaf of the forest, not an atom that floats in the sunbeam, not a flower that blooms, not a hair of your head that falls, not a sparrow that dies, not a trial that befalls you, but is directed and controlled by the Providence, and shall redound to the glory of God. Glorify God, then, in the fire, by patiently submitting, with Aaron, to the stroke of the Almighty, and whether he send sickness or health, pain or pleasure, death or life, let us say, "Even so, Father, for so it seemeth good in thy sight."

In conclusion, it may be remarked, that trials are not peculiar to the redeemed. The voice of mourning and lamentation is heard through the length and breadth of our miserable world. Death enters the palace as easily as the cottage, and the bitter streams of sorrow sweep over the throne as well as the dungeon. All must drink of the bitter cup. "I will restore her again to life," was the language, it is said, of Democritus, a heathen philosopher, to Darius, a Persian prince, who mourned and was inconsolable for the loss of his beloved wife; "I will restore her again to life, provided you are able to engrave on her tomb the names of three persons who have never mourned." The king, it is said, made inquiry to find such persons, but soon finding it to be utterly unavailing, he was silent.

While the good as well as the bad, then, are alike exposed to suffering, the trials of the righteous, we have seen, are disarmed of their sting, and deprived of their bitterness. Pray then that affliction may be sanctified. Remember, that trials of themselves, can bring no blessing to the soul. The plough breaks up the fallow ground, but if the husbandman sow not the seed, only thorns and thistles will grow where the plough has been driven. And thus afflictions may blast the comforts of the wicked, and bring their bodies to the dust, yet if God give not the word, and sanctify them not, they will prove a curse, and not a blessing; the fruit will be, not "to take away sin," but an increase of wickedness; "grapes of gall, and wine the poison of dragons, and the cruel venom of asps." "Why should ye be stricken any more? ye will revolt more and more." Afflictions of themselves, then, will not slay corruption, will not break the hard heart: though emptied from vessel to vessel, from condition to condition, the wicked man will be wicked still. The unsullied snow will not wash the skin of the Ethiopian white; nor will the waters of affliction wash them clean that are "accustomed to do evil." We may then be amongst the most afflicted of the sons of men, and yet be "in the gall of bitterness and bonds of iniquity," and the sword of the almighty may be drawn against us to destroy. Our afflictions do not, of themselves, prove that we are the children God. We may be miserable here, and yet not be happy hereafter. We may in our life-time receive no "good things," and yet through eternity not be "comforted," but "tormented." Have our afflictions then been sanctified to our souls? Are we with Aaron, bowing under the mighty hand of God, willing that He should do with us and

ours, as seemeth him good? Are dark and afflictive providences surrounding you? Is the soul groaning in anguish under a wound for which the world can afford no remedy? Are you suffering under a blow from a bitter and malignant enemy? Are the injuries you have received great, the wounds inflicted deep, the reproaches and insults repeated, slanderous, and unjust? Christian, it is not "Shimei" who curses and reviles you. It is not the Chaldean and Sabeen robbers who plunder you of your property, or your good name; it was not Satan that smote you with sore affliction, and brought the blast of death which swept away your nearest and dearest. Look beyond second causes, look above the instrument, to the hand that guides it. The "wrath of man," is a rod in the hand of a tender Father, which He uses to chastise in measure, to sanctify and bless his people. It was thus you know with David, under the irritating and cruel language of Shimei, "Let him alone, and let him curse, for the Lord hath bidden him." It was thus with Job, when reduced to beggary by the robbers of the desert, and when Satan was permitted to bring a great wind from the wilderness, and bury his ten beloved children in the ruins of their elder brother's house. This bereaved mourner looks above, and beyond the power and malice of men and devils, to his covenant God. "The Lord gave," says he in deep submission, "and the Lord hath taken away; blessed be the name of the Lord." When enemies, then, revile and despitefully use you, *pray* for them, and say with David, "The Lord hath bidden them." When health is taken away, when the Lord is threatening to "cut you off with pining sickness;" when death enters your dwelling and cuts down your parent, your wife, your child; when all your prospects of earthly happiness are blasted, say with Job, "Shall we receive good at the hand of God, and shall we not receive evil?" Plead, that when called to enter the furnace, when bowed down with grief, when on the brink of the grave, you may learn obedience by the things you suffer. Plead, that He who rules the raging of the ocean, and the rushings of the whirlwind, who stilleth the noise of the seas, the noise of the waves, and the tumults of the people, would say to the floods of sorrow and the storms of persecution, "peace, be still." Plead, when a bitter and malignant world seems to rejoice in your wretchedness; when all without is distress and desolation; when within the heart is breaking, and the body, bowed down with sickness, is hastening to the grave, that you may be enabled to "dwell in the secret place of the Most High, and abide under the shadow of the Almighty." Thus there will be peace in your heart, there will be joy in your soul; and when the world deems you of all men, most miserable, you can tell them your sorrows bring unutterable peace unto your heart; that you would not exchange your most "sorrowful moments for their happiest hours," your sackcloth for a monarch's robes. Should you even go down to the dust, wondering at mysterious and overwhelming Providences, and unable to see through the darkness, the hand of wisdom and love guiding and ordering them, yet knowing there is not one trial that befalls you in this valley of weeping, but has an intimate connection with your eternal welfare; not one affliction more than is necessary; you can rejoice, under them all, that they are working for your good; and that the stream of time, as it rapidly rolls along, is bearing you every hour nearer to your Father's house, where all shall be explained, where your eyes shall weep no more, where there shall be no more death—neither sorrow nor crying; where "thou shalt forget thy misery, and remember it as waters that pass away." "The ransomed of the Lord shall return and come to Zion, with songs and everlasting joy upon their heads; they shall obtain joy and gladness, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away."

ART. III. Some improper or doubtful expressions considered.

MR. EDITOR,—

I here transmit to you for insertion in the Monitor, if it is thought proper, a few critical remarks upon some doubtful or improper expressions, which are in too frequent use on subjects connected with religion, with a view to shew the impropriety of using them. Correct speaking, as well as correct thinking, in relation to divine things, we are to study, that we may honour the truth; and as it is through the truth and not error, that the Lord carries on his work of grace in the heart, according to the words of our Lord Jesus Christ himself, in his intercessory prayer, "Sanctify them through thy truth," so it is necessary as a preservative against error; for truth hangs together by a chain of connexion: and error has also its connecting links, by which those who lean to it in one point, are ready to fall into it in others. There is a progression in error which persons are in danger of getting into, if they once come into the way of it. I know that the meaning of those who use the expressions here reviewed, is often more sound than the expressions themselves. But we are to guard against error in words, as well as against error in judgment: as the one leads to the other, if not in respect to the person who using them attaches to them a sound meaning; yet in respect to those they are spoken to, if they receive them in their true import, or understand them as they are susceptible of a bad sense. If what is forwarded to you now, of this kind of matter, is thought to answer a good purpose, more may be at your service in time coming.

Y.

I. Mercy is denied by some to be an essential attribute or perfection of God's nature.

But that it is an essential attribute appears, 1st. As it belongs to his name. Hence, see Exodus xxxiii. 19, taken in connexion with xxxiv. 6. "And he said I will make all my goodness to pass before thee, and I will proclaim the name of the Lord before thee; and will be gracious to whom I will be gracious." "And the Lord passed by before him and proclaimed, The Lord, the Lord God merciful and gracious, long suffering and abundant in goodness and truth." But God's name is a description of what he is in himself. 2d. According to the same passage it makes a part of his essential glory and goodness. For it was in answer to Moses's request, "I beseech thee shew me thy glory," that the Lord passed by and proclaimed his name there. And we are told that the Lord in proclaiming his name, thus made all his goodness to pass before him. 3d. Mercy is said to belong to God, (Psalm lxii. 12,) not simply because it is his sovereign will and pleasure that he should exercise it, and because he has revealed himself in the character of a merciful God in the scriptures, and has abundant mercy for sinners of Adam's family in Christ; but because it is one of his essential excellencies that he is a God of mercy. 4th. God is infinite in his mercy. But an infinity of excellence or goodness in any view attributed to God, points at that as belonging to his own essence, because there is nothing properly infinite but what is in God himself, who is without all bounds or limits in his perfections and essential properties. For "canst thou by searching find out God? Canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection? It is high as heaven, what canst thou do? deeper than hell, what canst thou know? The measure thereof is longer than the earth, and broader than the sea." The very same language in substance, which is used concerning the love of God, by the Apostle, which is in effect the same thing with his mercy, as respects it in its bearing toward mankind, sinners, "O the breadth and length, the height and depth of the love of God! How unsearchable are his judgments and his ways past finding out!" 5th. It cannot be an at-

tribute or perfection of God at all, if it is not essential to him, because there can be nothing accidental to God. There may be so to us; as justice, goodness and mercy in us are accidents which we may have, or be without, as we are made partakers of the divine image or not. But nothing can be considered as accidental to God without destroying the simplicity and absolute perfection of his nature.

A reason why God is denied by some to be essentially merciful is because he is sovereign in the exercise of his mercy. But he is also sovereign in the exercise of his goodness generally, both common and special under which his mercy is to be considered: yet it will not be denied that the Lord is essentially good; both as respects that goodness as it is in himself, and in its relative consideration, when it has a proper object to be exercised upon. God is said to be love, yet he is sovereign in his love as he had it towards man in the purpose of his love from eternity: and it is sovereign in the flowings of it forth towards its objects in time, in their effectual calling and whole progress of a work of sanctification. He resolves it himself into his own sovereign love and pleasure as the reason why one was its object and not another; and as to the bestowment of the blessings which flow from it in time—"I have loved thee with an everlasting love; therefore, with loving kindness have I drawn thee:" giving of these blessings to every one according to the measure of the gift of Christ in the same exercise of his sovereignty. And why should the fact, that God is sovereign in his mercy, be adduced to show that mercy is not essential to him, while the fact that he is sovereign in his goodness generally, and in the exercise of other perfections of his nature, is not made an argument to prove that these are also not essential to him?

The fact that God is essential in his mercy does not make it necessary that on this ground he give out or exercise his mercy in a relative point of view, any more than that he exercise any other perfection or attribute of his nature. Though he is essentially just, and holy, and wise, and good; and though he is essentially truth itself, it was not necessary, from his nature, that he should ever have any creature, man or angel to exercise any of these perfections upon. But all these perfections ever were in God, and ever will be, as the sum of all perfection. And mercy, as good in itself, cannot but be in the nature of God; at the same time that it is in him as a communicable or imitable perfection, wherein man, as partaking of his image, may have a resemblance, as well as in his holiness, his truth, his wisdom, power and goodness.

It is to be remarked, that in respect to the perfections of God, or attributes of God, it belongs to some of them to create their own objects; as the power of God is put forth in bringing its objects into being; and even the wisdom of God in the first actual manifestation of it. But it is not so in respect to others of the divine perfections. They suppose an antecedent object, (as one properly mentions) and that qualified in such a manner as that these perfections may be employed about them as the vindictive justice of God, and pardoning mercy of God, cannot be shown unless there are sinners for these to show themselves through. For if there be no sinners, none can be punished or pardoned. Justice finds in the sinner, standing guilty in his own person before God, a proper subject for it to be exercised upon. But mercy requires that he be not only a sinner, but a sinner for whom mercy was designed in the purpose of God, and for whom an atonement is made by Christ, as it cannot be exercised in inconsistency with justice. This will answer an objection which will be made by some, viz: that "if God is essentially merciful, as he is essentially just, and holy, and wise, and powerful, then he must necessarily exercise it." For God was under no necessity in himself to exercise any of his perfections relatively, further than it was necessary from his own

sovereign will and pleasure, that there should be objects which his justice and mercy, truth and holiness, power and goodness, should be employed about. The sovereignty of God is connected originally with the relative display of all his perfections upon man, or about man, as the subject of his moral government.

II. Mercy, some call God's darling attribute.

But no perfection or attribute of God is more dear to him than another, as all his perfections are to be resolved into himself. His love and goodness, and his mercy, are just himself. His truth and faithfulness, justice and holiness, infinite wisdom and almighty power, are just himself, who is infinitely good and excellent in them all. They are so himself, that according to systematic writers generally, they are not to be considered as distinct from his essence, nor as separable, the one from the other, though spoken of distinctly, to meet our finite capacities, but as the one infinite perfection of the one Jehovah, who is a being of absolutely uncompounded excellence. Hence God is said to be love and light. In the person of the Son he is said to be goodness, and called the truth, &c. He is the Holy One. As he is infinite in them all, in none of them can there be a superiority or excellence above another, or any one he delights in more than another. If there is any perfection of God in which he accounts himself to be more glorified than another, His Holiness would seem to be that perfection, as we find an emphasis is used in respect to the Holiness of God in the scriptures, which is used concerning none of the rest, in the frequent threefold repetition of the word holy, in speaking of the perfection of God's holiness, as in Isaiah chap. vi. and other places. He is said to be glorious in his holiness. The truth and faithfulness of God seems also to employ much of the attention of the saints, especially in their songs of praise to God. He is said to be encompassed about with his faithfulness, a mode of expression which is not used concerning even the love or mercy of God. But God is alike glorious in all his perfections, and his saints are concerned to give him the glory of them all without any preference. To suppose that one attribute of God was more a darling attribute to himself than another would be something like supposing that there are better and worse among the perfections and attributes of Deity. God is said indeed to delight in mercy; but this does not mean that he has any more satisfaction in it as a perfection of his nature, or in the exercise of it, than in his justice. It only signifies that he is by no means unwilling to give out his mercy, or show it to sinners, but freely and willingly to do so. And this is said for the encouragement of sinners to trust in his mercy.

III. Another expression which is much in use, is, that "one drop of Christ's blood is sufficient to save a lost world, had not God seen meet that our salvation should be by the death of Christ," which I consider to be unscriptural and therefore improper as the following will shew.

Sin had death to follow it as its punishment. And the surety bearing the punishment of sin in the room of his people had to die the death. "Without shedding of blood," it is said, "there is no remission:" and the shedding of it unto the death is intended, as this was typified by the animals offered up in sacrifice under the law, all of which had to die the death, to typically represent the necessity of Christ's death, in bearing the sins of his people. Nor did this necessity arise only from the appointment of God that it should be so, but from the proper demerit of sin, the wages of which is death, so that Christ being made sin for us, he had to die the death that we might be delivered from death; death temporal as the wages of sin and as having the sting of sin in it, and death spiritual and eternal, as all taken together constitute the proper punishment of sin through him.

“Die man or justice must; unless for him
Some other able, and as willing, pay
The rigid satisfaction, death for death.”

To say that “one drop of Christ’s blood is sufficient to save a lost world,” carries in it an appearance of a respectful value put upon the blood of Christ, who is an infinite person, and whose sufferings accordingly, both collectively and separately considered, had an infinite value in them, as the blood he shed was the blood of God, and all his sufferings the sufferings of God himself in our nature, in the person of the Son. But at the same time it exceedingly detracts from the glory of divine grace, as it makes a great part of what Christ did and met with in the work of our salvation to be unnecessary, otherwise than by a mere appointment of God, that our salvation should be in this way; while we find on the contrary this brought into view in the scriptures as an evidence of the love and grace of the Father, that he sent his son to die for us; and as a very notable evidence of it, (1 John iv. 10,) which indeed would be no love at all, if there was not a necessity for his death in order that the honor of the justice and holiness of God, together with the other perfections of Deity might be maintained. It is mentioned also as an evidence of the love and grace of Christ himself, that many waters could not quench his love, nor all the floods drown it; the waters and floods of divine wrath he had to pass through in the work of our redemption.

The above expression is a reflection upon the wisdom, justice and goodness of God. Wherein would the wisdom, or justice, or goodness of God appear in giving up Christ unto the death for the sins of his people, if one drop of his blood could answer for the salvation of a whole world? There would be neither wisdom, nor justice, nor goodness in this. Not wisdom; if one drop of Christ’s blood could have saved a lost world, and yet death is made the penalty he had to endure, as he was made sin for us. The wisdom of God appears in apportioning the punishment of sin to its due demerit, even as Christ met with it in the law place of his people. The covenant of grace being well ordered in all things; it is well ordered in this, that a person able to bear the full punishment due to sin in the place of those whom this covenant embraces, is provided and that this punishment he is made to endure. But it would not be so, if more than what was the due punishment of it was laid upon him. Not justice, in enacting more of Christ the surety than what the law required as the proper punishment of sin. If one drop of Christ’s blood could save a lost world, how could justice demand his death? Not goodness; as the goodness of God even in the salvation of sinners through Christ is displayed in providing a substitute to answer for them, seeing that his justice could not allow in a consistency with its nature sin to go unpunished. But not in laying a heavier punishment upon him than what the law itself called for, or than would have answered for them. It is contrary to the truth of God who declares that Christ, as the surety, being made sin for his people, took their law place that he might answer for them, and so standing in their room, “he was wounded for their transgressions and bruised for their iniquities, the chastisement of their peace being laid upon him,” (that chastisement which the law demanded and was necessary to bring about their peace, nothing more and nothing less,) “that they by his stripes might be healed.”

We have the fitness and the necessity of his death, as the only means of the redemption of a lost world of elect sinners, set forth to us in very explicit language by himself, in the conversation he had with the two disciples on their way to Emmaus, “O fools, and slow of heart to believe, ought not Christ to have suffered these things and to enter into his glory?” Was it not meet? as if he had said; was it not necessary from

the justice and holiness of God, that if he would have sinners saved by his grace, that it be through my obedience and death as a complete satisfaction to his justice, and as a means through which all the divine perfections could harmonise gloriously in redemption work? And we have the same thing set forth by the Apostle Paul, in his epistle to the Hebrews, chap. ii. verse 10. "For it became him for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons to glory, to make the captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings." His sufferings unto the death in the making of our atonement for the sins of his people, is what is treated of there by the Apostle. And it became him, a three in one God, or was suitable to his perfectly holy nature, that if he would save sinners of Adam's family at all, he should save them in this way. And in prospect of redemption work, as to be accomplished by Christ in this manner, we find the Old Testament church singing in the language of anticipation, in the 85th psalm, verses 10 and 11. "Mercy and truth are met together; righteousness and peace have kissed each other. Truth shall spring out of the earth, and righteousness shall look down from heaven."

An expression of similar import with the one now under consideration is sometimes used, viz: that "God could have saved sinners, if he had seen meet to do so, without an atonement." But what is said above will serve also to show the impropriety of this. We are not to be too curiously disposed in our inquiries concerning what God can do. But this we know, that he cannot deny himself, nor act contrary to his holy and perfect nature. And as justice belongs to God, as well as mercy, the salvation of sinners must be in a way which is consistent with both. For, "shall not the Judge of all the earth do right? While "mercy and truth go before his face," "justice and judgment are the habitation," or foundation, "of his throne."

IV. The exhortation is often given, "*Make up your peace with God.*" And often in prayer God is addressed thus, "*May we be enabled to make up our peace with thee.*"*

The language in both instances is improper, and carries in it much of a legal appearance. We are not to make up our peace with God, and cannot do it. Christ has made this peace for us by the blood of his cross, as see Eph. ii. 15. And he makes over this peace to us in the Gospel, "Peace I leave with you; my peace I give unto you, (says Christ,) not as the world giveth give I unto you." It is said of Christ, "This man shall be our peace, when the Assyrian shall come into our land, and shall tread in our palaces." God is called "the God of peace." And all this makes it evident that the peace is already made, and made on heaven's side, not on ours; and as a proclamation to this effect is given in the Gospel, we have but to comply with proposals of peace made, that we may come into the enjoyment of the blessing. We would not say of a traitor, when he obtains a free pardon of high treason against his prince, and his country, and by their unmerited generosity is restored to his former privileges, that he made the peace with his prince or his country, he so betrayed. Nor of a criminal, that he made the peace when his crime is pardoned, so as that the sentence of the law is not executed upon him, and he is restored to his former standing as a citizen. No more will the language apply concerning a pardoned sinner, who has that peace with God which is through our Lord Jesus Christ.

The two expressions above mentioned may do in the mouths of Arminians, who maintain that all that Christ did by his obedience and death, was to render God placable, so as that by faith and repentance as condi-

* *Query.*—May not these expressions be warranted from Isaiah xvii. 5.1.—ED. MONITOR.

tionary means on our part, we may obtain or procure his favor; or, in other words, make up the peace with him: thus dividing the work of their salvation with Christ if they do not take it out of his hands entirely. But they will not do for those who would hold the truth as it is in Jesus. They carry too much of an Arminian air for believers in the absolute freeness of the grace of God. I do not deny that they are sometimes used, unthinkingly, by some of those who are sound in the main, in the great and leading doctrines of Christianity. But as unwarranted by the word of God, and dangerous, the one as an exhortation often given to persons on sick beds, and death beds, who have to be taught to go out of themselves to Christ, in whom alone they can have peace, instead of being taught to do something in themselves to obtain it, and enjoy it:— and the other is improper as a petition at that throne of grace, where our words are to be few and well ordered. It is safest to lay them aside.

ART. IV. *The Life of Mr. John Livingston, minister of the gospel; written by himself during his banishment for the cause of Christ.*

The generation among whom we live, are characterised by a very high opinion of themselves. It is a common idea, that we are superior to all past ages; not only in arts and sciences, but also in true religion. We come to this conclusion, however, in the way of "measuring ourselves by ourselves; and comparing ourselves among ourselves." But the apostle says they who do so are not wise; it would therefore be of good service if we could have some of those characters brought before us, who have lived in former times; and especially those who were engaged in the various struggles for the purity of religion in the land of our fathers, (for they in particular are now by many looked down upon,) that we might compare ourselves with them. And if we do so wisely and honestly, we shall see, that instead of being superior, we are far behind them. Your pages have lately presented us one interesting example of this kind in the *Memoirs of Mrs. Campbell*; and also some extracts from the *Life and Times of John Livingston*; which latter must be so interesting to every lover of practical piety, and so much to the point, that I presume it will not be thought amiss to insert it entire as written by himself. Mr. Livingston was born about the commencement of the seventeenth century; and lived through that eventful and trying period during the reign of James VI., Charles I., the Interregnum, and a great part of the reign of Charles II., by whom he was banished; he suffered much for religion through his whole life; and being a public character, and personally engaged in many of the great public proceedings of the time, his life gives us a view, not only of one exorcised Christian, but also of the general state of religion and public affairs.

D. G.

My father was Mr. William Livingston, first minister at Monybrock,* where he entered in the year 1600, and thereafter was transported about the year 1614, to be minister at Lanerk, where he died in the year 1641; being sixty-five years old. His father was Mr. Alex. Livingston, also at Monybrock, who was a near relation to the house of Calendon. His father was killed at Pinkiefield, in the year 1541, being a soldier of my Lord Livingston's regiment, who afterwards was dignified to be Earl of Linlithgow. My father was straight and zealous in the work of Reformation; and for his non-submission to the canons and ceremonies, was deposed and deprived of his ministry, both at Monybrock, and also at Lanerk. My mother was Agnes Livingston, daughter of Alexander Livingston, portioner of C—, of the house of Dumpace. She was a rare pattern of godliness and virtue; she died in the year 1617, being about thirty-two years of age. She left three sons and four daughters, I was born in Monybrock, in Stirlingshire, June 21, 1603. The first period of my life, I reckon from my birth till the day I first preached in public, which was in January, 1625.

* The same that is called Kilyth.

Having at home learned to read and write, I was sent in the year 1613, to Stirling, to a Latin School, with Mr. William Wallace, a good man and a learned humanity schoolmaster; where I staid till the summer of 1617, at which time I was sent for, to be present with my mother dying. In October, the same year, I was sent to the college of Glasgow, where I staid four years: I passed Master of Arts, July, 1621. After that I staid in my father's till I began to preach. During this time I observed the Lord's great goodness, that I was born of such parents, who taught me somewhat of God, so soon as I was capable of understanding any thing. I had great fears about my salvation, when I was very young; I had the advantage of the acquaintance and example of many gracious Christians, who used to resort to my father's house, especially at communion occasions; such as Mr. Robert Bruce, and several other godly ministers, the rare Countess of Wigtoun, Lady Lillias Graham, who also at my baptism desired my name, because her father, her husband and eldest son were all of that name; the Lady Culross, the Lady Bamton, and sundry others. It is remarkable, that Mr. William Wallace came but a short while to Stirling before I was sent thither to school; and the year after I left the school, he also left that charge; likewise worthy Mr. Robert Boyd of Throckbridge, was but lately come from Saumur in France, to be principal in the college of Glasgow when I went there, and went from the college the year after I left it. The while I was in Stirling, Mr. Patrick Simpson was minister there; a man learned, godly, and very faithful in the cause of God; and in Glasgow I heard Mr. John Bell, a grave, serious man; and Mr. Robert Scot, who also was once deposed for opposing the corruptions of the time. The first year I went to Stirling school, I profitted not much, and was often beaten by the schoolmaster; and it happened that one day, when he had beaten me on the cheek with a stick, so that it swelled; that same day my father came occasionally to town, and seeing my face swollen, chode with the master, that he had a chief hand to bring him to that place, and should he use me so? The master promised to forbear beating of me, and I profited a great deal more in my learning after that; and when, about Sept. 1616, I with the rest of my equals, had gone through all the Latin and Greek that was taught in the school, and so was ready to go to the college, and my father came to bring me home for that end; the schoolmaster prevailed with my father, I being so young, and the master having hopes of my proficiency, that I should stay yet one other year, and thus another boy and I stayed another year. We for the most part read by ourselves in a little chamber above the school, the master furnishing us books, where we read the most part of the choice Latin writers, both poets and others, and that year was to me the most profitable year I had at the schools, only in my third year at the college of Glasgow, I think I read more than I did any year since; I was then under the oversight of Mr. Robert Blair, who for two years was my regent. Having gotten some grounding in the logics and metaphysics, and the subtleties of the schoolmen, a vain desire to be above my equals, prompted me to more diligence. In many things, whereunto my mind was very bent, the Lord often disappointed me, and always to my greater advantage. After I had passed my degrees in the college, I had a great mind to the study of the classics, and therefore was desirous to spend some time as a Regent in the college, and for that end, a place being vacant in the college of Glasgow, I studied hard, and prepared to dispute for the place; but when the time came, I heard that one, without any dispute, was placed. Because in the winter of my last year at the college, I had been long detained under surgeons, with a fistula in my leg, in which time Mr. R. Boyd had taught the rest of my class some Hebrew; being grieved at that loss, I began in my father's house, by my private study, to attain some knowledge of the Hebrew, which thereafter by time, I somewhat increased.—I do not remember the time or means particularly, whereby the Lord at first wrought upon my heart; when I was very young, I would sometimes pray with some feeling, and read the word with delight; but thereafter did often intermit any such exercise; I would have some challenges, and begin, and again intermit. I remember the first time that ever I communicated at the Lord's table, was at Stirling, when I was at school, where sitting at the table, and Mr. Patrick Simpson exhorting before the distribution, there came such a trembling on me, that all my body shook, yet thereafter, the fear and trembling departed, and I got some comfort and assurance.—I had no inclination to the ministry, till a year or more after I had passed my degrees in the college, and that upon this occasion, I had a great desire to give myself to the knowledge and practice of medicine, I was very earnest to go to France for that purpose, and propounded it to my father, that I might obtain his consent, but he refused the same. Also about the same time, my father having before purchased some land in the parish of Monybrock, the rights whereof were taken in my name, and that land by ill neighbors, being in a manner laid waste, and Sir William Livingston, of Kilsyth, one of the lords of session, being very desirous to buy that land, that he might build a burgh of barony upon it at Burnside, my father propounded to me that I should go and dwell on the land and marry; but finding that that course would divert me from all study of learning, I refused that offer, and rather agreed to the selling of it,

though I was not yet of age to ratify the sale. Now being in these straits, I resolved that I would spend a day alone before God, and knowing of a secret cave on the south side of Mouse-water, a little above the house of Jerviswood, over against Clegorwood, I went thither, and after many to's and fro's, and much confusion, and fear about the state of my soul, I thought it was made out to me, that I behoved to preach Christ Jesus, which if I did not, I should have no assurance of salvation. Upon this I laid aside all thoughts of France, and medicine, and land, and betook me to the study of divinity. I was from my infancy bred with an aversion to episcopacy and ceremonies. - While I was in the college of Glasgow in the year 1619, being as I think, the first year that kneeling at the communion was brought in there, I being with two or three more of the young men at the college, set down among the people at the table, and Mr. James Law the pretended Bishop of Glasgow coming to celebrate the communion, he urged all the people to fall down and kneel; some did so, we sat still; he came to us, commanding us to kneel or to depart; somewhat I spoke to him, but do not remember perfectly what I said, it was to this purpose; *there was no warrant for kneeling, and for want of it, we ought not to be excommunicated from the table of the Lord.* He caused some of the people about us to rise that we might have place to remove, which we did. The next day the Principal, Mr. Robert Boyd, called me to him and said, within two or three weeks, he would celebrate the communion at Govan, for he was minister at Govan, and desired me that whom I knew to be well affected of the young men of the college, I would bring with me to him; although he was a man of sour-like disposition and carriage, I always found him so kind and familiar as made me wonder; sometimes he would call me with other three or four, and lay down books before us, and have us sing tunes of music, wherein he took great delight. The first christian acquaintance and society whereby I got any benefit, was with a religious gentleman William Cunningham, tutor of Bonnytown, who used to be oft at my father's house; several times he and John Weir, of Stockbridges, Alexander Tenant, James Weir, George Mathew, and David Mathew, who were packmen, would meet in my chamber in Lanerk, where we used to spend some time in conference and prayer.

The second period of my life, I reckon from the time I preached in public, till the time I was settled in the ministry in Killinchie in Ireland, for having begun to preach in January 1625, I continued in my father's house in Lanerk, and for the space of a year and a half or some more, I studied there, and preached sometimes there, and sometimes in neighboring kirks, during which time I wrote all my sermons before I preached them, word by word, till one day being to preach after the communion of Quodquan, and having in readiness only a sermon which I had preached one day before in another kirk, and perceiving severals to be at Quodquan, who had been at the other kirk, I resolved to choose a new text, and having but little time, wrote only some notes of the heads I was to deliver, yet I found at that time, more assistance in the enlarging of these points, and more motion in my own heart, than ever I had found before, and after that I never wrote all at length, but only notes. About April, 1626, I was sent for by my lord Kenmure to come to Galloway, in reference to a call to the parish of Anwoth, which at that time was not a parish by itself, but a part of another, neither had a church builded; they offered before August next, to have it disjoined, a church built and a stipend settled, and desired that I would stay there in the mean time. I was not willing to stay at that time, there being no appearance that I could preach in the mean time; therefore they desired, if they got these things performed before August, that upon a call I would return thereunto; I condescended, but some difficulties coming in the way, they got not these things so soon done, and therefore in harvest first I hearkened to a call to Trophichen; but thereafter the Lord provided a great deal better for them, for they got that worthy servant of Jesus Christ, Mr. Samuel Rutherford, whose praise is in all the reformed churches; and I observed afterwards, that several parishes whereunto I had a motion of a call were disappointed, either by obstruction from the Bishops, or thereafter by the General Assemblies refusing to transport; yet these parishes were far better provided; for Leith got Mr. David Forest, Kircaldy got Mr. Robert Douglass, Clagow got precious Mr. James Durham, Antrim, in Ireland, got Mr. Archibald Fergusson, Newton there got Mr. John Grey, and Killinchie there got Mr. Michael Bruce. The short time I was in Galloway, I got acquaintance with my lord Kenmure and his religious lady and several worthy experienced Christians, as Alexander Gordon, of Earlstoun, Alexander Gordon of Knockgray, Alexander Gordon of Knockbrack, John his brother, Alexander Gordon of Garlurk, John Gordon of Barskeach, the laird of Carloun, Tultertown, John M'Adam and Christian M'Barn of Waterhead, Marion M'Naught in Kirkubright, and several others, for I preached at a communion in Borgue, where were many good people that came out of Kirkubright, and was at some private meetings with some of the forementioned in Garlurk, and in the Airds, where Earlstoun then dwelt. In harvest 1626, I was desired by my lord Trophichen, to come to his house in Calder, and being desired by the aged minister of Trophichen, to preach there. Af-

ter two or three weeks, Presbytery of Linlithgow kept a visitation in that church, where I got a joint call by the parish and Presbytery, and the old minister, and by my lord Trophichen, patron of the parish, and master of the land, to be minister there.—The old minister died within a month or two; I preached there a whole year, and found several times the Lord's presence with me in preaching, other than I had done before. Means were used by the parish and the lord Trophichen, that I might be ordained.—The Presbytery, though some of them were but corrupt men, showed themselves willing thereunto: but Mr. John Spotswood, pretended Bishop of St. Andrews, stopt all, because of my nonconformity; and when the earl of Linlithgow, lord Trophichen and some others, dealt with him on my behalf, (for even at that time some few by *moyen** were suffered to enter into the ministry without conformity) he pretended that notwithstanding of my nonconformity, he should not hinder my entrance in some other place; but that was promised to one Mr. George Hanna, who thereafter was intruded upon that poor people; and the report went, that either Mr. George, or his brother Mr. James, had given the bishop, or some about him, five hundred merks Scots, to get that place. This opposition and fear of disappointment, made the people more desirous to hear the word; and this desire to hear, I thought made, that the Lord furnished the more to be preached to them, especially toward the end; for about October, 1627, the Presbytery of Linlithgow wrote to me, to desist from preaching any more at Trophichen, and I found the two or three last sabbaths I preached there, the sweetest sabbaths, though sorrowful, that I had seen in that place. When I was thus forced to leave Trophichen, and was resolved to return to my father's house in Lanerk, and had only gone to take my leave of my uncle William Livingston in Falkirk, being anxious about the care of Trophichen, and my own want of employment, when I had sent away before me to Lanerk the boy that waited on me and kept my horse, being minded within half an hour to follow, I got letters from the Countess of Wigtoun from Cumbernauld, (that was six miles distant) desiring that I would come thither, to be present with her mother, the Countess of Linlithgow, who was dying, and had been all her days a papist, but some while before had deserted that religion. When I came thither, the Earl of Wigtoun and she proposed, that (seeing their house was six miles from their parish, and several of their tenants might come and hear sermons in their house; and that it was but ten or twelve miles from Trophichen, and so some of them also might come) I would stay with them, and at least in the winter time, preach in the hall of Cumbernauld to the family and such as came, until other occasion of employment offered; whereunto I condescended. Thus until August, 1630, at which time I went to Ireland, I continued more than two years and a half, most part in the house of the Earl of Wigtoun, and sometimes with my father in Lanerk. Most part of these summers I was travelling from place to place, according as I got invitations to preach, and especially at communions in Lanerk, Irvine, New-mills, Kenniel, Culross, Larber, and the Spots, and several other places; I preached sometimes also at Glasgow for Mr. Robert Scot. He died Jan. 28, 1629. I was with him several times on his death bed. One time in presence of many, speaking of the bishops and ceremonies, he said, "Their wicked and corrupt courses my soul abhors, and my comfort is that God hath withheld me from them; if God lengthen my days, I shall not be so sparing as I have been, to gain ease, I have dishonored God." And a little before his death, having lain some time in a kind of trance, he awaked, and taking off his night cap, threw it to the bed foot, and cried out, "I have now seen the Lord, and heard him say—make way for my faithful servant Mr. Robert Scot." And after a short while he died.

(To be continued.)

ART. V. *The Christian Minister's Soliloquy.*

MR. EDITOR,

Thinking the following extract will be very acceptable to many of your readers, and even useful, especially to pious ministers, I transcribe it for insertion in the Monitor; having it by me in manuscript, I know not at present the print from which it is taken.

D.

"My glorious and condescending Lord, who has endowed mankind with a wise variety of capacities, and assigned to each of them his proper work, agreeably to the various exigencies, they inhabit, has appointed me the most pleasant work, the work of love and benevolence. He only requires of me, to act the friend of human

* Forbearance, or connivance.

nature, and shew myself a lover of souls—souls whom he loves, and whom he redeemed with the blood of his heart—souls, whom his Father loves, and for whom he gave up his own Son unto death—souls, whom my fellow-servants of a superior order, the blessed angels love, and to whom they concur with me in ministering—souls, precious in themselves, and of more value than the whole material universe—souls, that must be happy or miserable in the highest degree throughout an immortal duration—souls, united to me by the endearing ties of our common humanity—souls, for whom I must give an account to the great Shepherd and Bishop of souls—souls, whom none hate, but the malignant ghosts of hell, and those fallen spirits who are under their influence on earth. Angels! can I help loving these dear souls? Why does not my heart always glow with affection and zeal for them? O! why am I such a languid friend, when the love of my Master and his Father is so ardent; when the ministers of heaven are flaming fires of love, though they do not share of the same nature? And when the objects of my love are so precious and valuable. The owners of these souls often do not love them. Shall not love then invigorate my hand to pluck them out of the burning? Yes, I will, I must love them. But O to love them more! Glow my zeal! Kindle my affections! Speak my tongue, flow my blood! Be exerted all my powers. Be my life a sacrifice, if necessary to save souls from death! Let labor be a pleasure; let difficulties appear glorious and inviting in this service. O! thou God of love, kindle a flame of love in this cold heart of mine, and then I shall perform my work with alacrity and success.”

ART. VI. Congregationalism in the Presbyterian Church.

The peace of the church is unquestionably a precious blessing, for the preservation of which, *personal* sacrifices, to almost any extent, ought to be made. But the truth of God and the order of his house must not be sacrificed, even for the preservation of peace. Professor M. fully agrees with us in this; but he seems to think that all important differences in the Presbyterian church may be reconciled, without a division. If this can be effected, none will rejoice in such an event, if we live to witness it, more than ourselves. But we solemnly protest against the late fashionable method of settling differences by *compromise*; that is, by letting those who teach false doctrine, and violate their ordination engagements, and disregard the order of the Presbyterian church at pleasure, take their course, with only saying what amounts to this—“it were well, dear brethren, if you would be a little more careful of what you say and do,” and then declaring that they are no longer to be disturbed by those to whom they have been opposed. We have had more than enough of such *reconciliations* as this already.

And when we consider how numerous and important are the existing differences, even if we take into view only those which relate to the topics on which Professor M. has dwelt in his letters—how strong are the attachments of the parties who differ to the things about which they differ; how prostrate the discipline of the church has become, especially in regard to discipline for unsoundness in the faith; and how deeply and generally our church is imbued with the spirit of Congregationalism—we confess that we almost despair of seeing *real concord* restored, while our church is composed of such heterogeneous materials.

We feel constrained to say, that we think professor M. is in an extreme, in the indulgence of his fears of the evils that may ensue from a disturbance of the peace of the church. He seems to be horrified at the very thought of it. Let us not forget that the Bible is full of examples, of the testimony which the decided friends of God's truth and ordinances have borne in their favor, in the face of prevailing degeneracy; and this, although the peace of the church might be disturbed, and frequently was, in fact, greatly disturbed, by what they said and did. The history of the ancient prophets, of our blessed Saviour himself, and of his holy apostles, is in great part, the history of their conflicts with the corruptors of the church of God, and the disturbance of the false peace in which it had settled down. The prophet Jeremiah, after lamenting in the most pathetic strains the state of the church in his day, mentions among the worst evidences of its corruption, that those, from whom decision in favor of reformation might have been expected, were “not valiant for the truth upon the earth;” our Saviour declared that he “came not to send peace but a sword;” the apostle Paul had a constant conflict with false teachers and false brethren. In regard to the latter he says, “to whom we gave place by subjection, no not for an hour;” and why not? The answer is “that the truth of the gospel might continue with you.” Of false teachers he hesitates not to declare, “I would they were even cut off that trouble you.” The apostle John enjoins, “If there come any unto you and bring not

this doctrine [the doctrine of Christ] receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed"—Why so sternly repulse?—For a very sufficient reason—"he that biddeth him God speed, is partaker of his evil deeds." Nearly the whole of the short epistle of Jude consists of a warning and of fearful denunciations against false teachers; and he tells the churches, "it was needful for me to write unto you, and to exhort you, that ye should earnestly contend for the faith once delivered to the saints." At the time of the Protestant reformation, there was a great cry against disturbing the peace of the church. But had this been regarded by Luther, Zuingli, Calvin, Cranmer, and Knox, what would have become of the *real* church of Christ? It might still have been slumbering in the corruptions of the Man of sin. What if the heroic Scotch Presbyterians, and the devoted English Puritans, had succumbed to those who wished and admonished them not to disturb the peace of the church?—There might have been no Presbyterian and Congregational churches at this day in the United States.

It is manifest then, that there are occasions on which it is indispensably incumbent on the friends of pure evangelical truth and gospel order, and most of all incumbent on the ministers of Christ, who are "set for the defence of the gospel," to disturb the peace of the church—so far as it will be disturbed by standing up, and standing firmly for the truth of God and his sacred institutions. The only question is, whether such an occasion exists at present in the Presbyterian church. If we did not most solemnly believe that it does, no consideration on earth (God helping us by his grace) should induce us to take the course we have been pursuing for three years past. Often have we been tempted and strongly inclined to shrink away from it. Often have we sought counsel of God. Often have we asked ourselves—what if we should be called to our last account—not an improbable event at our age—in the midst of what we are doing and writing? The result has been, that while we have been sensible of great imperfection in all we have done, we have believed that our *course itself* has been, and is, the right course; and we have not dared to abandon it. But for this, we should long since have been silent. We were, in fact, almost silent, for a year after the General Assembly of 1832. But we have been constrained to break our silence. If we are naturally prone to controversy, it was long before the propensity showed itself. We were about forty years in the ministry, before we ever wrote a sentence of polemicks, or were engaged in serious religious controversy of any kind. We have always hated it, and we still hate it. But in opposition to our reluctance, it is our purpose, in reliance on divine aid, to maintain, as far as our feeble powers will permit, our part of the struggle in which the best friends of the Presbyterian church are now engaged, for the preservation of her purity and her *eventual* restoration to solid peace—till we either see a favourable issue of the conflict, or death, or some other dispensation of the providence of God, shall manifestly decide that we have fulfilled our part of a sacredly incumbent duty.—*Dr. Green's Chr. Advocate.*

ART. VII. *Modern Errors in the Church—No. I*

That the present aspect of the Reformed Churches offers to our consideration a serious and affecting subject is undeniable. To a scrutinizing Christian observer, "the signs of the times" unfold a remarkable analogy to that early period, when by the donation of inordinate wealth, and the accession of Antichristian power, Constantine unwittingly poured poison into all the veins of the nominal churches.

The accession of worldly riches, dignity, and influence attracted within the boundaries of the church, multitudes of unregenerate men, who filled all the offices, from which corrupting measures, dreadful errors flowed; and by the reaction, desolated the christian community, with heresy, superstition, and formality, until every vestige of spiritual worship and vital godliness almost disappeared.

All persons who are intimately conversant with the ecclesiastical history of the fourth and fifth centuries know, that the prominent departures from Evangelical truth consisted in that denial of the agency of the Holy Ghost, which is indissolubly connected with the Arian principles; and as a necessary consequence in the assertion of the full ability of man unassisted by divine influence to comply with the commands of God; from which followed as an essential adjunct, the dogma that man enters the world a sinless and undepraved being.

These features combine a graphical delineation of the prevalent corruptions in theory and practice at that period. It is not necessary now to enter upon an investigation, whether these positions are derived from the scriptures of truth; as my present essay is only preliminary, and intended to point out the remarkable similitude between the preceding and the present era. In another point of view, the circumstances are alike. Great varieties of opinions were maintained upon these important doctrines, some contending to exemplify the marvellous inconsistency of "holding the head," while they

also wished to connect with it, "the rudiments of the world," and others diverging by every "by path," wandered away, some more and others less widely, into the grounds which environ Doubting Castle.

There were temporizers like Arius himself who affirmed, denied, explained, and darkened "counsel by words without knowledge," exactly as hope, fear, loss or gain at the time swayed; and there were bolder sinners, who rejected more of the restraints imposed by "the belief of the truth;" and there were more decided men, who, like Pelagius, when he discovered that he had a sufficient number of adherents, openly announced those strong delusions, which in truth nullify the whole of Christian revelation.

This eventful and appalling condition of the church, it is believed, is rapidly returning; and unless objects are beheld through a distorted medium, it also appears evident, that the lamentable causes are the same, as well as the prospective mischievous results.

Every student of ecclesiastical history knows, that the immediate consequence of Constantine's decrees, by which the church was endowed with splendor, opulence and power, was this; it introduced among Christians, not a publicly avowed, but a secretly operating propensity, to be conformed to the world. Thus it erased from their minds and hearts that fear of the Lord which is the beginning of wisdom, and that solicitude for the Redeemer's approbation, which ought to be the sole governing motive of every believer in Jesus. If this be not one of the most clearly discernable characteristics, which mark the present generation of many of the professed disciples of Christ, then there is no certain criterion by which men can be accurately judged.

Now we know that this spirit and tendency to compromise with the world are altogether deleterious. In coalitions of this nature, the parties never advance with even step, so that at last the dividing line between the sons of God and the servants of Mammon, has become imperceptible, even through the largest magnifying glass which the ingenuity of gospel faith can possibly invent. But the Christian backsliders go the whole distance from the domains of the sanctuary to the temple of the god of this world; and from the land of Canaan to the darkness and degradation of Egyptian bondage. It is in vain to extenuate, or justify this departure from the living God, as the apostle Paul saith, Hebrews, iii. 12, 14, it is an evil heart of unbelief, hardened through the deceitfulness of sin.

Another circumstance in the comparison of the church fourteen centuries ago, and at this day is most impressive. The abhorrent heresies which God mysteriously permitted, and hitherto irretrievably, to become a noisome pestilence to the church, were gradually introduced, and so cautiously and craftily that they were scarcely noticed, until the disease was altogether incurable by the most skilful spiritual physicians.

This is most exactly descriptive of some of the facts which have passed before our own eyes.

Many persons are living who can recollect when doctrines which are now proclaimed as orthodox, would not for one moment have been tolerated. An instance of this kind occurs to my remembrance. Little more than twenty years ago, an avowed Arminian preacher was menaced with a denunciation before the Baltimore Methodist Conference for promulgating heresy condemned by the articles of their church; but the Pelagian corruptions mingled with his errors would escape notice by the side of many of the deceptive dogmas constantly preached in some of the professedly Calvinistic pulpits in this city and elsewhere. During the last twenty-five years, the enemy has been sowing his semi-Arian and semi-Pelagian tares, until they are so completely intermixed with the wheat, that no ingenuity and efforts of man seem sufficiently potent to counteract their diffusion; and nothing less than the power and grace of the Most High God can eradicate their noxious seed and their pestilential fruits.—*Christian Intelligencer.*

ART. VIII. Doctrinal Differences in the Presbyterian Church.

As Professor Miller says, "I cannot allow myself to doubt that a very large majority,—nay, nineteen-twentieths of the whole number of our ministers are sufficiently near to the Scriptures and to each other, in respect to all the essentials of truth, to be comfortably united in Christian fellowship and co operation;" and as we have expressed a very different opinion, we feel disposed to state distinctly, from our accredited standards, certain articles of faith, which seem to us to be essential, and which, notwithstanding, are openly impugned and rejected by preachers and writers in the Presbyterian church, without any efficient discipline being applied to correct and prevent the evil.

In speaking of "essential truths," we observe that Professor Miller mentions those which are "sufficiently near to the Scriptures." This is the favorite language of

those who do not in their hearts approve of our Confession of Faith, and Catechisms—of those who do not like what Professor M. has ably and conclusively written and published, to show that the very design of our doctrinal standards is to make known *how we understand* the Scriptures: and which, be it remembered, is the understanding that every man who is licensed, or ordained in the Presbyterian church, solemnly declares to be his own. The advocates and propagators of unsound doctrine always profess to go right to the Scriptures—they sometimes even glory in not being trammelled or restrained by any frame work raised around the Bible. They well understand, that if they can be allowed to put their own licentious construction on the language of Scripture, the field is open for endless controversy, and for advocating any heresy which they may choose to adopt. They forget—we will say *they remember to forget*—that they have already told the churches how they do, or did, understand the Scriptures: that this understanding was the ground of their admission into the church: that if they abandon this ground they ought also to abandon the church: and that they violate their most solemn engagements, while they keep their standing in the church, and yet set at nought the terms on which that standing was given them, and by which alone they can with good faith retain it.

But although Professor M. has used the language, we have no suspicion that he has adopted the principles of the latitudinarians.[*] We are satisfied that he believes with us, that the whole authority of our public Formularies is derived from the sacred Scriptures; that if they were not a just exposition of the leading truths of the word of God, they would have, and ought to have, no authority at all; but as they do soundly expound, and clearly set forth, the doctrines of the holy oracles, in such a manner as to discriminate truth from the endless errors which men of corrupt minds have professed to derive from the volume of inspiration, these Formularies, taken in the obvious sense which their language bears, are solemnly obligatory on every minister of the Presbyterian church. In an argument with Professor M., therefore, it is fair for us to take our acknowledged standards as exhibiting “the essential truths of Scripture,” as held both by him and by us.

In chap. iii. sec. vi. of our Confession of Faith, we find the following article: “As God hath appointed the elect unto glory, so hath he, by the eternal and most free purpose of his will foreordained all the means thereunto. Wherefore they who are elected, being fallen in Adam, are redeemed by Christ, are effectually called unto faith in Christ, by his Spirit working in due season; are justified, adopted and sanctified, and kept by his power through faith unto salvation. Neither are any other redeemed by Christ, effectually called, justified, sanctified and saved, but the elect only.” The framers of this article appear to have intended it as a *summary* of doctrines, to be afterwards explained more at large, and have placed it under the general title of “God’s eternal decrees.” We take it for the very same reason that its authors composed it—as containing a summary; and one that exhibits at a single view, the most of the important points that are now impugned by teachers and writers in the Presbyterian church. We mean also to add, from the Confession of Faith and Catechisms, a portion of what they contain on each of the topics, in the general statement.

As we intend to state no points which we have not, with our own eyes or ears, seen or heard publicly opposed or denied, and which, but for the space it would occupy, and the labor of transcription it would require, we should like to quote in the very language of the impugners, we shall not dwell on the doctrine of particular election. We do not recollect to have seen or heard a *direct* denial of this point, among the clergymen of our church; although of the laity we know that not a few make no hesitation in rejecting it avowedly and utterly; and although many clergymen do actually contend against doctrines, which by fair implication necessarily involve that of particular election. The Methodists have had considerable success, in some parts of our church, in inculcating their notions on the private members of our communion; and it is well if a number of our clergy also are not tinctured with their sentiments in regard to election, as we know they are on the subject of human ability.

I. Then, the elect, and of course the whole human race, have “fallen in Adam.” The Confession of Faith, chap. v. sec. 4, says, “The almighty power, unsearchable wisdom, and infinite goodness of God, so far manifest themselves in his providence, that it extendeth itself even to the first fall, and all other sins of angels and men, †—yet so as the sinfulness thereof proceedeth only from the creature and not from God, who be-

[* We have very strong suspicions that Dr. M. “has adopted” in no inconsiderable degree, “the principles of the latitudinarians.” This article, to say nothing of the whole tenor of his letters, proves that he *teaches* latitudinarian principles. And we know not why Dr. M. should be charged with teaching principles, which he has not adopted.—ED. MONITOR.]

† We shall make our quotations by connecting only the clauses which bear on the points we touch. We shall endeavor in no instance, to mutilate or vary the sense; and of this our readers will be able readily to judge for themselves, by the distinct references we shall always make.

ing most holy and righteous, neither is, nor can be, the author or approver of sin." On this point we shall depart from our general course, and make a quotation, which we think—although we do not say or believe that the writer himself thinks—directly contravenes the above important doctrine of our standards. A professor of a theological seminary in the Presbyterian church, has made a publication in the form of letters, in which he says, (p. 4,) "God is properly the author of that which is produced or brought about by his direct agency, the nature of which he approves, without any free agency coming between his agency and the event, so as to produce it." And again, (p. 3,) he says, "Then according to Scripture and sound philosophy, to God alone belongs causation, and he alone is uncaused. While he is the HOLY EFFICIENT CAUSE of all our thoughts and volitions, there is no agent between him and these effects, causing them, and producing them. But before God could be the author of sin, his agency and causation must include an approbation of sin, and so be sinful; to suppose which would be blasphemy." Thus it appears, according to this theological Professor, that the difference between God's being *the author* of sin, and *the efficient cause* of sin, lies wholly in this—that the former terms imply God's *approbation of sin* and the latter terms *do not imply it*, but leave room to maintain that he utterly disapproves of it. The position is, that sinful thoughts and volitions, are creatures of God's own immediate production, which he utterly disapproves; that is, he forms, by his sole and direct efficiency, creatures which he hates the moment they are formed. It would be blasphemy to say that he loved these creatures, at any instant after he has formed them; but it is sound philosophy and theology to say, that he hates these creatures of his immediate efficient power, from the very birth of their being. Now, in our humble opinion, this distinction between an "author" of a thing, and the "efficient cause" of that thing, is what no one would make or understand, without some sapient professor to teach him. To us it seems to be a distinction without a difference. And we have no doubt that whoever should say, without an explanation, that *God is the immediate efficient cause of sinful thoughts and volitions*, would be understood, by every one acquainted with the English language, and who has not heard of this theological system, as affirming unequivocally, that *God is the author of sin*. We once heard a man say, when a strange thing was mentioned, it takes such things as that to make some of all sorts. And so it is, in the *variety* of theological notions now afloat in the Presbyterian church—it takes such a system as the one we have just mentioned, to make up the assortment. Yet when the Executive Committee of the Board of Missions of the Presbyterian Church, refused to commission two young preachers who, it was well ascertained, had imbibed the sentiments above exhibited, they received a letter of severe reprimand from the teacher of those hopeful youth, and were threatened with a complaint to the General Assembly. Nor was the threat an idle one—the complaint was made, and very seriously discussed; and although the Committee at length escaped without censure, yet so also did the complainant. Nor have we ever heard, and do not believe, that this system of theological instruction has ever met reproof, from any judicatory in the Presbyterian Church.—*Dr. Green's Review of Dr. Miller's "Letters to Presbyterians."*

ART. VI. *Correspondence between the Lords and Commons in the Parliament in England, and the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland; also between said Assembly and the Assembly of Divines met at Westminster, 1643—1648.*

(Continued from page 201.)

Letter from the assembly of Divines in the Kingdom of England, to the right Reverend the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland.

Right Reverend and dearly beloved in our Lord Jesus Christ.—We the Assembly of Divines and others, called and now sitting by authority of both Houses of Parliament, to be consulted by them in matters of religion; have received from the honorable Houses of Commons, a special order (dated the 3d of this instant August) recommending it to us to write a letter to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, taking notice of the pious and good expeditions to this Church and State, certified in the late answer of the Commissioners of the General Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland, from their meeting at Edinborough the 17th of July 1643. And further to desire them to possess the people of that kingdom with our condition; and to encourage them to our assistance in this cause of religion. And having with that order received and read the answer directed to the honorable Houses of the Parliament of England, we cannot sufficiently express the great content and comfort, unto which it hath raised us, in the midst of the sad and calamitous condition under which we lie.

It is no small refreshing to our mourning spirits to confide, that yet our God hath not left us wholly comfortless, nor cast us so far out of his sight, as having made us sick with smiting that should be verified of us, *Lover and friend hast thou put far from us*, and that no man

should turn aside to ask how we do : but that we find so many of the churches of Christ, and above them all, our dearest brethren of Scotland, so far to take to heart our extremities, as to sit in the dust with us, and so to look upon our adversities, as being themselves also in the body.

And as we cannot render thanks sufficient unto our God for remembering such mercy in the midst of so much wrath; so we embrace with all cheerfulness this opportunity of thankful acknowledgement of the great debt which your love doth continually lay upon, not us alone, but upon this whole kingdom, in the free and full expressions of your care, piety and zeal, and of like affections of that whole nation, to assist and concur with the Parliament here, by all good and lawful means, for settling of religion in godly unity and uniformity throughout all his Majesty's dominions, against all the designs, power and malice of bloody Papists, and the prelatical faction, with all their malignant adherents, the common enemies of reformation, truth and peace.

We are likewise much engaged to the great vigilance and travels of the honorable Convention of the Estates of Scotland, in contributing their brotherly advice, and for their readiness to give assistance for recovering and settling the peace of this kingdom, against the devices, power and practices of the enemies of religion, and the public good, whereof some hints are given in that answer, and of which we doubt not but the honorable Houses of Parliament will be so sensible as to give such a return as becomes them; for they, better knowing than we do, the depth of the evils under which this Nation now groaneth, and the further dangers imminent, will be more able to value and improve the great affection and wisdom of their brethren, in points of so high and general concernment, for the safety and glory of the king's majesty, and of all his kingdoms, and are more fit to take notice of advices of that kind, in reference to the civil state, which therefore we wholly leave with them.

But as for the many prudent, pious, and seasonable admonitions which concern our assembly, the good Lord reward (for we cannot) seven fold into your bosoms all the good, which you have labored to procure unto the house of our God, and blessed be his name who hath put such a thing as this into the hearts of our Parliament, to cleanse the house of the Lord of all the uncleanness that is in it, by impure doctrine, worship, or discipline.

Nor can we in the depth of all our sufferings and sorrows, withhold our hearts from rejoicing in the wonderful goodness of God toward this kingdom, in that he hath let us see the gracious fruit of your effectual prayers and tears, as well as of our own endeavors this way : In bringing together this assembly, although in a very troublous time, whereby we may have better opportunity, more fully to pour out our souls jointly and together to our God, for healing of this now miserable church and nation : To consider thoroughly, for what more especially the land mourneth, and how we may be most useful to our great God and master Jesus Christ. In contributing somewhat to the vindicating of his precious truth, many ways corrupted through the craft of men that have lain in wait to deceive. In the seeking out of a right way of worshipping our God according to his own heart ; In promoting the power of godliness, in the hearts and lives of all his people, and in laying forth such a discipline as may be most agreeable to God's holy word, and most apt to procure and preserve the peace of this church at home, and nearer agreement with the church of Scotland (highly honored by us) and other the best reformed churches abroad, that so, to the utmost of our power, we may exalt him that is the only Lord over the church, his own house, in all his offices, and present this church as a chaste virgin unto Christ.

It is a timely and favorite prayer which you have put up at the throne of grace, touching the due managing of the proceedings in this assembly, and that with straight intentions we may all seek the truth in every thing, which by the blessing of God upon our labors, must needs produce all those blessings which your worthy commissioners mention. And now, for your comfort as well as our own encouragement, we desire you to take notice of the gracious answer of the God that heareth prayer, unto your fervent cries. For beside our own particular addresses and secret vows to our God to be faithful (with disdain of all baits of avarice and ambition) it hath pleased the Divine Providence so to direct both the honorable Houses of Parliament, to take care of preventing all obliquity in our proceedings, and to stop the mouths of all that watch for their and our haltings, and are apt maliciously to traduce both, (as if we were so restrained by them, in our votes and resolutions, as to be bound up to the sense of others, and to carry on private designs in a servile way) that the houses have tendered to us, and we have most readily taken a solemn and serious protestation in the presence of Almighty God, to maintain nothing in this assembly touching doctrine, but what we are persuaded in our consciences to be the truth; nor in matters of discipline, but what we conceive to conduce most to the glory of God, and the good and peace of his church; which doth not only secure the members against fettering of their judgements or votes, but engage them to the use of all freedom, becoming the integrity of conscience, the weight of the cause, the gravity and honor of such an assembly. It is likewise a great consolation, that our God hath put it into your hearts to design some godly and learned brethren to put in their sickles with us into this harvest, which is so great, and requires so many laborers; for which, as we heartily return thanks, so we earnestly pray the Lord to open a way to their timely coming hither, and do assure them of all testimonies of respect, love, and the right hand of fellowship, who shall undertake a journey so tedious, and now so perilous, to join with us in the work, when it shall please the honorable Houses of Parliament to invite them thereunto.

It remains that we should now spread before you our calamities, danger and fears of further evils, not only drawing towards us, but even threatening you also; and crave your passionate aids in all ways becoming the servants of Jesus Christ. But your commissioners have so fully declared your certain knowledge and deep sense of them, that they have left us no room for enlarging ourselves in this particular, to brethren so full of bowels and zeal. And they have sufficiently intimated unto the honorable Houses, that you are well aware how often the common enemies of both kingdoms have consulted together with one consent to cut off both

the one and the other from being a nation, and that the tabernacles of *Edom*, and the *Ishmaelites* of *Moab*, and the *Hagarens*, *Geball*, *Ammon*, and *Amalek*, the cursed Papists, and their implacable and bloody abettors here, do still retain the same malice and carry on the same design against religion, and perfect reformation, even in your kingdom, happily rescued from their former tyrannies, as well as in this of scorched England, now in the furnace: Only they have varied the scene, pouring out all their fury upon us at the present. That so, having once trodden us under as mire in the streets, they may afterwards more easily, (which God avert) set their proud and impure feet upon your necks also. Wherefore, with the good leave and favor of the honorable Houses of Parliament, we shall now spare the further exciting of you to that which we doubt not of your forwardness by all lawful and meet means to promote with all your might: namely, the possessing the good people of that kingdom, (of whose willing mind and readiness you have already given ample testimony) touching our condition, and to encourage them to our assistance in this cause of religion.

And now remembering without ceasing your work of faith, and labor of love, and patience of hope in our Lord Jesus Christ, with all due acknowledgments of the precious effects of your prayers; we most humbly and earnestly desire, that the same breathings of the spirit in you may still continue, and (if possible) more frequently and fervently ascend to your God, and our God, not only for removal of outward pressures, and the visitation of the sword, that hath already learned to eat much of our flesh, but also for the special assistance and protection of the Father of lights, in this great work unto which we are now called, and wherein we already find many and potent adversaries; that feeling the plummet is now in the hands of our *Zerubbabels*, all mountains may become plains, and they may bring forth the *capatone* of the *Lords house* with shoutings, crying *grace, grace unto it*, and that how weak and contemptible builders soever we be, the Lord would enable us to build with them, that none may have cause to despise the day of our small beginnings, nor to stop our progress in the work which he hath given us to do. And as for us, who cannot but take notice of the extraordinary employments unto which you are called in your great Assembly, now also sitting; God forbid that we should sin against the Lord, in ceasing to pray for you, that the Lord may enable you to be wise master-builders, preserve your peace always by all means, and make you steadfast, unmoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, to the praise of the glory of his grace, and to the farther benefit and comfort of the whole church of God, but more especially of this our afflicted ark, now wafted into the midst of a sea of miseries, and tossed with tempests, until our wise and gracious God, by the furtherance of your prayers and brotherly endeavors, shall cause it to rest upon the mountains of *Ararat*, which may take away our fears, as well as put an end to our present sufferings, and give you to rejoice with us, that now mourn for us.

WESTMINSTER, August 4, 1643.

Subscribed by your most loving brethren, highly prizing the graces of God in you, and that are your servants for Jesus's sake, in the name of the whole Assembly.—William Tuisse, prolocutor; John White, Cornelius Burges, Assessors; Henry Roborough, Adoniram Byfield, Scribes of the Assembly.

The Assemblies Answer to the right Reverend the Assembly of Divines in the Church of England.

Right Reverend and dearly beloved—As the sufferings of Christ abound in you, so our hearty desire to God is, that your consolations may much more abound by Christ. The perusing of your letter, produced in every one of us such a mixture of affections, as were at the laying of the foundation of the second Temple, where there was heard both shouting for joy, and weeping aloud. We rejoiced that Christ our Lord had at last in that land, created a new thing, in calling together, not as before, of a prelatical convocation to be task-masters over the people of the Lord, but an assembly of godly divines, minding the things of the Lord, whose hearts are set to purge the defiled house of God in that land: yet this, our joy, was not a little allayed by the consideration of the sad and deplorable condition of that kingdom, where the high provocations of so many years, the hellish plots of so many enemies in a nick of time, have brought in an inundation of overflowing calamities. We know you are patiently bearing the indignation of the Lord, because you have sined against him, till he thoroughly plead your cause, and disquiet the inhabitants of Babylon, who now laugh among themselves, while you are fed with the bread of tears, and get tears to drink in great measure, being on the mountains like the doves of the vallies, all of you mourning every one for his iniquity.

It is now more than evident to all the Kirks of Christ, with what implacable fury and hellish rage, the blood thirsty Papists, as *Babylon* without, and the prelatical faction, the children of *Edom* within, having adjoined to themselves many malignant adherents, of time-serving Atheists, haters of holiness, rejecters of the yoke of Christ, (to whom the morning light of reformation is as the shadow of death) have began to swallow up the inheritance of the Lord, and are not easily satisfied in making deep and long furrows on your backs. We cannot say that the loudness of your cry surpasseth the heaviness of your stroke; but though the Lord hath delivered the men, every one into his neighbor's hand, and into the hand of his King, and they have smitten the land, yet the rod of the wicked shall not rest upon the lot of the righteous. This cloud shall speedily pass away, and a fair sun-shine shall appear.

As for us, though your extreme calamity did not threaten the ruin of our religion, peace, and liberties, as it doth most evidently, we would hate ourselves, if we did not find our hearts within us melting with compassion over you; you are engraven on the tables of our hearts to live and die with you; we could desire that our heads were waters, and our eyes a fountain of tears, that we might weep day and night for the slain of the daughter of the Lord's people: So calamitous a condition of any of the Kirks of Christ, could not but be very

grievous unto us ; how much more shall not we stoop and fall down in the dust to embrace our dearest brethren of England, to whom we are tied into near and tender relation. When we were but creeping out of the deep darkness and bondage of Popery, and were almost crushed with the fury of foreign invaders, joined with intestine enemies, pretending the name and warrant of authority, as now your oppressors do; then did the Lord by your fathers send us reasonable assistance against that intended and begun bondage both of soul and body, the repayment of which debt, the Divine Providence seemeth now to require at our hands. And whereas of late, through our security we had fallen into a woful relapse, and were compassed about with dreadful dangers on all hands, while we aimed at the recovery of our former purity and liberty : then we wanted not the large supply of your fervent prayers, and other brotherly assistance of that nation, while those who are now your malignant enemies, would have swallowed us up.

These strait bonds of your ancient and late love, do so possess our hearts, that when the motions of the commissioners of the honorable Houses of Parliament, and your letters did challenge our advice and aid for defence of religion, and advancement of reformation, our smothered desires for a more strict union and uniformity in religion betwixt both the nations, did break forth into a vehement flame, in such sort, as when the draught of a league and covenant betwixt both kingdoms for defence of religion, &c. was read in open audience, it was so unanimously and heartily embraced, with such a torrent of most affectionate expressions, as none but eye or ear witnesses can conceive, whereof the two reverend divines sent from you to us being then present, no doubt will give you an account. Neither was it so only with us, but also the honorable convention of estates here, with the like harmony of affectionate expressions, did entertain the same; so that we hope to be real and constant in prosecuting the contents of this covenant. When we in our straits fled to the Lord, and entered into covenant with him, he owned us and our cause, rebuked and dissipated our enemies, and hitherto hath helped us, and blessed our enterprises with success from heaven, notwithstanding our great weakness and unworthiness. We trust in the Lord, that as once it was prophesied of *Israel* and *Judah*, so shall Scotland and England become one stick in the hand of the Lord; they shall ask the way to *Sion*, with their faces thitherward, saying, come, let us join ourselves to the Lord in a perpetual covenant, that shall not be forgotten; and so shall it come to pass, that the Lord's Jerusalem in this Island, shall be a cup of trembling, and a burthensome stone to all their enemies round about. Though now it be the time of *Jacob's* trouble, the Lord will deliver him out of it. Reverend and dear brethren, we conceive your case, and of all the faithful in that land, to be no other than of a woman crying, travelling in birth, and pained till she be delivered. The great red dragon, (under whose standard the sons of *Belial* are fighting) is your arch enemy. This cannot but be a time of fear and sorrow. But when the male child shall be brought forth, the pain shall cease, and the sorrow shall be forgotten. We are very confident in the Lord, that you will be faithful to Jesus Christ, in the work committed to you by him in all his ordinances, and taking neither foundation, corner-stone, nor any part of the rubbish of Babel to build the city that is called, *the Lord is there*: But measuring all with the golden reed of the sanctuary, you may more closely be united to the best reformed Kirks, in doctrine, worship, and government, that you may grow up in him in all things which is the head, even Christ.

And now, Reverend and dear brethren, though we know that you abound in all gifts and graces, the spirit of Jesus Christ being plentifully poured out upon you; yet according to your desire, and the motion made by the Commissioners of the Honorable Houses of Parliament, to testify our hearty sympathy with you in the work of the Lord. We have nominated and elected some godly and learned of this church, to repair to your assembly. We doubt nothing of your hearty embracing them in the Lord, and their diligent concurrence with you in advancing that great work.

Not only the common danger we are under, but the conscience of our duty to his suffering people, layeth bonds on us frequently to present you, and that blessed work of reformation, in your hands, to the throne of grace, that the God of all grace, who will call you into his eternal glory by Christ Jesus, after that you have suffered, and a while may make you perfect, establish, strengthen, and settle you.

EDINBURGH, August 19, 1643.

Subscribed in the name of the Assembly of the Church of Scotland, by the Clerk of the Assembly.

DR. BROWNLEE'S LETTERS ON THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CONTROVERSY — The last Christian Intelligencer contains the xxxii. and last letter of this controversy, which the Dr. has ably sustained throughout. The priests having long since left to him the undisputed possession of the field, he has followed up their retreat with a well directed and effectual fire. He has manfully discharged a duty he owed to his Divine Master, to the churches of the Reformation, and to the country. And though the deep apostasy of the times, and the general corruption both in church and state, may in a great measure paralyze their immediate effect, they cannot but be attended with ultimate benefit; nor will their author go unrewarded for his arduous labor. We cannot see how these letters can be read, by those sections of the Protestant churches, which, through a long season of ease and security, have become indifferent, if not opposed to many things which in the early periods of the Reformation were deemed of vital importance, in order to withstand the man of sin, without alarm for their safety. It is evident, that the battle of the Reformation must be again fought over in this country; and the issue cannot be otherwise than disastrous to the reformation cause, unless its friends, in the very onset, assume the whole armor of God, many parts of which they have thrown away as the rubbish of other times. It is with pleasure, we learn, that these letters are to be issued in a book form. They should be read by every American.

THE
RELIGIOUS MONITOR.

AND

EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

APRIL, 1834.

ART. I. *Divine Love.*

[Concluded from page 110.]

2. Did Christ set us an example of studying the Scriptures? We ought to search them with diligence and care. Indeed Christ was under no necessity to search them to obtain knowledge; because, "the Spirit of knowledge and understanding rested upon him." But he *read* the Scriptures, and, in the whole course of his ministry, *quoted* them with *ease* and *accuracy*. And to them he appealed in proof of the divinity of his person, and of his character and work, as the promised *Messias*.

We by nature are *darkness*, therefore, we ought to search the Scriptures, that we may be "made light in the Lord." Timothy, "from a child, knew the Scriptures, which are able to make us wise unto salvation, through faith, which is in Christ Jesus." Of the man who is blessed, David saith, "His delight is in the law of the Lord; and in his law doth he meditate day and night." As to himself he saith, "O, how love I thy law! it is my meditation all the day. How sweet are thy words to my taste! Yea, sweeter than honey to my mouth." Paul said, "I delight in the law of the Lord after the inward man." "The Bereans searched the Scriptures daily." And "Apollos was mighty in the Scriptures." In addition to the Scriptures of the Old Testament, we have those of the New. We ought to study *both*, "comparing spiritual things with spiritual."

Many of the most learned men, and diligent inquirers after truth, in all ages, ancient and modern, have placed their greatest delight in studying the Scriptures. Justin Martyr, who, before he became a Christian, was conversant with all sects of philosophers; but when converted from Plato to Christ, in his dialogue with Trypho the Jew, speaking of the doctrine of Christ, contained in the Holy Scriptures, saith, "I found this at last to be the only sure and profitable philosophy." Saith Chrysostom, "Let us not carry about the opinion of the multitude, but examine *things*. Is it not absurd, when you are to receive money, you do not trust other men, but examine it yourselves, and when you are to judge of *things*, then to be led away by other men's opinions? And this is the worse fault in you, because you have the Scriptures, which is an *exact standard*, and *rule*, of all things. I beseech you do not regard what this or that man saith, but inquire all things of the Scriptures." Luther would say to his students, "Read the Scriptures, pray, and make your sermons."

Dr. Owen, in his preface to his Exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews, expresses himself thus: "But yet, I must say, that after all searching and reading, prayer and assiduous meditation on the *text*, have been my only reserve, and far most *useful* means of light and knowledge." And again, "I know not a more deplorable mistake in the studies of divines, both preachers and others, than their *diversion* from the studies of *immediate* and *direct* study of the Scriptures themselves, unto the studying of commentators, scholiasts, annotators, and the like helps. Not that I condemn the use and study of them, which I wish men were more diligent in, but desire pardon if I mistake, and do only *surmise*, by the experience of my *own folly*, for many years, that many who *seriously* study the things of God, yet rather do make it their business to inquire after the sense of other men on the Scriptures, than to search studiously into *them* themselves."*

From all these particulars, you will easily observe, that ministers of the gospel ought, in a particular manner, to be diligent in searching the Scriptures, and that, not only to make *themselves* wise unto salvation, but, that they may be qualified, to "feed the flock of God, with knowledge and understanding, rightly dividing the word of truth, giving them meat in due season." "A scribe which is instructed unto the kingdom of heaven, is like unto a man that is an householder, which bringeth out of his treasure, things new and old." Preaching the gospel, is spreading a table to the hungry soul. "There we taste that the Lord is gracious. We are nourished up in the word of sound doctrine." Nay, ministers are set for the *defence* of the gospel, and they ought to be capable to wield "the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God," against the errors which abound. "Holding fast the faithful word, as they have been taught, [in teaching] that they may be able, by sound doctrine, both to exhort, and to convince the gainsayers."

But, alas! have we not reason to lament the great neglect of searching the Scriptures, by many, in this age? Hence, great ignorance prevails, and the grossest errors are published, and received with pleasure. Hath not God reason to renew the ancient complaint, "My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge." And again, "O, my people! they which lead thee cause thee to err, and destroy the way of thy paths." Of the Pharisees Christ saith, "They be blind leaders of the blind. And if the blind lead the blind, both fall into the ditch."

Nay, do not many prefer human compositions to "the *inspirations* of the Almighty?" Dr. Watts's *Hymns*, which Bradbury called Watts's *whims*, and Rawlin Watts's *jingles*, have excluded the great treasure of sacred psalmody from the worship of God, in many churches of the reformation. Yea, the whole Bible itself, is in danger of being swept off, by the flood of *tracts*, which contain no distinct system of divine truth, but are rather calculated to promote the *widest* and *wildest* *latitudinarianism* imaginable. And do not our *devotionalists* frequently prefer these to the Scriptures themselves. Thus we are told, that one, by *transiently* looking over a *small tract*, heaving a few *sighs*, and dropping a few *tears*, is converted to Christ. What! is the conversion of a sinner, which requires a day of *divine power*, nay, of the *exceeding greatness* of that power, accomplished at *once*, in such a *slight* and *transient* manner, and that without the word of God? Saith Christ, "The *words* that I speak unto you, *they* are Spirit and life. Believers are born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the *word* of God, which liveth and abideth forever." Again, "Of his own will begat he us. with the *word* of truth."

* Dr. Owen's Preface to Vin. Evan. p. 68.

“Believers desire the sincere milk of the *word*, that they may live thereby.”

In fine, as to *many*; if neglecting the worship of God in their families, spending their time, at *home*, in reading *novels*, and *licking up*, with avidity and pleasure, all the *corrupt springs* of the press; and, *abroad*, attending plays, balls and masquerades, be a life of *piety* and *devotion*, we have it. “Their houses are safe from fear, neither is the rod of God upon them. They send forth their little ones like a flock, and their children dance. They take the timbrel and harp, and rejoice at the sound of the organ. They spend their days in wealth.” But our God will not be mocked; “in a *moment* they go down to the grave.” Dr. Owen observes, “that the greatest wickedness is often committed under the greatest ornaments.”

3. Did Christ give us an example of the reverence we owe to the name of God? Then we ought to imitate him in all our worship and conversation, “serving God with reverence and godly fear. God is great, and greatly to be feared in the assembly of the saints, and to be had in reverence of all them that are about him.” Saith David, “I will walk in the fear of the Lord *all the day*.”

Our reverence of God ought to be increased according to the discoveries that he makes of his majesty and mercy, his justice and grace. This he declared by *Moses*, “If thou wilt not observe to do all the words of this law that are written in this book, that thou mayest fear this glorious and fearful name, the LORD THY GOD, then the LORD will make thy plagues wonderful.”

When *Isaiah* saw the glory of the Redeemer, and spake of him, he is borne down with the magnificence of the mercy, and cries out, “Wo is me, for I am undone.” He cries out at the sight of that which saved him. It is not the language of despair: the only meaning of the word is, that the glory of the design was too much for him. There was something so great in the revelation of the divine mercy, that makes him more apprehensive than ever he had been, that he was “a man of unclean lips.”

The whole compass of this branch of our duty to God is very plainly and concisely expressed in our excellent Shorter Catechism. “The third commandment requireth the holy and reverent use of God’s names, titles, attributes, ordinances, word and works.”

But, alas! is not the name of God “continually, every day blasphemed? This sin is also briefly and fully expressed in the same Catechism. “The third commandment forbiddeth all profaning or abusing of anything whereby God maketh himself known.” And by the exposition that the larger Catechism has given us, you will see that the guilt of it is to be considered in a very extensive way. It forbids all superstition or want of reverence of God’s name, and his ordinances; all *lotteries*, vain jangling and jesting, and many things besides, which are contained in the law, which is exceeding broad.

We shall limit the further illustration of this branch of the particular, to a very few remarks, to show the sin and danger of profane swearing, on account of which the nation ought to mourn. It is a sin like that of “*Babylon*,” that reaches to heaven, and has now prevailed among us, without any distinction of parties, among even professors of religion themselves. “Out of of the *same* mouth proceedeth *blessing* and *cursing*.” “All flesh hath corrupted its way,” from the child up, through every age, and station, to men of grey hairs. For it may be observed, that while some sins, such as “youthful lusts,” die of course, *swearing* often continues, and increases. Thus, old decrepid sinners go tottering, creeping, and cursing to the grave. How many in our streets and taverns, fleets and ar-

mies, give us a picture of hell! They hard a common sentence, and talk as if their tongues were upt with hell and blasphemy. They act in contradiction to all our prayers. We pray that God would *save* them. They pray that God would *damn* them; as if they were afraid of getting into hell *too late*.

And it is lamentable to observe, that in proportion to the *gracious* discoveries that God maketh of himself, sinners swear with a higher degree of aggravation. How *tremendous* to swear by the *Holy Trinity*—by *Jesus*, which name expresseth his love and power in “saving his people from their sins.” By *Christ*, which signifies his consecration, and unction to his office as a Saviour. By the *Holy Ghost*, whose office it is to convince and convert sinners, to sanctify and seal believers to the day of redemption. Swearing upon earth, by the “blood and wounds,” from which we have all our hopes of getting to heaven, is a most profligate way of trampling under foot the Son of God, “counting the blood of the covenant an unholy thing.” Swearing by the *sacrament* is a direct violation of the law, and makes us “guilty of the body and blood of the Lord.” “Swear not by heaven, for it is God’s throne; nor by the earth, for it is his footstool; nor by Jerusalem, for it is the city of the great King.” Nay, the word *God*, which conveys to us the apprehension of an independent, eternal, infinite being, ought not to be pronounced without awe. And thus these phrases, (God bless me, and God have mercy,) when it expresseth no more than our wonder, are very indecent. “Holy and reverend is his name.”

It is a pity our translation of the Bible has thrown out the word at random in several places. (1 Cor. iv. 3; 2 Cor. xi. 1.) “I would to God:” whereas the original is no more than “I wish.” And more frequently that other expression, “God forbid:” which is only “Let it not be.”

Societies are formed to extirpate *drunkenness*, which *rots* the nations, and is swearing to be permitted to go on? Indeed, a swearing drunkard, one that goes on recking and cursing, is such a mixture of the *beast* and the *devil*, that the crimes of earth and hell are met together in him. And excess of *riot* is making quick work with his body. And as if he were afraid his soul would not have guilt enough to come in for a share of misery, he resolves that the two abominations shall move with an equal pace. But such as these shall have all their debaucheries filled over again in a cup of *trembling*. Every curse is noted down: and what a number of them may they expect to find? Wishing for damnation is *working out* their own damnation. “By thy words thou art to be condemned.”

The advice in this case is plain: keep out of the way of these temptations. A swearer is fit for none but those who are fit for hell. He goes on without shame and fear, trampling upon the laws of God and man, employing the language of thieves and robbers, of highwaymen and murderers, and the whole train of hell that are yet upon the earth.

If any who should execute the law against swearers, break it themselves, they sin with a *distinguished aggravation*. A swearing magistrate is a monster. If any think they are at liberty whether to prosecute an offender or not, there is an awful passage in the law of God, which we leave with their consciences. “If a soul sin, and hear the voice of swearing, whether he has seen it or known it, if he does not utter it, shall bear his iniquity.” But magistrates who have it in their power, are not at liberty to be silent. If they bind themselves by a solemn oath that they will put the laws in execution, we cannot but think they must be guilty of “*false swearing*,” who do not punish “*profane swearing*.” But

"however they may escape punishment from men, the Lord our God will not suffer them to escape his righteous judgment."*

4. Did Christ give us an example of sanctifying the Sabbath? Then we ought to "remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." It is worth while to observe, that there is no other commandment in the moral law, more frequently mentioned in Scripture than this, with promises of blessings to those who observe it, and threatenings of judgments against those who profane it. First, saith God himself, "blessed is the man that keepeth the Sabbath from polluting it." Nay, he saith to the "eunuchs, and the sons of the stranger, who keepeth the Sabbath from polluting it, and taketh hold of my covenant; even them will I bring to my holy mountain, and make them joyful in my house of prayer." It is both *dutiful* and *delightful* to begin the Sabbath by worshipping God in our houses, and then go to worship him in his own; to join in prayer, and in singing with the voice of melody, the *established songs* of Zion, and to hear what the Lord will speak, by his servants coming forth "with the fulness of the blessings of the gospel of peace." When the consciences of sinners are laid open, and the countenances of saints are comely. In short, when "the gospel is preached with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven."

They that are above ordinances are above grace. The Lord's people are a generation of *seekers*: as the Psalmist saith, "They seek thy face, O Jacob:" that is, O God of Jacob. And where can they seek him on earth, but where he hath his principal residence? "The Lord loveth the gates of Zion more than all the dwellings of Jacob." To him the Psalmist made his appeal—"Lord, I have loved the habitation of thy house, and the place where thine honor dwelleth:" that is, the place of the tabernacle of thy honor. "One thing have I desired of the Lord, that will I seek after; that I may dwell in the house of the Lord, all the days of my life, to behold the beauty of the Lord, and to inquire in his temple." "There Christ shows himself through the lattice," that is, ordinances. There "he inhabits the praises of Israel:" that is, the *songs* he hath given to Israel." As they are *all of his own coining*, so the great *Exchequer* will receive them in again. Nay, saith the spouse, "I sat down under his shadow with great delight, and his fruit was sweet to my taste; while the king sitteth at his table, my spikenard sendeth forth the smell thereof." The palate has a new turn. "How sweet is the word to the mouth; sweeter than honey to the taste." This is a diet for which the world has no gust. This is a sort of feasting that to them is loathsome. But these believers taste that the Lord is gracious. A sermon is a meal; a sacrament is a feast. These are strange words among those to whom they are strange things.

Secondly, The Lord often threatened and inflicted great judgments upon his ancient people, for profaning the Sabbath. And at last was provoked to pile them up in a general captivity, and throw them into the furnace in Babylon. That, as they would not keep the Sabbath of weeks, and the Sabbath of years, "the land might enjoy her Sabbaths, to fulfil three score and ten years."

And after the restoration, when guilty of breaking the Sabbath; saith Nehemiah, "I contended with the nobles of Judah, and said unto them, what evil is this that ye do, and profane the Sabbath day? Did not your fathers thus, and did not God bring all this evil upon us, and upon this city? yet ye bring more wrath upon Israel, by profaning the Sabbath."

Nehemiah succeeded; but, alas! though many have *contended* with, or at least *petitioned our nobles*, as to certain articles on this head, have

* Some of the preceding notes are borrowed from Bradbury's sermons on the sin and danger of profane swearing, which the reader may consult at large.

they not pleaded in vain? The great profanation of the Lord's day, by multitudes at present, is too visible to be denied, and too gross not to be lamented. But it is of peculiar aggravation when established or permitted by a law.

In fine, if attending to secular affairs, by many in the country, and by others in counting houses, in cities, travelling, visiting, and going in parties of pleasure, be sanctifying the Sabbath, how many observe it with care and diligence! But saith God himself, "Ye shall keep my Sabbaths and reverence my sanctuary, I am the Lord." Saith our divines, "The fourth commandment forbiddeth the omission or careless performance of the duties required, and the profaning the day by idleness, or doing that which is in itself sinful, or by unnecessary thoughts, words, or works, about worldly employments and recreations."

Secondly, we should now proceed to show how we ought to imitate the example of Christ, in discharging the duties we owe to man. But, having illustrated the preceding observations so fully, it would swell this branch of the subject beyond proper bounds to descend to many particulars. And further, if a man love God, and perform his duties to him, he will love his brother and perform the duties he owes to him also. We shall therefore only mention a few texts of Scripture, which comprehend all the duties we owe both to God and man.

The first you have in Micah vi. 8. "He hath showed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee but to do justly;" that is, in your dealing with men: "to love mercy," that is, to the poor and afflicted: "and to walk humbly with thy God," that is, in a life of religion. Correspondent to this, saith Paul, "The grace of God, that bringeth salvation, hath appeared to all men. Teaching us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, as to ourselves;" righteously, as to our neighbor; "and godly"—performing the duties we owe to God himself, "in this present world." Philip. iv. 8: "Finally, brethren, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, [venerable] whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report: if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise; think on these things." Matth. xxii. 37: Jesus said to the lawyer, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it: Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments hang [depend] all [that is contained in] the law and the prophets." Lastly, "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so to them."

4. Christ was not only a pattern of holiness; he obeyed the precept, and endured the curse of the law, as a *surety*, and thus paid all the debt of his people. "What the law could not do," the impossible of the law, "in that it was weak through the flesh, God, sending his own Son, in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin," by a sacrifice for sin, "condemned sin in the flesh. That the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, first, in or by Christ, as our *surety*, and then, viewed by us, by a mystical union to him as the Lord our righteousness:" and this ought to be evidenced "by walking, not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." Thus, "we are bought with the price of the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish, and without spot." "We have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace." It is one of the most noble and triumphant acts of faith, to stand at the foot of the cross, and say, "Ah! he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities, the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed."

5. Did Christ vanquish all our enemies? This opens a door of hope. His victory secures ours. This was the case of the martyrs. "They overcame by the blood of the Lamb." When the heathen scoffed at the primitive Christians and called them Sarmenitii, and Sematii, because they were burned upon the cross, one of them, in the name of the rest, answers, "The cross was only their triumphant *chariot*, which carried them sooner to *heaven*."

Indeed, it is very surprising that Christ should overcome sin and Satan by dying; and that groaning under an avenging law, and crying after a departed God, should make death *easier* to us. But as "he put away sin by the sacrifice of himself," so "through death he destroyed him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and delivered them who, through fear of death, were all their lifetime subject to bondage." This is the victory by which we overcome the world," and all our enemies, "even our faith," in the cross of Christ.

This doctrine may give us great encouragement under all our afflictions, especially those for righteousness' sake. We may bid defiance to the power of the enemy. Let hell roar, and persecution go on, here is enough to keep us from sinking. We may give that large challenge. "Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or sword? Nay, in all these things, we are more than conquerors, through him that loved us." In fine, "If so be that we suffer with Christ, we must be glorified together." "We suffer with him," *in cause*, "we are glorified together" *in company*. We are rather his successors in trouble, but we must be his associates in the blessedness that comes at last.

6. Did Christ rise from the dead, and ascend up into heaven in the *nature* and *name* of his people? Then,

First, The relation between him and his people continues, and is confirmed for ever. As "he was born of a woman," so he died "in the fashion of a man." As death most fully *expressed* his manhood, we can never imagine it should *dissolve* it. He took our nature as a *Redeemer*, but he did not lay it aside when he made the atonement. Otherwise, the case of believers *now* had been worse than it was in the days of his flesh. But "this man," this person, this priest, "after he had offered up one sacrifice for sin, for ever sat down at the right hand of God." And then, as he taketh his people into union with himself, so that relation is to be eternal. Saith he, "I will betroth thee unto me forever." And as to believers, *their* death is so far from breaking the mystical union, that it makes it more clear and evident to *their* experience. "When we are in the body, we are absent from the Lord; but to depart is to be with Christ, is far better" than to continue here. Nay,

Second, He is touched with a sympathy and feeling of our wants. When he preached the gospel, "it was to heal the broken hearted, to proclaim deliverance to the captives, and set at liberty them that are bruised." And now, in heaven, he has the same heart and compassion for his afflicted church. "These things saith the first and the last, which was dead and is alive; I know thy works, and tribulation, and poverty." Though there is no diminution of his eternal blessedness, yet he has not lost all degrees of tenderness. "We have not an high priest which cannot be touched with a feeling of our infirmities;" and the ground of this is, because "he *was* in all points tempted as we are, yet without sin. Let us therefore come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need."

Third, He is advanced to the highest station. "Seeing then, that we have a great high priest that is passed into the heavens, Jesus, the Son of God, let us hold fast our profession." All our covenant privileges are

secured with him. "As concerning that he raised him up from the dead, no more to return to corruption, he said in this wise; I will give you the sure mercies of David."

7. Does Christ display his love in making continual intercession for his people? Then, we may come boldly to a throne of grace:" that is, to a God reconciled in Christ. Jesus Christ is "the great high priest over the house of God;" and thus in a capacity, both of *asking* and *giving*. "He *first* receives, and *then* gives gifts unto men." If there be enough in heaven to answer your petition, he has it at command. All the stock of your happiness is lodged in him. "God hath made him most blessed forever." He is exalted as a *blessed* and a *blessing* Saviour. "And do you think that prayer can puzzle one thus exalted? Can you *ask* what he is not able to *give*? Is a finite petition larger than heaven, and the fulness that is laid up there? Remember, though you are but *beggars*, yet you correspond with a *King*. One who maintains the kingdom of *nature, grace, and glory*. Therefore, beg largely. Don't stint yourselves. Open your mouths wide and he will fill them.' He is exalted for this purpose. His throne is a place of reward for his undertaking of intercession for his people. From thence he carries on the remaining part of his work; there he pleads the virtue of his blood and death. All which shows that he represents us. He is there in our name, and for our security."*

8. Will Christ judge the world and display his love by receiving his people into heaven, and giving them complete and eternal felicity there? Then we ought to "deny ungodliness and worldly lusts, and live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world; looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God, our Saviour, Jesus Christ." And as another apostle directs us, "Gird up the loins of your mind, be sober, and hope to the end," perfectly, "for the grace that is to be brought unto you, at the revelation of Jesus Christ."

Lastly. From the whole subject we may see, what great reason we have to exercise superlative love to Christ, in time, and in eternity. The two grand obligations of all rational love are *excellency* and *kindness*. The one is a general charm, and exposed to the view of all; the other is peculiar to ourselves. Christ has both. And both are seen by faith in the church below, and by immediate vision in the church above. His person is amiable to all the saints and angels, and his bruises lay the redeemed of the Lord under an everlasting debt of gratitude. They may proclaim these characters of him: "This is my beloved," all his furniture and sweetness make him so; "and this is my friend," his actions and pains for me have abundantly proved it.

We conclude with the words of Hierom, concerning that divine love which we owe to the person of Christ. "Whether thou readeest or writest, whether thou watchest or sleepest, let the voice of love to Christ sound in thine ears; let this trumpet stir up thy soul; being overpowered [brought into an ecstasy,] with this love, seek him on thy bed, whom thy soul desireth and longeth for."

Thus we have contemplated some evidences of Christ's love to his people, the comfort contained in them, and the improvement we ought to make of them. It is hoped we have not tired intelligent and pious readers. It is certain they will never tire in heaven; enjoying Christ's love, and exerting their own. Indeed, there are many things in the contemplation, that need an *apology*, much more than the *length* of it. How unfit are we to discuss such a sublime subject, as the *love of Christ*!

QUISLIBET.

ART. II. *Some improper or doubtful expressions considered.*

[Continued from page 309.]

V. It is often said, in speaking of the duties of persons under soul discouragements, that they are to go to Christ with a *may be* in their expectations, when they cannot get beyond this: founding their opinion perhaps upon the words in Amos v. 15. "It may be the Lord will be gracious;" and the words of the lepers mentioned in 2 Kings, vii. 3, who were suffering by the famine without the city of Samaria, "Why sit we here until we die. If we say we will enter into the city, then the famine is in the city, and we shall die there; and if we sit still here we die also. Now, therefore, come and let us fall unto the host of the Syrians: if they save us alive we shall live; and if they kill us we shall but die:" as if in spirituals, persons under discouragements were to imitate them in their dealings with God, when they do not seem that they can get above these discouragements otherwise. But it is a mode of speaking in relation to persons' duties in such a case, which has not countenance from the word of God. For, according to the tenor of this word, we are never to deal with God in a hesitancy, but always in a certainty. We are called to come with boldness to a throne of grace, and to ask nothing doubting; and this is said be "the confidence that we have in him, that if we ask any thing according to his will, he heareth us." Christ says, "Ask and ye shall receive; seek and ye shall find." And he invites to come unto him all who labor and are heavy laden, with an assured promise that he will give them rest.

The character of that God we have to do with, considering that his promise is to be the ground on which we are to seek the blessings of his grace, which we need from him, makes evident that we are not to hesitate a moment in respect to our right to plead the promise, and our duty to trust in him for its accomplishment in our own particular case. He is true, and faithful, and encompassed about with his faithfulness. "Hath he said, and will he not do it? Hath he spoken and will he not make it good?" "He is not a man that he should lie, nor the son of man that he should repent." And the language which we find to be in the mouths of the saints, when in the right exercise of the grace of God, which is in them, they wait on him in his ordinances, and seek him in any of those ways by which he has promised that he will be met with by us, corresponds with the encouragements which the Lord gives unto us, to come unto him and trust in him according to the calls and promises of his grace. "O God, thou art my God, early will I seek thee," speaks the Psalmist; "my soul thirsteth for thee, my flesh longeth for thee in a dry and thirsty land, where no water is; to see thy power and thy glory, as I have seen thee in the sanctuary:" expressive not only of his desire of enjoying God as he had done in former times, but also of his assured hope of doing so when he should again have the opportunity. Again; "My soul, wait thou only upon God, for my expectation is from him." "We shall be satisfied with the goodness of thy house."

The integrity of a fellow-creature would be impeached if making to us a promise concerning any thing, which he professes himself to be ready to do for us, we speak with hesitancy, or carry ourselves with hesitancy, in respect to its accomplishment, or in regard to our welcome to it. And seeing God is revealing himself in so much love and grace in the gospel, and representing himself as waiting to be gracious; giving to all to whom the gospel comes the most free and full welcome to those blessings which he has laid up, for mankind sinners, in Christ. Whatever show of humility there may be in such language, it is strong and

positive unbelief; esteemed so by God, and exceedingly dishonouring to him.

Persons in dealing with discouraged souls are to lay the grounds for assured trust in God before them, plainly and particularly. They are to show them the nature of the promise as free and particular, being made not only to gospel hearers generally, but to them, and not to them as persons possessed of certain good qualifications, which make it to apply to them, but as gospel hearers, as sinners, that they might believe in it and take comfort from it. They are to remind them of God's character as true and faithful, and tell them that they are not upon their peril to disbelieve its application to themselves. They are to show them that so far are they from being warranted to lie under discouragements in respect to their right to the blessings held forth by it, to the acceptance of all who hear the gospel, that God accounts himself dishonored by such discouragements; and that they are guilty of charging him with falsehood if they put away the promise from themselves and take not the comfort it warrants them to take from it. For, "he that believeth not God hath made him a liar, because he believeth not the record that God gave of his Son."

But perhaps some may say, Is not to go to God with a *may be*, or in a peradventure, when persons cannot attain assurance of their welcome, better than not to go to God at all? Ans. There is no going to God but by faith, in the exercise of which grace it is that we come to him through his word, revealing our welcome, by which and upon which faith acts, nor any encouragement to approach him in any other way; for without faith it is impossible to please God in any attempted approach to him: and "he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that *he is the rewarder of them that diligently seek him*. The grounds of our assurance of welcome and right to expect the blessing from God, lying not in ourselves, but in the word; the calls and promises of God being given there, assurance is what any person may attain in a dependance on the Holy Spirit, in the way of a right consideration of whose word it is, and that in that word God is speaking to all who read it or hear it. For, "unto you is the word of this salvation sent." And persons are to be told that they must go out of themselves to God, speaking in his word for it. It is seeking the grounds of it in themselves, and not going to the word for it, which is the cause of all uncertainty about it in gospel hearers. It is in answer to the promise, that God gives out the blessings of his grace to those who obtain them. There is a promise made to faith, but no promise made to unbelief in all the scriptures. And therefore to go to Christ with a *may be* is to go to him in a way in which they have no warrant to expect they will be heard. Persons may come to Christ under much doubting, and yet meet with acceptance, as he is sometimes found of them that seek him not in the due manner. There may be faith too where there is much doubting, or mixed with unbelief. And as a person goes to Christ in faith, notwithstanding all his unbelief, he meets with acceptance. But in dealing with discouraged souls, persons are always to endeavor to have them brought to a knowledge of their welcome, and that it is with a certainty, and not a *may be*, they are to go to Christ.

VI. There are some expressions often used in prayer which are improper, and deserve to be noticed, as the following: "*May we be effectually called.*" "*May we be regenerated.*" "*May we be justified.*" "*May we be adopted into thy family.*" "*May we be united; or, do thou unite us to Christ.*"

These are improper in prayer, as prayer is to be the prayer of faith. And though persons engaging in this duty may not always know that

they are effectually called, regenerated, justified, united to Christ, and adopted into the family of God, by a sensible evidence of this, yet if they are believers, or engage in this duty believingly, the way in which they are required to do it, and the only way in which they can do it acceptably, they are indeed effectually called of God, regenerated, justified, and united to Christ, and also already members of the family of God. The very introductory language of our prayers, as exemplified to us in the Lord's prayer, which is given to us for our direction, as to the manner in which we are to perform the duty, intimates this: "Our Father who art in heaven;" by which all these things are supposed, and the very relation considered as existing, which in petitions of this nature would be prayed for as if it was yet to take place. No man can call God Father, but by the Holy Ghost: namely, as working true faith in him to claim him in this relation, and go to him in this relation, for the blessings he would ask from him. And as he is possessed of this true faith, he is effectually called and regenerated, justified and in union with Christ; for though, as respects the last two, justification and union to Christ, faith goes before the former of these in the order of things, and is the uniting bond on the believer's part, as that the union between him and them is not completed until true faith is exercised upon Christ: yet they go so close together, that the person who believes cannot be said to be unjustified, or to be at any moment of time as a believer, otherwise than united to Christ. It is the union begun by the Spirit's apprehending the sinner, thereby disposing him to the exercise of true faith in Christ, by which the union itself is completed, and the work is so instantaneous, and so connected one part with the other, that it is as effectually called of God and regenerated, that a person believes, and as one that believes he is justified, and in union to Christ. This being the case, to go about the duty of prayer in that way in which the Lord requires of us, that we essay this duty: that is, in faith, it could not be proper to make use of such language in our petitionary addresses to him. To have God as our Father, supposes that we belong to his family of grace, and are in Christ, justified and accepted, as to our persons, and effectually called by his grace. For they are the sons of God, to whom he is a Father; and in union to Christ, for God is the God and Father of believers in Christ, and they are all "the sons of God by faith, which is in Christ Jesus." And thus brought under grace, there is no condemnation for them, but they are justified and accepted ones in Christ.

Though we may not consistently call God Father in our prayers to him, and then pray that we may be effectually called, regenerated, justified and united to Christ, yet we may, with all manner of consistency, address him by this name; and if we know not certainly that we are effectually called, regenerated, &c., we may at the same time seek of him, that he would give us evidence that this is our condition. Though it is the duty of unregenerated sinners to pray to God, yet it is not as unregenerated sinners, but as believers they are to do it, going forward in the duty, in obedience to the call of God, and encouraged by this promise, claiming him as their God and Father through the promise. While they are to address God as their Father in this duty, it is to be done believingly; for "without faith it is impossible to please God:" and "he that cometh to God" in this or any other duty rightly, "must believe that he is, and that he is the rewarder of them that diligently seek him." From the word of God we may learn what we are to pray for, in the example of the saints in this duty, in those formal prayers of theirs, on record there, which they put up on special occasions; and in those implied prayers, which we have throughout the whole word of God, and especially in the book of Psalms, a portion of God's word, which, though it is designed to

furnish the church with what is to be the formal matter of her praises to God, is yet full of petitions. But we find no such petitions as these in the Psalms, or in any other portion of the Scriptures. The Marrow divines teach that we are not to confess our sins to God, and seek pardon and forgiveness from him, as a wrathful judge, which we would do in praying that God would justify us; because, in an unjustified state, it is this pardon we need, and which, in justification, we obtain. The reason why we are not to pray for this is, that in going to God in prayer believingly, the only manner in which we are to do it, we take up with that pardon which we obtain in justification, so we have not need to seek it anew, and have but to pray for suitable evidences of it, and a comfortable enjoyment of the blessings already obtained. Our confessions are to be to him as a father offended, and it is to be fatherly pardon we are to seek from him, such as a justified person often needs. So it is to be with respect to our effectual calling, regeneration, and union to Christ. Going to God believingly, in the duty of prayer, we are not to seek these as if we were without them; because in that believing interest we take in God, when we go to him as the father of our mercies, we have these blessings, and are but to seek that we may be made to know that we have them, and that we may be enabled to walk conformably to so great a privilege, if we are indeed possessed of it.

When we go to God in faith in this duty, we go through Christ as the way, so that in the right performance of it we stand accepted in Christ, or justified, and are partakers of his grace, as already regenerated persons, and persons who are in union to himself; so that not that grace which is received in first believing, is what we are to pray for, but that grace which is necessary to our after sanctification, the mortification of sin in us, and for our spiritual comfort. The man in the gospel does not pray for the grace of faith in order to first believing, but for further believing, or the strengthening and increase of that grace he was already made a partaker of. "Lord I believe, help mine unbelief." None will pray in faith until they are effectually called by grace, regenerated and justified. And it being the fact, that those only who are thus effectually called of God and regenerated will believe, it would be inconsistent to be praying for the grace itself after it is received.

It is true that in the answer to the question, "What is the second petition?" in the shorter Catechism, we are told that we are to pray with respect to Christ's kingdom, that *ourselves* and others *may be brought into it*, and kept in it. But to take this in a sound sense, we must understand it in respect to a bringing into it more and more, in a higher enjoyment of its blessings: because a person who can call God his Father, as he is engaged in presenting to him the prayer of faith, is already in that kingdom, though he may not have always a sensible evidence of it. And the passage of Scripture appended by the Westminster divines as their proof, gives no evidence that they themselves put any other sense upon the words in the question than this: in which view they should be analogous with that exhortation of the Apostle, Phil. ii. 12: "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling," &c., which only intends a working it out in the due use of means, to have the salvation already begun, carried forward to its perfection, as will appear from the character the Apostle himself gives to those he writes the epistle unto, viz., believers, and from the connexion. Those who pray to God aright, have received the spirit of adoption, teaching them to cry *ABBA, Father*: intimating to us that it is under the influence of this spirit we are to pray to God, and that we are not to seek adoption itself, but more of the spirit of adoption, that we may have more of that boldness and confidence which becomes us in dealing with God at the throne of grace. The preface of the Lord's

prayer, the Assembly of divines themselves tell us, teacheth that we are to come to God in prayer, as children to a father. And the answer to "What is the second petition?" in the larger Catechism, shows that nothing more is intended in the answer to the same question in the shorter Catechism than I have mentioned. The words are:

"In the second petition, which is, thy kingdom come, acknowledging ourselves and all mankind to be by nature under the dominion of sin and Satan, we pray that the kingdom of sin and Satan may be destroyed, the gospel propagated throughout the world, the Jews called, the fullness of the Gentiles brought in. The church furnished with all gospel offices and ordinances, purged from corruption, countenanced and maintained by the civil magistrate, that the ordinances of Christ may be purely dispensed, and made effectual for the converting of those that are yet in their sins, and the confirming, comforting and building up of those that are already converted; that Christ would rule in our hearts here, and hasten the time of his second coming, and our reigning with him for ever: and that he would be pleased so to exercise the kingdom of his power in all the world, as may best conduce to this end."

If in the sense that persons are to pray for their own conversion, effectual calling, adoption, regeneration, &c., the words "that we may be brought into it," namely Christ's kingdom, are to be understood in the shorter Catechism, in this question in the larger Catechism, which is intended as an enlargement upon the doctrine contained in the shorter Catechism, for the further elucidation thereof, we have reason to conclude that this would have been explicitly stated. But nothing that amounts to that, or bears towards it in the least, is contained in that answer. Fisher and Erskine, in their explanation of the shorter Catechism, take no notice whatever of the words, "that ourselver may be brought into it," as a thing to be prayed for; but show the means by which persons generally are brought into it, as well as kept in it. But Brown of Haddington, in his explanation, after asking how persons are brought into God's invisible kingdom of grace, and showing the means, he asks also, "Why need believers pray for the coming of God's invisible kingdom of grace, with respect to themselves, when they are already in it?" And answers, "They need to pray that it would come in them more and more;" referring to Phil. iii. 9, 14, as his proof.

I shall now conclude with a few extracts, bearing upon the subject treated on in this article, and tending to illustrate the view I have taken, from Marshal on Sanctification, a work justly esteemed by the judicious class of professing Christians, especially those who are friends to the marrow doctrine; wherein he speaks as follows: "That conscience whereby we judge ourselves to be under the guilt of sin and the wrath of God, is accounted to be an evil conscience, though it performs its office truly." In praying that we may be regenerated, justified, and adopted into God's family, &c., we virtually do judge ourselves to be under the guilt of sin and the wrath of God; because this is the case of all unregenerated and unjustified persons, and of such as are not as yet belonging to God's family, which such a prayer supposes, or why put it up?

Again, "The accomplishing of union with Christ is the first work of saving grace in our hearts. And faith itself, being a holy grace, and part of spiritual life, cannot be in us before the beginning of it; but rather it is given to us and wrought in the very working of the union. This shows that a person endeavoring to go to God in the prayer of faith for blessings he stands in need of, cannot consistently pray that he may be united to Christ, as thereby partaking of a thing he is without, because he has union to Christ with that faith, if he is possessed of it, and acts it truly."

Further: "This union is fully accomplished by Christ giving the spirit of faith to us, even before we act that faith in the reception of him;" "when you truly believe you are regenerated, and not till then." These need no remarks.

And further: "In confession you must condemn yourself, according to the flesh, but not as you are in Christ. You must not deny that grace that you have, as if you were only wicked hitherto and now to begin again;" which persons, in praying that they may be regenerated, justified, and united to Christ, &c., virtually do.

I might add one from the Marrow of Modern Divinity, chapter third, part first, where Evangelista, addressing himself to Neophytus, speaks as follows: "Confess your sins unto him, saying with the prodigal, Luke xv. 21, 'Father, I have sinned against heaven, and in thy sight, and am no more worthy to be called thy son.' And beg pardon and forgiveness at his hands, as you are taught in the fifth petition of the Lord's prayer, Matth. vi. 12. Yet do not you crave pardon and forgiveness at the hands of the Lord as a malefactor at the hands of a judge, that feareth condemnation and death, as though you had sinned against the law of works, and therefore feared hell and damnation: but beg pardon and forgiveness as a child at the hand of his loving father, &c." "To ask in Christ's name believing," says Boston on the covenant of grace, "is to present one's self before the Lord as a member of Christ, joined and cleaving unto him offered unto us in the gospel; and for the sake of the Head to implore the free favor of the promise, relying on his merits for obtaining it." The marrow divines generally may be consulted on the subject.

If in any case these expressions may be justified, can they be so, as used in families, in social fellowship, and frequently by ministers, as the mouths of their congregations, in the duty of public prayer to God? If in such cases these, or any of these petitions be applicable, we must form the idea of families wholly in a state of irregnecy, unconverted and unjustified persons, yet worshipping God regularly, and doing it under a sense of duty, though believing and warranted to believe themselves to be those who need conversion, regeneration, justification, &c. We may consider them as jointly calling God Father, and claiming him in this relation, yet virtually confessing themselves as not his children.

We must form the idea of unconverted congregations, ministers, and people, dispensing and attending on God's ordinances regularly and steadily, and even taking the seals of God's covenant, time after time, whereby they own publicly their relation to God as their covenant God; their interest in Christ, and union to him; and that they are the true friends of Christ. If there is but one converted and justified person, and one in union to Christ, effectually called, &c., in a family, or in a congregation where such a petition is put up, it is inapplicable, as it cannot in truth be the joint petition of the whole where this is the case. The prayer in such a case should be: "Let such of us as are in an unconverted state, and not effectually called by grace, &c., be made the subjects of true conversion, justification, union to Christ, &c. Those who are effectually called, justified, &c., their prayer should be: May we obtain the evidences of these graces and benefits, and walk conformably." When an individual person prays who wants the evidence that he is converted, &c., he should ask that evidence. But for a person to pray that he may be converted, justified, united to Christ, and adopted into God's family, &c., and at the same time call God Father, appears to me to be a contradiction. "For, ye are all *the sons of God by faith* in Christ Jesus." And, "No man can call God Father, but by the Holy Ghost."

[To be Continued.]

ART. III. *Of Heart Wandering, when engaged in Religious Duties.*

MR. EDITOR—The two questions below were originally proposed and answered for a particular purpose. As the subject of which they treat is of general concern, and they may be of use to others besides those for whom they were originally prepared, I place them at your disposal, that you may give them a place in the Monitor if you think they will be of any service to the interests of practical religion among the readers of that periodical.

1. *What are some of the causes of heart wandering when engaged in religious duties, particularly when attending upon public ordinances?*

2. *How are persons who are much troubled with it most likely to be relieved from it?*

I. The primary cause is sin, which has depraved and disunited the heart, that it is unfitted in so far as it is under the influence of that disorder which sin has brought into it, for rendering a right service to God.

II. Secondary causes are:

1. The heart too much engaged about the world through the week; the profits of it; the business of it. The employments of some are very great temptations in this way, and call for particular care.

2. Unwatchfulness.

3. Forgetfulness of the particular presence of God with us when we engage in them, particularly when we are waiting on God in ordinances:

4. Want of due value for ordinances. "Where the treasure is, there will the heart be also." If Christ is the treasure of the heart, we will delight to hear of him and to be near him, in duties and in ordinances, where he is to be found: and he will be so particularly in our thoughts as to fill our desires when waiting on him in ordinances, or engaged in duties, that our attention will by this means be fixed, especially when the heart is brought to view him distinctly as its treasure, and its portion.

5. The taste for divine truth not properly directed and chastened by a desire for what is solid and useful, so that things which excite curiosity more than edifying truths of religion, occupy the attention. We find many persons to be hearers of the word of this description, that if something curious is the subject which is treated of, they are all attention; while, let the massy doctrines of the gospel be preached in their hearing, in all their simplicity, and they can find little satisfaction in them. Jesus, and him crucified, yet a living Saviour, and an exalted Saviour, is the subject of the gospel. And if persons would but endeavor to see the more importance in a sermon; the more of Christ is in it, it would help to fix their minds upon the subject when Christ is preached:

6. Particular temptations of Satan, and a too ready listening to them. When the sons of God came to present themselves before the Lord, Satan of old came also in amongst them: He is busy at all times, more especially then in his endeavor to work upon the corruption of the heart, and through this it is he obtains his influence. And his temptations listened to and not resisted in their first onset in time of particular duties and attending on ordinances, gives him the opportunity of leading the heart away from what it ought to be fixed on, often entirely. At least always in proportion as there is a yielding to him in his attacks, without due care to guard against them.

Among the ways to be relieved from it, the following things may be noticed:

1. Watchfulness against the first motions towards it.

2. A due sense of our wants when we are waiting on God in public ordinances, or engaged in prayer, reading the word, &c.

3. A due sense of the presence of God in them; and deep impressions of his holiness, omniscience, and love, and grace.

4. An endeavor to entertain a due sense of the value of the gospel, keeping this in view in the time of hearing it preached, and in our attendance on all the ordinances of it.

5. An accustoming ourselves with the exercises of God's worship, so as that we become familiar with them, and acquire by this means a readiness for duty. It was the advice of one in respect to the duty of prayer, given to those who feel in themselves an unwillingness to this duty, they desire to be delivered from, "Pray until you love to pray, working thus out your salvation, or endeavoring after the advancement of a work of grace in your souls already begun." The very way of the Lord is strength to those who set out in that way rightly, and go in it obedient to God's command, and depending on his grace. Prov. x. 29.

6. An endeavoring to lay proper restraints upon the outward senses; "making a covenant" particularly "with our eyes," at the entry upon the worship of God, either in public, private, or secret, because from this exercise our depraved lusts are apt to take occasion to excite to vain and wandering thoughts, even in the midst of such solemn work. A wandering eye, in the time of religious duties, is naturally accompanied with a wandering heart. The wandering and giddy eye, at the time when persons are attending on the public worship of God, always evidences inattention to the great and important work they profess to be engaged in.

7. Self-examination before we go up to ordinances, as to motives and reasons, which is of great use, as it tends to show us whether our hearts are right with God for the time, or not. It leads also to thoughtfulness as to the manner in which we are to engage in duties, and attend on ordinances, and serves by these means to assist us much in the performance of the one, and attendance upon the other.

8. Previous meditation through the week, on Sabbath mornings, and about the time of attending on God's worship, whether public, or private, or secret; or on sabbath, or on week days: a portion of time being particularly devoted to this purpose might be very helpful. By this means, the mind is more readily turned to what it is to be employed in, and called away from the world, it is fixed on God. Being engaged in this way, of course, is a special means of preparation for our meeting with God in ordinances and duties. One who carefully observes the operations of his own mind, and the connexion which one part of Christian duty has with another, in his own experience of things, will readily discover that as he is much employed in this way, preparatory to his attending on public ordinances, or essaying the observance of particular duties, or neglects it, it is usually with him better or worse, during the time of his attendance on the one, and being engaged in the other.

9. Taking God's company with us and pleading it. "If thy presence go not with us, carry us not hence."

10. Particular prayer to God that he would prevent these heart wanderings, and remove them when we are troubled with them: "Unite my heart, that I may fear thy name," was the prayer of the Psalmist under the unpleasant sensation of his heart, as often found wandering from God in duty. God is the hearer of prayer, and "for this thing," as well as others, we are to pray concerning what "he will be enquired of by the house of Israel," his professing people, those who would wait on him in ordinances, and perform duties in a right manner, "that he might do it for them." God promises his presence in ordinances and duties, and his promises of this we are to plead; not only his presence as a God of grace, who is to be met with in ordinances and in duties, so as that we

may expect a fellowship with him; but his presence as a God of grace to assist us in them, and to make his grace sufficient for us, perfecting his strength in our weakness.

RESPONSOR.

ART. IV. *The Life of Mr. John Livingston, minister of the gospel; written by himself during his banishment for the cause of Christ.*

(Continued from page 312.)

THE parish of Shots bordered on the parish of Torphichen, where they sometimes resorted, and I was several times invited by Mr. John Howe, minister of Shots, to preach there. In that place I used to find more liberty in preaching than elsewhere; yea, the only day in all my life wherein I found most of the presence of God in preaching, was on a Monday after the communion, preaching in the churchyard of Shots, June 21, 1630. The night before I had been with some Christians, who spent the night in prayer and conference. When I was alone in the fields, about eight or nine o'clock in the morning, before we were to go to sermon, there came such a misgiving of spirit upon me, considering my unworthiness and weakness, and the multitude and expectation of the people, that I was consulting with myself to have stolen away somewhere, and decline that day's preaching, but that I thought I durst not so far distrust God, and so went to sermon, and got good assistance about an hour and a half upon the points I had meditated upon, Ezek. xxxvi. 25, 26. "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean; from all your filthiness and from all your idols will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you, and I will take away the stoney heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh." And in the end, offering to close with some words of exhortation, I was led on about an hour's time, in a strain of exhortation and warning, with such liberty and melting of heart, as I never had the like all my lifetime. Some little of that stamp remained on the Thursday after, when I preached in Kilmarnock; but the very Monday following, preaching in Irvine, I was so deserted, that the points I had meditated and written, and had them fully in my memory, I was not for my heart able to get them pronounced. So it pleased the Lord to counterbalance his dealings, and hide pride from man. This so discouraged me, that I was upon resolution for some time, not to preach, at least not in Irvine; but Mr. David Dickson would not suffer me to go from thence till I preached the next sabbath, to get (as he expressed it,) *amends of the devil*: and so I stayed and preached with some tolerable freedom. By reason of this going from place to place, in summer time, I got acquaintance with many of the godly and able ministers and professors of Scotland, which proved to me a great advantage. The ministers chiefly were Messrs. Robert Bruce, who had been a minister in Edinburgh, John Scrimgeour, who had been at Kinghorn, John Chalmers of Auchterdean, John Dykes of Anstruther, William Scot of Cowper, Alexander Henderson of Leuchars, John Row of Carnock, John Kee of Prestonpans, James Greg of Newmilns, John Fergushel of Ochiltree, Robert Scot of Glasgow, James Ingles of Dalzel, and some others. And of professors, William Rigg of Athernie, the lairds of Halkie, Crogshill and Cunninghamhead, Cosswock and Rowallen, John Stewart, provost of Air, William Rogers, merchant there, John Mair, merchant in Edinburgh, John Hamilton, apothecary there,

James Murray, writer there, the countesses of Eglinton and Lowdon, the ladies Boyd and Robertland, Culross her sister, Monwhanny, Halhill, Raith, Innertail and many others; the memory of whom is very precious and refreshing.

I got not much read, nor any settled study followed all that time, only some touches here and there of sundry both ancient and modern divines. Those whereby I profited most were the sermons of Mr. Robert Rollock, Mr. Robert Bruce, Mr. Joseph Welsh, and Mr. David Dickson, whom I thought, of all that I had read, breathed most of the Spirit of God, were best affected, and most clear, plain and powerful. Several of Mr. Robert Rollock's sermons are in print. I got in loan from John Stewart, in Air, a large book of sermons of Mr. Welsh's, in which are almost nothing but unfolding the inward exercise of the Christian. Mr. Robert Bruce I several times heard, and in my opinion never man spake with greater power since the Apostles' days. There are five or six of his sermons printed; but the chief that I saw were some written preachings of his, which I got of my father and Mr. David Dickson. I often heard and borrowed from Crosshill several of his written sermons.

Several motions were made of calls to churches during this time, as to Linlithgow, North Leith, and Kirkaldy, in which places, upon invitation I preached in reference to a call; but all were obstructed by the bishops.

The third period of my life I reckon from the time I entered to the ministry in Killinchie, in Ireland, till I was settled minister at Straurawer, in Galloway, 1633.

In summer 1630, being in Irvine, Mr. Robert Cunningham, minister at Holywood, in Ireland, and sometime before that Mr. George Dunbar, minister at Lern, in Ireland, propounded to me, seeing there was no appearance I could enter into the ministry in Scotland, whether or not I would be content to go to Ireland? I answered them both, if I got a clear call and a free entry, I would not refuse. About August, 1630, I got letters from the Viscount Clanniboy to come to Ireland, in reference to a call to Killinchie, whither I went, and got a unanimous call from the parish; and because it was needful that I should be ordained to the ministry, and the bishop of Down, in whose diocese Killinchie was, being a corrupt, humourous man, and would require some engagement; therefore, my lord Clanniboy sent some with me, and wrote to Mr. Andrew Knox, bishop of Rapho; who, when I came and had delivered the letters from my lord Clanniboy, and from the earl of Wigtoun, and some others, that I had for that purpose brought out of Scotland, told me he knew my errand; that I came to him because I had scruples against episcopacy and ceremonies, according as Mr. Josias, Welsh and some others had done before; and that he thought his old age was prolonged for little other purpose than to do such offices; that if I scrupled to call him my lord, he cared not much for it; all he would desire of me, because they got there but few sermons, that I would preach at Ramallan the first sabbath, and that I would send for Mr. Cunningham, and two or three other neighboring ministers, to be present; who, after sermon, should give me imposition of hands. But though they performed the work, he behoved to be present; and although he durst not answer it to the state, he gave me the book of ordination, and desired that any thing I scrupled at I would draw a line over it on the margin, and that Mr. Cunningham should not read it; but I found that it had been so marked by some others before, that I needed not mark any thing. So the Lord was pleased to carry that business far beyond any thing I had thought, or almost even desired.

That winter following, I was often in great heaviness; for though the people were very tractable, yet they were generally very ignorant, and I saw no appearance of doing any good among them; yet it pleased the

Lord that in a short time some of them began to understand somewhat of their condition.

The bishop of Down had an ill eye upon me, because I had gone elsewhere to receive ordination, and at a visitation at Down in the Spring following, whither I went much against my will; but Mr. Blair and Mr. Cunningham drew me, saying may staying away would procure more trouble; the bishop asked me, in the presence of all the ministers, what was my judgment of the service book. My answer so displeased him, that there was some appearance I might shortly be censured; but my lord Clanniboy prevailed with him that I might be forborne. The parish of Killinchie being looked upon but as a pendule of another parish, namely, Killileach, there was never any official court kept in it all the while I was there. Not only had we public worship free of any inventions of men, but we had also a tolerable discipline; for after I had been some while among them, by the advice of the heads of families, some ablest for that charge were chosen elders, to oversee the manners of the rest, and some deacons to gather and distribute the collections. We met every week, and such as fell into notorious public scandals, we desired to come before us. Such as came were dealt with, both in public and private to confess their scandal, in presence of the congregation, at Saturday's sermon before the communion, which was celebrated twice in the year. Such as after dealing would not come before us, or coming would not be convinced to acknowledge their fault before the congregation, upon the Saturday preceding the communion, their names, scandals and impenitency were read out before the congregation, and they debarred from the communion; which proved such a terror, that we found very few of that sort.

We needed not to have the communion oftener, for there were nine or ten parishes within the bounds of twenty miles, or little more, wherein there were godly and able ministers, that kept a society together; and every one of these had the communion twice a year, at different times, and had two or three of the neighboring ministers to help thereat, and most part of the religious people used to resort to the communion of the rest of the parishes. These ministers were, Mr. Robert Blair at Bangor, Robert Cunningham at Holywood, James Hamilton at Ballywater, John Ridge at Antrum, Henry Colwort at Old Stow, George Dunbar at Lern, Josias Welsh* at Temple Patrick, Andrew Stuart at Dunagor. Most of all these used to meet on the first of every month at Antrum, where was a great and good congregation, and that day was spent in prayer, and fasting, and public preaching. Commonly two preached in the forenoon and two in the afternoon. We used to come together the Thursday's night before, and stay the Friday's night after, and consulted about such things as concerned the carrying on of the work of God. And these meetings amongst ourselves were sometimes as profitable as either Presbyteries or Synods; and out of these parishes now mentioned, and some others also, such as had religion to heart, used to convene at those meetings; especially out of the Six-mile-water, which was nearest hand, and where was the greatest number of religious people: and frequently the sabbath after the Friday's meeting, the communion was celebrated in one or other of these parishes.

Among all these ministers there was never any jar or jealousy; yea, nor amongst the professors, the greatest part of them being Scots, and some good number of very gracious English; all whose contention was to prefer others to themselves; and though the gifts of the ministers were much different, yet it was not observed that the people followed any, to

* He was the son of John Welsh, and grandson of John Knox.

the undervaluing of others. Many of these religious professors had been both ignorant and profane, and for debt, and want, and worse causes, had left Scotland; yet the Lord was pleased by his word to work such a change. I do not think there were more lively and experienced Christians any where, than were these at that time in Ireland, and that in good numbers, and several of them persons of good outward condition in the world. Being but lately brought in, the lively edge was not yet gone off them, and the perpetual fear that the bishops would put away their ministers, made them with great hunger wait on the ordinances. I have known them come several miles from their own homes, to communions, to the Saturday's sermon, and spend the whole Saturday night in several companies, sometimes a minister being with them, sometimes themselves alone, in conference and prayer, and waited on the public ordinances the whole sabbath, and spent the sabbath night likewise; and yet at the Monday's sermon were not troubled with sleepiness, and so have not slept till they went home. Because of their holy and righteous carriage, they were generally revered even by the graceless multitude among whom they lived. Some of them had attained such dexterity of expressing religious purposes by the resemblance of worldly things, that being at feasts and meals in common inns, where were some ignorant, profane persons, they would among themselves entertain a spiritual discourse for a long time, and the others professed, that though they spoke good English, they could not understand what they said. In those days it was no great difficulty for a minister to preach or pray in public or private, such was the hunger of the hearers, and it was hard to judge whether there was more of the Lord's presence in the public or private meetings.

August 24, 1631. The Lord was pleased to deliver me from a great danger of fire. I lay in a high chamber in John Stuart's house in B., the room was strewed with a great deal of dry sea bent.* I used never after I was asleep to awaken till the morning; yet that night, about 1 o'clock, all the house being fast asleep, I wakened peaceably and thought it had been day, and for a little space kept my eyes shut, and neither heard any noise nor felt any smell; but within a little while, opening my eyes, I saw the flame of the bent, burning within two ells of the bed whereon I lay; for a great fire in the room below, making ready the meat for the reapers, had fired the joist of the chimney, the end of which came into the room where I lay. The fire was betwixt me and the door of the chamber: I rose and took my breeches, my Bible and watch, giving my books and anything else I had for lost, I got out of the door, and called up those of the house. It pleased the Lord, that in a short space they got the fire quenched: whereas, in all appearance, had I slept a quarter of an hour longer, the fire had seized on the roof of the house, covered only with straw, and so not only the house and goods, but our lives had been consumed.

I got not above a year's quiet ministry in Killinchie, for in harvest, 1631, Mr. Robert Ecklen, bishop of Down, suspended Mr. Blair and me, for nonconformity; but the occasion was, that the summer before we had been in Scotland, and had preached in several parts, but especially at a communion in the kirk of Shots, which procured that the bishops in Scotland, and especially Mr. James Laud in Glasgow, sent information against us, by one Mr. Henry Lesly, then dean, afterwards bishop of Down: he and Sir Richard Benton, lord chief baron of Ireland, who used to come to the assize circuits in the north, stirred up the bishop against us. But we were shortly after restored; for worthy Messrs. Dunbar, Welsh, Hamilton and Culvert, went to Iradeth, to Dr. James Usher, pri-

* A kind of sea grass of a small hard stem, somewhat like the fine twigs of broom corn.

mate of Armaugh, not only a learned, but a godly man, though a bishop. Hither came also Sir Andrew Stuart, after lord castle Stuart, to deal for us. The primate very carefully dealt for us with the bishop, so that we were at that time restored. But the bishops of Scotland sent information to the king against us, by Mr. John Maxwell, called bishop of Ross; and thinking that nonconformity would not be a crime sufficiently heinous, they informed that we stirred up the people to extasies and enthusiasms. There were indeed, in some parishes, especially in Braidisland, where was a godly aged minister, Mr. Edward Bryce, some people who used to fall on a high breathing and panting, in time of sermon, as those who have run long; but most of the ministers, and especially those who were complained of, discountenanced these practises, and suspected them not to proceed from any working of the Spirit of God, and that upon this ground: that these people were alike affected, whatever purpose was preached; yea, though by one who had neither gifts nor good affection to the work of God; and accordingly, few of these people ever came forward to any solid exercise of Christianity, but continued ignorant and profane, and left off that seeming motion. It is likely Mr. Henry Lesly had informed this against us. However, upon these informations, the king wrote to the lords justices of Ireland, and by them to the bishop of Down, that Messrs. Dunbar, Blair, Welsh, and I, should be tried and censured.

The 4th of May, 1632, the bishop deposed Mr. Blair and me, and eight days after, Mr. Dunbar and Mr. Welsh. He proceeded against us for nonconformity, never mentioning what was in the king's letter, knowing us to be free of that charge. Therefore we resolved, for our own vindication, and upon some hopes that we might be restored again, to petition the king that we might be tried on what was informed, and if found guilty, we refused no punishment: otherwise, that for simple nonconformity, we might in respect of our Scottish breeding, be forborne with in such a barren place as the north part of Ireland. Upon this design, shortly after, Mr. Blair went to London, and I to Scotland, with a purpose to follow him; only I was to procure letters from my lady marchioness of Hamilton, and from the earls of Eglintoun, Linlethgow, and Wigtoun, to some of their friends at court, that we were free of what was informed, and to desire toleration in our nonconformity. Mr. Blair wrote to me that it was needless for me to come, and only required that I should send those letters, which I did. He, after tedious onwaiting, at last obtained a letter from the king to Stafford, lord deputy, that the information should be tried, and if we were free some favor should be showed us. And after the letter was thus drawn up by the secretary, the king wrote on the margin with his own hand, that the matter should be narrowly tried; and seeing he had got from some persons of honor, attestations of our innocency, that the informers should be punished if we were free. But when Mr. Blair took this letter to the deputy of Dublin, it seems he had got new advertisement from Laud, who guided all church matters at court; for he refused, except we would conform, to take any trial, or show any favor. So we continued deposed till May, 1634. At that time, there being some little difference between Stafford and some of the English nobles in Ireland, and Stafford speaking occasionally with my lord castle Stuart, a good and wise man, he took occasion to show him that he might gain the hearts of all the Scots in Ireland, if he would restore the deposed ministers, for which he had also some warrant from the king. Hereupon he wrote that we should be restored.

[To be Continued.]

ART. V. Doctrinal Differences in the Presbyterian Church

[Concluded from page 317.]

In chap. vi., sec 3 and 4, of our Confession of Faith, it is said, speaking of the fall of our first parents, and of their sin—"They being the root of all mankind, the guilt of this sin was imputed, and the same death in sin and corrupted nature conveyed to all their posterity, descending from them by ordinary generation. From this original corruption, whereby we are utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all good, and wholly inclined to all evil, do proceed all actual transgressions." In chap. vii., sec. 2, it is stated—"The first covenant made with man, was a covenant of works, wherein life was promised to Adam, and in him to his posterity, upon condition of perfect and personal obedience." In questions 12, 16, 18, of our Shorter Catechism, (to save space we omit the fuller statement of the Larger Catechism,) we read as follows—"When God created man, he entered into a covenant of life with him, upon condition of perfect obedience: the covenant being made with Adam, not only for himself, but for his posterity, all mankind descending from him by ordinary generation, sinned in him, and fell with him in his first transgression. The sinfulness of that estate, whereinto man fell, consists in the guilt of Adam's first sin, the want of original righteousness, and the corruption of his whole nature, which is commonly called original sin." The 82d question and answer of this Catechism are as follows:—*Q.* Is any man able perfectly to keep the commandments of God? *A.* No mere man, since the fall, is able, in this life, perfectly to keep the commandments of God, but doth daily break them in thought, word and deed.

Let our readers mark well how many contradictions of the above extracts from the public authoritative standards of our church, are at present publicly avowed, orally and in print, by ministers in the Presbyterian church, who have solemnly adopted those standards at their licensure or ordination.

1. It is explicitly stated, in the foregoing extracts, "that the first covenant made with man was a covenant of works"—that it was "made with Adam, not only for himself, but for his posterity." But it is now denied that there ever was a covenant of works made with Adam, either for himself or his posterity. All the errors under this general head unavoidably involve this denial—whether made in explicit terms or not. The federal headship of Adam is discarded as an antiquated notion.

2. It is explicitly declared, in speaking of our first parents, that "they being the root of all mankind, the guilt of this sin was imputed." At present, in the Presbyterian church, the imputation of Adam's first sin, is absolutely scorned. We will not say that "nineteen-twentieths" of our clergy absolutely reject it, but we do seriously fear that at least a moiety of them disbelieve it.

3. It is unequivocally declared in the Confession and Catechism, that "the same death in sin and corrupted nature [of our first parents] was conveyed to all their posterity"—that "the sinfulness of that estate whereinto man fell, consists in the guilt of Adam's first sin, the want of original righteousness, and the corruption of his whole nature, which is commonly called original sin." These positions of our standards are denied as openly and positively, although we hope not quite so generally, as that of the immediately preceding item. In regard to the quotation from the Catechism, we heard a clergyman in the Synod to which we belong, on being asked, before the Synod, if he believed it, answer categorically, "I do not."

4. It is stated, in the above questions from our standards, that "from

this original corruption, [derived from our first parents] we are utterly indisposed, *disabled*, and made opposite to all good, and wholly inclined to all evil—and that “this corruption of his [man’s] whole nature, is commonly called original sin.” This fundamental point in Christian theology, for which all the Reformers contended, (and none so earnestly and ably as Calvin,) which is called in some Formularies “birth sin,” and in ours, as we have just seen, “original sin,” is now violently impugned, and totally set aside, by not a few religious teachers, in both the Presbyterian and Congregational churches. Taking ground on some dogmas of their “philosophy, falsely so called,” they maintain that “all sin consists in voluntary action—in man’s *own act of choice*,” and consequently that infants, before they are capable of discerning good and evil as the objects of *choice*, are perfectly free from sin; as destitute of any moral taint as Adam was at his first creation—from whom, it is maintained, they inherit no corruption whatever, and to whom they sustain no other relation than that which every infant now bears to his father. This is Pelagianism of the highest kind; and it is rampant, and spreading like a leprosy in many portions of the Presbyterian church.

5. Our quotation from the Confession of Faith affirms, that by man’s “original corruption” he is utterly “*disabled* to all good,” as well as “made opposite” to it, and “inclined to all evil.” And the Catechism teaches that “no mere man since the fall is *able*, in this life, perfectly to keep the commandments of God.” Now it has become fashionable to deny this outright—to maintain that man has natural ability to keep all the commandments of God, and to keep them perfectly. We have not long since seen it in print, by a Presbyterian minister, that Satan never invented a more successful artifice to ruin souls, than the preaching of the very doctrine of our standards—the natural inability of unsanctified men to obey the commandments of God.

II. As our Confession of Faith and Catechisms teach the entire corruption, depravity, and impotence of man in his natural state, so they hold forth with equal clearness and explicitness, that his recovery to holiness and the divine favor, is wholly free, and from the power and free grace of God. It is said, Confession of Faith, chap. vi. sec. 3, that “man by his fall, having made himself incapable of life by that covenant, the Lord was pleased to make a second, commonly called the Covenant of Grace, promising to give unto all those that are ordained unto life his Holy Spirit, to make them willing and *able* to believe.” And in the Larger Catechism, in answer to the sixty-seventh question, it is affirmed that “effectual calling is the work of God’s almighty power and grace, whereby he does, in his accepted time, invite and draw them [the elect] to Jesus Christ, by his word and Spirit; savingly enlightening their minds, renewing and powerfully determining their wills, so as they (although in themselves dead in sin,) are hereby made willing and *able*, freely to answer his call, and to accept and embrace the grace offered and conveyed therein.” We omit the answer to the question on effectual calling in the Shorter Catechism, which is of the same import as that here recited.

The foregoing doctrine of our Confession of Faith and Catechisms notwithstanding, we have heard a sermon from a Presbyterian minister, the avowed purport of which was to show *what* God had done for the salvation of man, and that he had done *all* that was necessary and proper to be done; and yet the gift and work of the Holy Spirit was not mentioned, or alluded to, from the beginning to the end of the discourse. It was not intimated, in all that was said, that in the great concern of renovation, and the acceptance of Christ as he is freely offered in the gospel, man needed the quickening influence and the special aid of the Spirit of all grace—nor needed any assistance whatever, beyond the proper exer-

cise of his own powers. That man is essentially active in *regeneration*—in regeneration strictly considered, and as distinguished from *conversion*—is both proclaimed and printed; although our standards explicitly declare that he is “dead in sin.” In fact the *effective*, and often, we believe, the *intended* impression, made on the minds of their hearers, by the preachers to whom we refer, is, that men are fully able to convert themselves, without any other divine aid than what every man under the light of the gospel already possesses. They are told that they can and ought to *will* it; and if they do, they will go away renewed in the temper of their minds. We have been credibly and recently informed, that a Presbyterian minister said—we understood *publicly*—that we ought not to pray that God would convert sinners, but that he would convince them, that they can convert themselves. And indeed this is only putting into words, the system which is substantially taught and inculcated, by the whole class of preachers and writers to whom we here refer.

III. In the chapter on justification, in the Confession of Faith (chap. xi. sec. 1) it is said, “Those whom God effectually calleth, he also freely justifieth—by imputing the obedience and satisfaction of Christ unto them, they receiving and resting on him and his righteousness by faith; which faith they have not of themselves, it is the gift of God.”

Again, in the third section of this chapter, we are taught that “Christ by his obedience and death, did fully discharge the debt of all those that are thus justified, and did make a proper, real and full satisfaction to his Father’s justice in their behalf.” In both Catechisms the same doctrine is clearly laid down. We quote only the Larger Catechism, question 70. “What is justification? *A.* Justification is an act of God’s free grace unto sinners, in which he pardoneth all their sins and accounteth their persons as righteous in his sight; not for anything wrought in them or done by them, but only for the perfect obedience and full satisfaction of Christ, by God imputed to them, and received by faith alone.”

Now, there are preachers and writers in the Presbyterian church, who, if they had distinctly intended to gainsay almost every idea contained in the essential article of our Creed, as stated above, could scarcely have done it more effectually and explicitly, than they have studiously attempted to do. According to them, the “atonement” (a word not found in the doctrinal part of the standards of our church,) did not consist in “Christ, by his obedience and death, fully discharging the debt of all those that are justified, and by making a proper, real and full satisfaction to his Father’s justice in their behalf.” All this is most unequivocally denied. It is explicitly asserted that Christ did not endure the penalty of the violated law of God, in behalf of his people; and of course did not discharge their debt: that the atonement is merely an exhibition of the displeasure or wrath of God against sin, and was made for all mankind alike and equally; was an offering made for the race; did not by itself secure the salvation of any one; and consequently did not make a proper, real and full satisfaction to the justice of God in behalf of all those that are saved: for these men profess to reject the doctrine of universal salvation. In a word, all ideas of substitution, or that Christ took the sinner’s place, and obeyed and suffered in the room and stead of his people, are completely, and by some indignantly, rejected. And as to his righteousness, consisting of his active obedience to the law of God, and passive endurance of the penalty—being imputed to his people, as the meritorious cause of their justification, it is regarded and treated as an absurdity, and even as an impossibility. The old orthodox terms of “atonement,” “justification,” and the “righteousness of Christ,” are retained; for what purpose we know not, if it is not to blind the populace, and leave them impressed with the belief that there is no real difference between the sentiments of these men and their orthodox brethren.

We wish it to be understood, that a principal part of our purpose, in making the exhibit that we are now closing, is to let our readers see what is the *doctrinal* difference between the parties that divide and distract the Presbyterian church. Let them look at it and consider it well: and when they have done so, we ask,

1. Is there not only a *real*, but a *wide* difference? To us it does seem, after the most serious and impartial view that we have been able to take of the whole matter, that here are *two systems*—two systems which in their characteristic features, are directly opposed to each other. If we understand the doctrinal system of our Confession of Faith and Catechisms, the principle of **IMPUTATION** is fundamental, and essential to the whole. Deny the imputation of Adam's covenant breaking sin, with its consequences, (as specified in our standards,) to all his posterity; deny the imputation of the sins of believers to their Surety Saviour, and the full satisfaction which, when imputed, he made for their sins, to divine law and justice; and deny the imputation of the finished righteousness of Christ to his people, for their justification before God, and their title to eternal life—and you deny a very large part of the very essence of the doctrinal standards of our church. But the party contemplated do unequivocally deny all this; as well as the other fundamental principle of regeneration, as being *exclusively* the work of the Holy Spirit. The most frank and candid among them will tell you so expressly. Question them on each of the points to which imputation applies, as stated above, and they will tell you, that they do not hold this, that, or the other.—Yet they will preach, after all, in such a manner as to lead the people to believe that they cannot be far wrong—that the most of the difference between them and their brethren, is only a difference in language—a dispute about words—that in reality they all think alike—or as Prof. M. has it, “are sufficiently near to the Scriptures and to each other, in respect to all the essentials of truth, to be comfortably united in Christian fellowship and co-operation.” Great was the delight which this declaration gave to the whole party. It was the very thing which they wished, and which they still wish, and labor to have believed. It gained an admission of the letter which contained it, and a few of the succeeding ones, into their periodicals. But they found after a while that they must treat the Professor pretty much as a Quaker preacher treated Whitfield, when he had spoken a short time in one of their meetings—“Friend George,” said the Quaker, interrupting him, “I think thou hast said *about enough*.” And so no more of the Professor's letters, so far as we have seen or heard, have appeared in any of their papers.

2. Is it true that “nineteen-twentieths of the ministers of the Presbyterian church, are sufficiently agreed in all the essentials of truth, to be comfortably united in Christian fellowship and co-operation?” We take it for granted, not only from what we personally know of Prof. M., but from what he says in immediate connexion with the quoted passage, that those who materially disagree, in relation to the points which we have exhibited from the Constitution of our church, cannot be comfortably united in Christian fellowship and co-operation. It follows, necessarily, that his estimate is, that not more than one in twenty of our ministers hold the obnoxious system which we have endeavored to expose. Now, without stating any calculation of our own, we shall offer a few reasons, briefly, why we think the Professor's estimate must be exceedingly erroneous. We first mention the free and fearless manner in which the advocates of unsound doctrine preach and publish their opinions. Would they do this, if they were not well assured, that far more than one in twenty are prepared to stand by them? Or if they would still state, preach and print as they do, *could* they do it, without suffering disci-

pline? No, assuredly. They well know that there is a *large party*—in the General Assembly of the church, probably a *majority*—who either through fellowship with their errors, or reluctance to offend those who are in such fellowship, will see them safe and sound through any jeopardy into which the orthodox may endeavor to bring them.

Again: Look at the theological seminaries in our land, that send forth their pupils to become, and who actually and immediately become, ministers in the Presbyterian church. Are nineteen-twentieths of these substantially sound in the faith? Have the professors of the seminary in which Dr. M. sustains his office, been able to prevent many of their pupils from maintaining and advocating, through their whole course, several of the obnoxious sentiments to which we have adverted; and from preaching and publishing them, after they have left the institution? We know they have not. But let us not be misunderstood. We believe the professors in that seminary have honestly and faithfully labored to imbue the minds of their pupils with sound doctrine; and that they sincerely lament that they have too often labored in vain. We firmly believe that the evil arises from the minds of some of the youth being so preoccupied before they enter the seminary, and from knowing that popular opinion is much in their favor; that they can neither be convinced of their errors from all the lectures they hear, nor be restrained from defending, and even endeavoring to propagate them, in the institution. And others, who leave the seminary apparently and avowedly sound in the faith, find so many clergymen opposed to their sentiments, and the popular current in the places where they are located so strongly set against them, that at length they yield and swim with the tide. Could this take place to half the extent to which it has taken place, if nineteen-twentieths of our ministers were substantially orthodox? We are confident it could not.

Once more, and finally: Whether it is known to Prof. M. or not, it is known to us, that on one side there are strong hopes, and on the other side strong fears, that in the event of the death of any one of the present professors of the Princeton seminary, a man of the same, or similar theological tenets with the defunct, could not be chosen in his place. "Nineteen-twentieths" of our clergy substantially sound in the faith, when this is the case! Impossible! We fear that even a majority will not be found so, or not found so with a sufficient firmness and decision whenever another professor is to be elected in that seminary. We are ready to weep over the prospect; although it is probable we shall not live to see the event. Our duty, we think, consists in making known the danger, that measures may, if possible, be taken to prevent its being realized.—*Christ. Advocate.*

ART. VI. *Popish Method of making Converts.*

In a late number of the *Presbyterian*, in which the editor is replying to some attacks made in the *Roman Catholic Herald*, upon Protestant missions, we find the following passages, taken from "Letters on the state of Christianity in India, "by the Abbe Dubois, a Roman Catholic missionary. The Abbe, after denying the possibility "of making converts to Christianity among the natives of India," says:

"The Christian religion has been announced to the natives of India (by the Jesuit missionaries,) without intermission, during the last three or four centuries; at the beginning with some faint hopes of success, but at present with no effect." That "he had labored in India two and thirty years in *vain*—every where the seeds sown by him have fallen upon a naked rock, and

have instantly dried away. At length, entirely disgusted at the total inutility of his pursuits, and warned by his grey hairs that it was full time to think of his own concerns, he has returned to Europe to pass in retirement the few days he may still have to live." "The low state to which it. (popery) is now reduced, and the contempt in which it is held, cannot be surpassed. There is not at present in the country more than a third of the Christians who were to be found in it eighty years ago, and this number diminishes every day, by frequent apostasy. It will dwindle to nothing in a short period."

The Abbe next proceeds to show that nothing had been omitted of all the means upon which the Romish Church depends for making converts. Take his own words:

"We withheld from them the Scriptures—we concealed with care every thing in the Christian religion likely to wound the feelings, or offend the prepossessions of the natives, and endeavored in every possible way to conciliate their minds—our priests styled themselves Brahmins, made frequent ablutions, applied to their foreheads the holy paste, made of sandal wood, and put on the idolatrous dress—we indulged their taste for idolatry by substituting the images of the Virgin, Peter, Thomas, Sebastian and other saints, for the Lingum, Maha Deva, &c.—we indulged their taste for pompous ceremonies, for we celebrated the great festivals of the church by a theatrical representation of the event commemorated, and followed it by an exhibition of fire-works, accompanied by repeated shouts, and the barbarous music of the Indians, as at the Hindoo festivals—we imitated the ceremony of the Rutt, by placing the image of the Virgin on a car and dragging it round the church, in the same manner as the Hindoos drag their idols round their temples—our maxim was, 'if we come among dogs, we must do as dogs do'—in a word, we adopted every expedient to make the transition from Hindooism to Christianity as easy as possible."

Now, the only importance to be attached to these statements, made by a Roman Catholic dignitary, and missionary to India, is simply this:—they teach us two important facts, which the people of this country will be compelled to learn, or surrender up both their religion and their liberty; and the entire history of Popery in every age, from its commencement down to this day, demonstrates, beyond the possibility of doubt, the same facts, to wit: that conversion to Popery is not conversion to Christianity—and that Papists assimilate themselves to the manners and customs of those countries which they seek to proselyte, whether those customs be right or wrong, Pagan or Christian, that they may undermine and overthrow them. Let us see if the above extract will not prove both these assertions.

First, We have asserted that conversion to Popery is not conversion to Christianity. Supposing the Abbe and his coadjutors had succeeded in converting the "natives of India" from the worship of "Lingum, Maha Deva," &c., to that of the "Virgin, Peter, Thomas, Sebastian, and other saints," their worship would have been *idolatry* still, and consequently not Christianity: because no sin is more pointedly condemned in the Scriptures, than is every species of idolatry and image worship, and even *imaging making*, for religious purposes. Therefore, the only object that could have been obtained by the conversion of the "natives of India," would have been to extend the power of the Roman Pontiff. And this is the mainspring of Popery. It is the lever that moves all Popish missionary operations.

Second, We have asserted, that Papists assimilate themselves to the customs of those countries which they seek to proselyte, that they may undermine and overthrow them. "Our maxim was," says the Abbe, "if we come among dogs we must do as dogs do." If this do not prove our assertion, it is because some facts are so simple and certain as not to be capable of proof. Thus we see that Popery is a base fraud upon mankind. It is one of the mightiest engines ever invented by Satan to enslave the bodies of men, and make merchandize of souls.

But let us apply these facts to our own country. The Papists have come among us American "dogs." They are spending vast sums of money to convert us, body and soul, to the Roman See. That *free government, Austria, has taken our miserable condition into its Christian*

sympathies, and is sending us hordes of Popish priests. They come here; they find a happy, young and flourishing republic. They find a vast number of Protestant sects; differing in their religious views, yet jointly and harmoniously maintaining an admirable civil government. They find also quite a number of freethinkers, as they call themselves; and that a great proportion of the people *talk* more of liberty than they *understand* of its nature and invaluable blessings. And the rabble that followed Demetrius the silver smith, did not shout "Great is Diana of the Ephesians," louder than these miscreants shout, great is the goddess of liberty! And that they may secure the co-operation of our freethinkers, they join them in crying against Protestants, union of church and state!* And finding themselves flattered by office seekers, they bring to the polls a miserable array of foreign paupers, to vote away the rights and privileges of American citizens. They find charitable institutions for the maintenance and education of poor children, and their compassion also yearns over orphan and destitute children, especially those of Protestant parents. Thus they act on the maxim of doing as we American *dogs* do, that they may prevent us from barking, while they assist the old Roman *fox* in stealing away our liberties. For, let it be remembered, that they adopt "every expedient to make the transition" from Christianity to Popery, and from liberty to despotism, "as easy as possible."

Yet Americans, men boasting of freedom, will neither see nor hear. They hug this viper to their bosom, and should they do so till it becomes sufficiently warmed, it will sting them to the heart. Americans join with the miserable and degraded slaves of a foreign despot, who claims absolute power over both soul and body, in crying church and state! Presbyterians are seeking to subvert our liberties! While it is a well known fact, that no country on earth has enjoyed a greater degree of civil and religious liberty, than has the United States for the last fifty years; and that all the different denominations of Protestants have used, and are still using their endeavors to maintain and transmit unimpaired this precious blessing of heaven; and while it is equally well known, that in all Roman Catholic countries the first buddings of liberty are blasted by a most abhorrent superstition, upheld and kept in being by the arm of secular power. Yet these men cry church and state! Now such as cannot see the design and tendency of all this, wilfully shut their eyes against the light. The Catholics mean to use the freethinkers among us, in the hope of setting the tide of public opinion against Protestants sufficiently strong to destroy what little of Protestant influence there is still remaining in the government, and divert it to themselves. If this can be done, they will easily find means to repeal or explain away existing laws that stand in their way. And although our gentlemen freethinkers may enjoy the satisfaction of seeing a religion which they no doubt hate, persecuted and oppressed, yet this satisfaction will be wofully marred when they shall hear the clanking and feel the weight of their own chains. It is probable this design will never be accomplished; but that it exists, there is no manner of doubt. And if it should not prove successful, no thanks will be due to these American freethinkers; nor to those politicians who use Popery as a stepping stone to power and influence.

LAOS.

* Vide, for five years past, a paper published in New-York, and mis-called the *Truth Teller*.

ART. VII. *Remarks on an Article in the Christian Examiner.*

The following article, headed *STRICTURES ON THE ASSOCIATE'S TESTIMONY*, appears in the January number of the *Religious Examiner*, a periodical edited by Rev. Samuel Findley, of the Associate Reformed Church.

Mr. Editor,—A book has lately come to my hand, entitled, "A Display of the Religious Principles of the Associate Synod of North America, revised by the Synod, 1813, fourth edition, Pittsburgh, 1829." About 58 pages of this book are filled up with a history of the Church, from the year 1560 to the year 1784. Chapter 10 treats of the Constitution of the Associate Reformed Synod. It commences with saying,—“The Constitution framed by a Synod of these United Brethren, is one of the most dubious professions of faith we remember to have seen made by any church. Almost every article of it is expressed in such a manner as may be understood in different senses; and we have reason to believe that it was thus framed with that very design.”

Now, any one that wants to know if this is truth, has nothing to do but to compare the Constitution with the Westminster Confession of Faith. He will find that there is not one word of difference from beginning to end, only on the power of the magistrate, and on that point the Associate church has altered it as much as the Associate Reformed has done. The Constitution referred to was made and adopted in 1799. The second edition was printed at Pittsburgh, in 1827. The Testimony was printed at Pittsburgh in 1823. Now is it possible that the Associate Church in 1823 knew not what was contained in the Constitution? Certainly they could not but know it. The truth is, they have published a wilful falsehood to slander the Associate Reformed Church. Is this the way the Associate Church bears testimony for truth, and against error or falsehood? Is there not falsehood in that very Testimony itself, to which they bind up their people so strictly? This, with other falsehoods contained in chapter 10, the ministers keep their people ignorant of, as much as possible. They could tell their people that their synod had long since agreed that there was no just cause why the two churches should not unite. This some may dispute; but we can show the document, signed by the moderator and clerk. If they would tell their people this, they would not be so shy of attending on the ministrations of the Associate Reformed Church. Consider that this edition was revised after the Constitution was adopted, in 1799. If there had been any thing in the former Testimony that they thought was not truth, then we think was the time to have altered it. They cannot now go farther back than 1813 to lay the blame of it on any former edition; nor can they refer to any publication by the Associate Reformed Church before the Constitution was adopted in 1799, to cease their falsehoods.

I also notice, in said chapter 10, p. 51, that it is said, “But the pointed Testimony promised by our brethren is not to be seen.”

This is as palpable a falsehood as was ever put in type. To prove this, we refer to those Testimonies, which are to be seen in thousands, emitted at different times and on different subjects, since the Constitution was first adopted. I wonder how they could miss seeing the last which was lifted and printed by the Associate Reformed Synod of the West, at near the same time and place that the Associate's Act and Testimony was printed. If they had said that they had not seen it, they might have plead ignorance; but they say it is “not to be seen”—which puts it out of their power to prove what they have said, to be truth. When I obtained my copy of said Testimony of the Associate Reformed Synod, all the members of Synod had been supplied, and still many copies not taken. None are so blind as those who will not see. It would be very strange that an advertisement should be printed in the pamphlet of Rev. J. Steele on Slavery, notifying that the Judicial Testimonies emitted from time to time by the Associate Reformed Church would shortly be published, if no such Testimonies existed.

Again,—at page 53 it is said: “According to the 5th article of this new Synod's Constitution, a minister is not to be excommunicated, and may not even be deposed from his office, for any violations of the law of God, unless they are what the Synod may judge notorious.”

This, like the other, is false, and no where to be found in the Constitution. Such sentiments do not belong to the Associate Reformed Church. If the Associates ever saw it any where, it must have been in some of their own writings.

Again—in page 54, it is said: “This new Synod, so far as we can understand the 6th and 7th articles of their Constitution, have one set of terms on which they will admit people to what they call *FIXED* communion, and another set of terms on which they will admit people to what they call *OCCASIONAL* communion,” &c. &c.

The Constitution is not silent on the terms of admission to our communion. I shall give the very words of the Constitution. “The terms on which any person or persons shall be admitted as a member or members of this church, are, a profession of faith in the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as the perfect and only rule of faith and practice—together with an approbation of the Confession of Faith, Larger and Shorter Catechisms, form of Church Government, and Directories for Worship, as therein received—a holy life and conversation—and subjection to the order and discipline of the church.” I ask the reader whether he understands the Constitution in the way that the Testimony sets it forth—or, does it not appear that they would wish to misrepresent and slander the Associate Reformed Church and Constitution? I do not believe that any person, on reading the Constitution, ever did think, that what was asserted in the Testimony was the meaning of the Constitution. To say that they printed the 2d edition as it was in the 1st, is a pitiful excuse. If they printed it without examining whether it is truth or not, they manifested that they did not care whether it was truth or falsehood—They would not have published such falsehoods on themselves without

looking—and certainly ought to have searched the Constitution to see if these things were so, when they revised their Testimony in 1813—or when they reprinted it in 1823.

I notice that in page 50 it is said: "All that is required of ministers, and elders, and deacons, belonging to that society, at their ordination, as a profession of the principles of Christianity, &c., is—that they approve the principles exhibited in this Constitution, and profess a resolution to adhere thereto," &c. They go on to the end of the second obligation, as it is in the Constitution—and show by the quotation that they had the Constitution before them; but why they say "ALL that is required"—and yet leave out the first, and part of the second, and the fifth, that follow in the formula of questions for ministers and elders, is strange indeed. It agrees, however, with what they say in this chapter, which is, to get people to believe that no one ought to join the Associate Reformed Church, but come and enlist under their banner. Of this quotation we may reckon one-seventh part as true, and six-sevenths as false. Indeed, the whole of chapter 10 is about the same, and no selection need be made. I would advise the Associate Church, in the next edition of their Testimony, that those things which they must see and know are not in the Constitution (to which I have referred,) should be left out. For us to suffer others to publish falsehoods against us, and make no reply, would be "to lie against our right." Job xxiv. 6. This would be a sin in us, and it would encourage them in sin.

I do earnestly wish that the elders and common people would examine the Constitution for themselves, and they will find that their ministers have deceived them, as some of the Associate elders did, at the time of union between our Church and a body of the Associates in the South. At the meeting for this purpose, lately held at Waxsaws, these elders declared publicly that Rev. Mr. K., and others of their ministers, had given them false representations of the Constitution, and that they never would acknowledge the Testimony containing such misrepresentations of our Constitution. This was the result of their comparing the Constitution and Testimony; and I well believe that many would do the same, if they would take the pains to obtain a knowledge of the truth. The terms of union will be published shortly.

These few lines are from a ploughman, who cares not how many enemies he makes by publishing NECESSARY TRUTHS.

JAMES HARRIS.

York District, S. C., Nov. 26, 1833.

The writer of the above STRICTURES has done manifest injustice to the Associate Church, and not only so, but to his own conscience also; for he has knowingly and wilfully perverted and misrepresented the TENTH CHAPTER of the NARRATIVE prefixed to their TESTIMONY. He represents the Associate Church in 1784, (the date of their Narrative) as finding fault with a Constitution of the Associate Reformed Synod, which was made about fifteen years afterwards, viz: in 1799! It is true, that the chapter in the Narrative alluded to, does point out some defects in a certain specified Constitution of the Associate Reformed Synod; but our very discerning author would have his readers believe, that the Constitution referred to, as containing those defects, was that of 1799, the present Constitution of the Associate Reformed Church! And because he cannot find those specified defects in this last named Constitution, he raises "the hue and cry" that the "Associates" "have published a wilful falsehood to slander the Associate Reformed Church!" And the Rev. editor of the Examiner unites with him in this very *brotherly and charitable* asseveration! We wonder that Mr. Harris, after having examined the present Constitution of his church, without finding any of those defects, referred to, and after knowing that this Constitution was as yet in "the womb of futurity," at the time the Narrative was written, did not take it into his head to suspect, whether or no there might not have been some other Constitution of the Associate Reformed Synod, which the "Associates" had their eye upon? We should, indeed, feel willing to attribute his bungling misrepresentation of matters to his ignorance, or lack of information, (for he takes pains to tell us that he is only a "ploughman,") but we cannot make even this allowance for him; because he *knew*, at the very time he wrote his strictures, that it was the first Constitution of the Associate Reformed Synod which was framed in 1783, and not their present one, which is animadverted upon in chap. x. of the Narrative. We say distinctly that he *knew* this. It is utterly impossible that he should not have *known* it; because it is expressly stated in the Narrative, in the very first sentence which he mutilates and quotes. The Narrative reads thus: "But these (the articles) soon gave way to what was still more defective and ambiguous, viz: the Constitution framed by a Synod of these United Brethren, 1783. This last is one of the most dubious professions," &c. This Mr. H. quotes as follows: "The Constitution framed by a Synod of these United Brethren is one of the most dubious professions," &c. Did he not see the figures 1783! Or did he regard them as some unintelligible Arabic characters that had no business there, and that might be dispensed with without at all affecting the sense? We say, then, that he *knew* that he was wilfully misrepresenting our Synod, when he penned his strictures. By artfully leaving out the date of the Constitution animadverted upon, he would persuade his readers that the "Associates in 1784, condemned the present Constitution of the Associate Reformed Church, which he admits himself was made and adopted in 1799! Yes, would persuade them (for he expressly states it,) that "they had this Constitution before them," fifteen years before it was born! But the writer's design in all this is obvious. He hopes by this artifice to seduce some of our less informed members into the communion of his Church. We can see no other object which he *could* have in view; especially when we consider, that of our people living in his section of country, many are dissatisfied with our Synod's late act respecting slavery, and who, he might suppose, would on that account allow themselves the more readily to be imposed upon by his misrepresentations. But a person, though having proselyting ends in view, should never resort to such barefaced jeaunism.

The remarks, contained in our Narrative, on the first Constitution of the Associate Reformed

Church, have never yet been shown to be incorrect. Indeed their correctness was virtually admitted, when that Constitution was laid aside and the present one adopted. And we are inclined to think that their correctness would be acknowledged even by Mr. H. himself, had he ever seen the *Constitution* on which they bear; since he seems to manifest an abhorrence at the very idea of having his church tarnished with the charges they contain.

But why has not our Synod altered or erased the tenth chapter of the Narrative, since the Associate Reformed Church have adopted another Constitution? Because, though churches change their Constitutions, historical facts remain the same. The Narrative was designed to state some historical facts bearing upon the interests of the church. And it was a historical fact, very closely connected, indeed, with our section of the church, that a union was formed between some of the Associate and some of the Reformed Presbyterians, which gave rise to the Associate Reformed Church: it is also a historical fact, that a Synod of these united brethren, in 1783, framed and adopted a certain Constitution; and it is also a historical fact, that that instrument was very defective and ambiguous, so much so, that in order to defend themselves against the charge of "schism," "bigotry," &c., for not then going into the union, the remaining ministers of the Associate Church felt themselves called upon to point out its defects in the manner they have done. All this, then, being matter of history, it is but *just and proper* that that chapter should stand unrepealed and unaltered, as containing a defence of the motives and conduct of our fathers, in taking the stand which they then did, in the maintenance of Secession principles. And in the end of said chapter this is declared to be the reason why it was written:—"These remarks upon the Constitution of the Associate Reformed Synod we judge necessary, as a warning against that latitudinarian scheme, which it is calculated to promote, and as a vindication of the conduct of this Presbytery, in refusing to agree to that union which produced it."

There are other things in Mr. H.'s strictures, which perhaps ought to be noticed; but from what has been said, we shall leave the reader to form his own estimate of them. And, indeed, we should not, probably, have taken any notice whatever of these strictures, had not the editor of the Examiner made them his own, and become responsible for them by the following endorsement:

"The *Strictures on the Associate's Testimony* are written by a plain man, but a man of Christian intelligence, and a laudable zeal for the truth—and, assuredly, a sincere and judicious adherence to the truth of God, should at least imply an assiduous adherence to truth in our intercourse with man. A defect in this latter point is that which this communication detects in the *Secession Testimony*. An aptitude to receive conviction, in the spirit of Christian meekness, will, we trust, lead our brethren of the Associate Synod to respond to the above strictures in the pious language of the Psalmist:

'Let him, that righteous is, me smite,
It shall a kindness be—
Let him reprove, I shall it count
A precious oil to me.'

We exceedingly regret to see a passage of Scripture misapplied and *profaned* in the manner that is here done. Did the Rev. editor really think that that text was applicable to the case of a person who was smitten by the tongue of slander? Did he suppose that such smiting was to be accounted an "excellent oil?" To make the text applicable to the case for which he quotes it, he ought to have had some better proof than "the strictures," that the *smiter* was *righteous*; he ought to have been certain that the *smiting* was *deserved*; and he ought to have been very sure that the smiting administered was not *identically the same* as that of which the prophet complains: "Then said they, come and let us devise devices against Jeremiah—come and let us smite him with the tongue, and let us not give heed to any of his words." Jer. xviii. 16.

We have another word to say to the editor. In the same number of the Examiner he has done very great injustice to one of our correspondents. He calls him a "*wrothy*" author; for no other reason that we can divine, than simply his *presumption* for offering some very modest and reasonable remarks on Mr. Reid's dissertation on the second Psalm. Had he known the writer, he would have known that his remarks proceeded more from *sorrow* than from *wrath*, in seeing an author, whom he highly respected, writing so *loosely* on the fundamental article of the Trinity. We shall wait patiently for the editor's promised Review, in which he is "either to obviate or correct such misconceptions," as our correspondent has been guilty of. Indeed, were the article of our correspondent, together with the brief notice which introduced it, submitted to the judgment of any candid person, we are persuaded he would say, that great tenderness and good feeling were manifested towards Mr. Reid. We, therefore, suspect that the conscience of the editor had been *napping*, when, contrary to truth, he stigmatized our correspondent as "a *wrothy* author."

We might also complain of the editor for crediting an article in the same number to the Christian Intelligencer, which should have been credited to the Monitor. We refer to the "Letter from Rome," which *first* appeared in our pages, and was, in fact, *so acknowledged* by the Christian Intelligencer. This, however, is a small matter, arising probably from *mere mistake*, and should never have been heeded by us, had it not been for those "weightier matters," which a sense of duty has compelled us to notice.

ART. VIII. Popery in Baltimore.

MR. EDITOR,—Your account of the recent ineffectual attempt of Mr. Smith to preach in Baltimore is *substantially* correct. He had made an appointment to preach in the Third Presbyterian church on Wednesday evening, the 5th instant, which was announced from the pulpit

on the preceding Sabbath. It was rumored that the Roman Catholics intended, if possible, to hinder him from preaching; but the people, who entertained a better opinion of them than Protestants in other places generally do, did not believe them capable of such an outrage upon our civil laws and religious rights! On Wednesday evening the House was crowded long before the usual time of service, and the street filled with multitudes. Mr. Smith, accompanied by the pastor of the church, entered the pulpit about half an hour before the appointed time. A number of men who posted themselves on each side of the gallery immediately opposite the pulpit, soon began to talk in a loud and threatening tone. The pastor of the church observed them, and requested them to move further along the aisle, in order to enable others to get in, for there was still some space unoccupied in the aisle of the gallery. This they refused to do, and continued to talk in the manner already described. Several gentlemen then went up stairs and requested them to be silent, but the only answers received were curses! The pastor, supposing it possible that order might be restored by commencing religious worship, gave out a Psalm, which was sung by the congregation. But during the whole of this time the noise was continued. He then attempted to lead in prayer, but was compelled by the increased disorder to desist! He then made some remarks, intended to secure attention and order; and spoke of the rights and privileges of American citizens. But as soon as Mr. Smith arose, the noise in the gallery recommenced; and it became obviously impossible to proceed in peace. The pastor perceiving this, and observing the indications of uneasiness and alarm in the congregation, rose to request Mr. Smith to desist. But at this moment the people were thrown into utter confusion, by the intimidating causes already mentioned, and by exclamations from certain individuals outside of the church! The congregation was then dismissed and requested to vacate the house. Mr. Smith did not escape by a back window of the church; he went out at the front door with the crowd, accompanied by men who would have sacrificed their lives in his defence. The pastor remained in the pulpit, urging the people to withdraw, and assuring them that they were in no danger, until nearly all had left the house; and then, after publicly announcing his intention to retire, he went out in the same manner that Mr. Smith had done. Mr. Smith was to have preached on the succeeding evening in the Fourth Presbyterian church, but in consequence of the disturbance on Wednesday evening that church was not opened.

Whether the interference above described was instigated by the Romish priesthood, I cannot say. That the disturbance was made by some *Roman Catholics*, there can be but one opinion. Individuals were recognized, and expressions heard, which leave no room to doubt as to the character and intention of the rioters. The truth is, that some of them were caught in their own net!! On that evening and the next morning, before they had learned the effect which was produced on the city, they exulted in their victory! But as soon as they found the general indignation which this outrage had excited, they changed their key, and endeavored, some to deny that it was the Papists who did it, and others that they were only a few ignorant and low Catholics, whose conduct was not approved of by the church!

You are greatly mistaken if you suppose that Romanism is predominant in Baltimore. Roman Catholics are not, I should judge, more than one-tenth of our population: the Methodist society alone is more than a match for them. The number of churches in Baltimore is now about fifty, and the Romanists have six! But it has been their strong hold—the strongest in the United States; and the influence hitherto exerted by them, has been owing to their superior cunning and activity, the criminal silence of the majority of Protestant ministers, and the consequent apathy of the people. But for several years past ministers have begun, as faithful watchmen and patriots to sound the alarm. The event of Wednesday evening has produced such a state of public opinion and feeling in regard to their intolerance, as cannot fail to accomplish much good. It has done more for Protestantism than a hundred sermons by the most eloquent of men. It has led thousands to examine and converse upon the subject, who were before indifferent. And multitudes who were lukewarm, are now zealous and decided. A few more such victories and their cause is ruined!

Mr. Smith is to return to this city from Virginia in the course of a few days; and we have resolved to open our church to him again. Public opinion loudly demands this, and thousands, if necessary, are prepared to support the laws, and protect him in the exercise of his rights as an American citizen. For the question now is, not Protestantism or Romanism—but LAW OR NO LAW—whether we are to be FREEMEN OR SLAVES!!—*Presbyterian*.

ART. IX. To Correspondents.

The remarks of our worthy correspondent Y, are in themselves excellent; but we think he has misapprehended the meaning of the writer in the sentence which he criticises. Had he read carefully what follows, he might have seen that the writer was not speaking of the *primary* making of the covenant with Christ in eternity, but of (what Mr. Gib calls) the *secondary* making of the covenant in time with believers. The sentence animadverted upon, taken by itself, is faulty; but when taken in connection with its following context, its meaning, we think, is sufficiently obvious and correct. Y will therefore perceive the reason why we have not inserted his remarks.

We regret to see the backwardness of some of our old correspondents in furnishing matter for our pages.

THE
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,

AND
EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

MAY, 1834.

ART. I. *On the Difference and Agreement between the Love of the Father to Christ, and Christ's Love to his People.*

"As the Father hath loved me, so have I loved you." John xv. 9.

As the love of Christ to his people shines so conspicuous through the whole gospel, so the Holy Ghost employeth a great variety of similitudes to express it: but they all fail to declare fully its excellency and greatness.

It is compared to the love of an affectionate and faithful husband. "Thy Maker is thy husband." Again: "The Lord delighteth in thee, and thy land shall be married." But here the metaphor fails us, in general, in two respects. *First*, "Christ loved the Church, and gave himself for it, an offering, and a sacrifice of a sweet smelling savour to God." *Secondly*, The relation is eternal. "I will betroth thee unto me for ever."

To the love of an affectionate parent. "As a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear him." But Christ displays his love in *really pardoning* and giving suitable *solace* in time, and in the rich *inheritance* which he purchased *for*, and gives to them forever. "He will bring many sons to glory, being made perfect through sufferings."

The love of Christ surpasseth that of an affectionate mother. "Can a woman forget her sucking child, from having compassion on the son of her womb? Yea, *they may* forget, yet will *I not forget* thee. Behold, I have graven thee upon the palms of my hands; and thy walls are ever before me."

To the relation and love of a brother. But, "None can by any means redeem his brother from death, nor give to God a ransom for him. The redemption of the soul is precious, and ceaseth forever," if it had not been accomplished by "the precious blood of Christ."

Christ's love is compared to the care and tenderness of a shepherd. "He shall feed his flock like a shepherd, he shall gather the lambs with his arm, and carry them in his bosom, and shall gently lead those that are with young." But here, again, he *exceeds* the metaphor. "I am the good shepherd; the good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep."

Not to multiply particulars, Christ is compared to a skilful and sympathizing physician. "He healeth the broken in heart, and *tenderly* bindeth up all their wounds." But the *medicine* expresseth the greatness of his love. "With his stripes [bruises] we are healed."

Thus, as these and other similitudes do not fully declare the greatness of Christ's love, he compares it to the love of the Father to himself. "As the Father hath loved me, so have I loved you."

We have contemplated the love of the Father to Christ, and Christ's love to his people. As an *additional* we may contemplate the *harmony* between these two. But here it is necessary to observe, that they are not in all respects *parallel*. It is therefore necessary to show:

First, Wherein the love of the Father to Christ, and Christ's love to his people *differ*: and,

Secondly, Explain wherein they agree.

The proper illustration of these two heads of doctrine from the Holy Scriptures, will present us some of the distinguishing properties and excellencies of Christ's love.

PART I.—*First*, We shall show wherein the love of the Father to Christ, and Christ's love to his people *differ*. They do so in the following particulars:

1. The love of the Father to the Son is as natural, necessary, and complete, as his love is to himself. And the reason is plain. The Son possesseth all the divine perfections, in their full glory, *equally* with the Father himself. "He who was made in the form of a servant was essentially in the form of God, and thought it no robbery to be *equal* with God." Indeed, there is an interpretation that deadens one of these expressions, and quite inverts the other. "In the form of God," some tell us, cannot express the divine nature, but only a *resemblance* of it. But will it not be as good an argument that the "form of a servant," and "the fashion of a man," doth not signify the human nature, but only a similitude, an apparition, something that looks like it? And these words, "he counted it no robbery to be equal with God," is what they turn into quite another meaning: that he did not "do that robbery," as to *make himself equal* with God." But the Apostle is there giving us both an example and an argument of lowliness of mind. For he saith, "Let the same mind be in you that was in Christ Jesus, who was in the form of God, and took on him the form of a servant." According to their notion, to set up for a God would have been the vilest thing possible. Aiming at such a robbery as this, lost the fallen angels their seats in heaven. And is this *all* that can be said of Christ Jesus, that he was not so wicked as they? None of the angels or saints that are in heaven, or upon earth, run into a robbery of making themselves *equal with God*: so that they had no need of him for an example, in a case where there was not the least danger of their going wrong.

To return, Christ himself said, "I am in the Father and the Father in me. He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father." Thus, the Father, naturally and necessarily loves those divine perfections that are in himself. For the Son is the brightness of his glory, and the express *character* of his *substance*.

The Son was under no necessity of nature or condition to love any of mankind sinners. As he possessed *fully* all the perfections of divinity, in a distinct personality, so he was consummately perfect, and happy in the enjoyment of all the immediate manifestations of his Father's love.—Therefore, no reason, without himself, can be assigned for loving his people. This he himself declared of old. "I have loved you, because I loved you."

2. The love of the Father to Christ is *deserved* love. We do not mean that the Son purchased the Father's love. No: this is impossible; but that the Son is an object highly *worthy* of it. And that on several accounts: First, he hath *personal* excellencies: as he is the Son of God, having all the fullness of the godhead, as has been observed: and as he

is Emmanuel, having human nature in the highest degree of purity and perfection: and, lastly, having a superabundant unction of the Holy Ghost. "God gave not the Spirit by measure unto him." Thus he is fair, fair above all the children of men.

Secondly, The Son hath *acquired worth*. The Father hath an infinite complacential love, and delight, in all the branches of his meditation, particularly in his death. "Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life that I may take it again." This was a most distinguishing evidence of his submission to his Father's will; of love to his Father's glory; of zeal for the salvation of his chosen people. He *did* and *suffered* all that was necessary for accomplishing the Father's gracious purposes in bringing them to glory. Thus the Father speaks of him and to him, in the whole compass of his character and work. "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased."

The love of Christ to his people is entirely free, and undeserved. Indeed, if it had not been so, he would not have loved them at all. To affirm that the Father chose his people, and that the Son engaged to save them, from their foreseen faith and repentance, is contrary to the whole current of Scripture. Holiness is not the *cause*, but the *fruit* of election. As saith the Apostle, "The Father hath chosen us in Christ, before the foundation of the world, that we might be holy, and without blame before him in love." Correspondent to this, believers are called in time, "Elect, (that is, effectually called,) according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit unto obedience, and the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus."

But they were viewed as under a sentence of death—"alienated from the life of God, enemies in their minds by wicked works." These were foils to set off the free and undeserved nature of the Son's love. "He died for sinners, for the ungodly." For the vilest of the vile he died, even for the "chief of sinners."

The freedom of his love is displayed in the declarations, calls, and promises of the gospel. To affirm that these suppose some good qualifications in the persons to whom they are made, according to the Arminian *pride* and *vanity*, is quite wrong.

Had Adam and his wife any good qualifications when they hid themselves from the presence of the Lord God, among the trees of the garden? And when he told them that the seed of the woman should bruise the head of the serpent, which in the style of the gospel is, the prince of this world is judged. Had the people in the old world any good qualifications? God himself said, "The end of all flesh is come before me: for the earth is filled with violence through them: and behold I will destroy them from the earth." And yet they were the objects of Noah's ministry. Had Abram any good qualifications, when God called him from idolatry, and blessed him? Did not God, by his prophets, address the greatest sinners? Saith he, "Come now, and let us reason together, saith the Lord: though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow: though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool."

John the Baptist addressed his hearers as the vilest of sinners. "O, generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come?" Christ himself wept over Jerusalem, and said: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not."

In fine, the revelation is closed with the most extensive, unlimited, and generous invitation. "The Spirit and the bride say, come. And let him that heareth say, come. And let him that is athirst, come. And whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely."

Thus you see, that the Arminians, by *trying* to support their *vile opinion*, have to fight against the *whole Bible*.

But, they may be told, that *faith* and *repentance*, which they consider as necessary prerequisites in those to whom the promises of the gospel are addressed, are as freely given as pardon and eternal life.

Saith the Apostle, "By grace are ye saved, through faith; and that *not of yourselves*: it is the *gift of God*." And Christ is "exalted to give repentance," as well as "the forgiveness of sins."

3. The love of the Father to Christ is *reciprocal love*. That is, there is no love lost between them. It is equally sincere, fervent, and unchangeable in both. The Father repeatedly declares his infinite love to, and delight in his Son. "Behold my servant, whom I uphold; mine elect, in whom my soul delighteth. This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." This love of the Father, receives a full and suitable return from the love of the Son; both as he is the Son of God, and as Emmanuel, the mediator of the covenant. "I have kept my Father's commandments, and abide in his love. I do always those things that please him."

We can never make suitable returns to Christ, of love for love. His love is infinite, our love is finite. His love is strong and fervent, ours often very weak and cold. His love is unchangeable, ours not so. His love is entirely free, our love to him is in the rear of a thousand kindnesses.

In fine, Christ hath brought his people under a debt of love to himself, which they cannot clear off to all eternity. Will this be any abatement to their happiness? No. In heaven they will be ravished with a view of Christ's *wounds*, which are so many *glasses* into his affections. And the glorified eye will wander at large in that field of love. The saints will perpetually contemplate, and be solaced with Christ's love, and employ their own, proceeding in an eternal circle of love for love.

4. The Father's love to Christ, and Christ's love to his people, differ in their *evidences*. As the Father appointed the Son to be the mediator of the covenant, and as the Son himself engaged as the surety, to confirm the covenant by his own blood, and thus purchase the salvation of a chosen people: so the Father gave him the promise of qualifications for his work, assistance in it, acceptance of it, and reward for it.

Accordingly, he displayed both his faithfulness and his love. "He prepared him a body:" that is, a human nature. "He gave not the Spirit by measure unto him:" that is, suitable to the greatness of his person, and the importance of his work. "His mercy and his faithfulness were with him." He accepted the atonement, gave the discharge, and bestowed the reward. "He raised him from the dead, and gave him glory."

The Son displayed his love to his people in ways quite different, as has been declared. He engaged as their surety, assumed their nature, gave the last and best edition of the gospel, wrought miracles of mercy, left them a perfect example of holiness, paid their debt, vanquished their enemies, pleads their cause within the veil, and will at last return, "and receive them to himself, that where he is they may be also."

5. The Father's love to Christ, and Christ's love to his people differ in the *degree* of manifestation. As the Son possesseth all the fulness of divinity, so he is capable of receiving and enjoying the highest degree of the manifestation of the Father's love. The nature of this love, the manner and degree of manifestation is what no finite being can conceive or express. If we can have any idea of the felicity of Deity, it consists in the mutual love of the Father and the Son, with the Spirit. Christ is "the only begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father." And

what is said of the omniscience of God, may be affirmed of his love.—“No man knoweth who the Son is but the Father, and who the Father is but the Son.” That is, there is that in the Son which none but the Father knows: and there is that in the Father, (*viz.* his love,) which to Christ's uncreated nature lies open.

Nay, though Christ's human nature be finite, limited, and dependent, it is capable of receiving and enjoying greater degrees of manifestations of the Father's love, than any finite nature not so intimately united to God. Thus, “God gave not the Spirit by measure unto him.” “He is anointed with the oil of gladness above his fellows.” That is, above those who were types of him in his several offices; and above all believers, who, in an inferior degree, are his fellows, being “made kings and priests unto God.”

Believers cannot receive the highest degree of the display of Christ's glory and love. Thus saith the spouse, “He brought me into his banquetting house, and his banner over me was love. Stay me with flagons, comfort me with apples; for I am sick of love.”

There is a glory in Christ's divine nature, or person, which would overwhelm the most enlarged finite capacity. “A horror of great darkness fell upon Abram when God talked with him,” and gave him the covenant. He said to Moses, “Thou canst not see my face, for there shall no man see me and live.” When God spoke to him, it was out of a cloud.” Nay, when “the cloud covered the tent of the congregation, and the glory of the Lord filled the tabernacle, Moses was not able to enter into the tent of the congregation, because the cloud abode thereon, and the glory of the Lord filled the tabernacle.” Thus it was when the Lord took possession of the temple. “The priests could stand to minister by reason of the cloud, for the glory of the Lord had filled the house of God.” When the Son gave a vision of his future incarnation, the seraphim covered their faces and their feet; and Isaiah said, “Wo is me! for I am undone.”

Nay, Christ's body is capable of receiving a glory that our eyes cannot behold. When he was transfigured before his disciples, “his face did shine as the Sun.” It is said, “the fashion of his countenance was altered.” Though they knew him to be the same person, yet the lustre of his face was new to them, “and his raiment was white and glistening,” as if it had been full of an inward glory, and prepared to send out the rays that it contained. He appeared as if he had been in the environs of his own country. Human nature could not bear this. It so wasted the spirits of Peter and his company, that they were “heavy with sleep.” It was living too fast. The attraction, the drain of such a vision, was too great for these houses of clay. And they just awoke to see Moses and Elias, who appeared in glory, and talked with him. Nay, “there came a cloud and overshadowed them, and they feared as they entered into the cloud. And there came a voice out of the cloud, saying, This is my beloved Son, hear him.” When Saul was going to Damascus, and Christ spoke to him, “there shined a light round about him from heaven. He could not see for the glory of the light.” When he was “caught up into paradise, he heard words that were not possible for man to utter.” When John saw Christ in his glory, he saith, “I fell at his feet as dead.”

From all these particulars it is evident that human nature cannot bear up, under the full manifestations of Christ's glory and love. Indeed, the Apostle saith, “We shall see him as he is.” We shall behold him in the splendor of his countenance, the ensigns of his majesty, the mystery of his titles, and the memorial of a past crucifixion.” “His eyes are as a flame of fire, and on his head are many crowns.” “He is clothed with a vesture dipped in blood.” But the view of him must be still suitable

to a finite, limited capacity. For, "he has a name written that no man knows but himself." And his *declared character* "is the word of God."

PART II.—Having thus shown wherein the love of the Father to Christ, and Christ's love to his people *differ*, we proceed to show, secondly, wherein they *agree*. Here we observe,

1. Both are *eternal*. Without any beginning. We have them mentioned together in that delightful passage, which has been repeatedly quoted. Says the Son himself, "I was set up [that is, by the Father,] from everlasting. Then I was daily *his delight*, rejoicing always before *him*. And then I was rejoicing in the habitable part of his earth, and my *delights* were with the *sons of men*. When on earth, he appealed to his Father, as an *equal*, when pleading for his people, and for no more than his due. "Father, I will that they also whom thou hast given me be with me where I am; that they may behold my glory, which thou hast given me: for thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world." And, with regard to his people, he saith, "I have loved thee with an everlasting love; therefore, with loving kindness have I drawn thee."

2. The Father's love to Christ is *real* and *sincere*. To suppose that there is the least degree of dissimulation in it, is dishonorable to the God of truth. But he has confirmed the sincerity of his love with all the solemnity of an oath. "Once have I sworn by my holiness, that I will not lie unto David." All the evidences that the Father gave of his love to Christ, in time, and at last raising him to a throne, and crowning him with glory and honor, are proofs of a glorious sincerity.

The same may be affirmed of Christ's love to his people. He always proclaimed this. Every sermon, breath, and step that he took, gave an undeniable testimony to his goodness. But, if words and miracles will not do, let his death convince us. "I am the good shepherd; the good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep." The death of Christ is too much for a dissembled kindness. "By this we perceive the love of God, because he laid down his life for us."

Farther: Is not this enough to make us believe that he is in earnest, in the offering he makes of the happiness that he died for? There is a goodness in his heart to sustain all the invitations of his gospel. "He hath loved us, and given himself for us." The latter vindicates and completes the former. Every argument is rolled in blood to make it stronger. "The love of Christ constraineth us, because we judge that he died for us."

3. The love of the Father to Christ is *fervent* love. Christ is "his dear Son." "The Son of the Father in truth and love." Thus saith the Father himself: "I will make him my *first born*, higher than the kings of the earth."

All the branches of Christ's mediation are undeniable proofs of the great *fergency* of his love to his people. Though from eternity he had a full prospect of all the humiliation, sufferings, and death that he must submit to, "He engaged his heart [quieted his soul by suretyship engagements] to approach unto God." He declared his resolution to accomplish his undertaking. "Lo, I come." On earth he said, "I have a baptism to be baptised with, and how am I straitened till it be accomplished? To his Father he said, "For their sakes I sanctify [consecrate] myself." And to his enemies, "If ye seek me, let these go their way." In fine, heaven adores the evidence he gave of his affection. "Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood."

4. The Father hath a love of *complacency* in Christ. "Behold my servant, whom I uphold; mine elect, in whom my soul *delighteth*." He declared this at his baptism and transfiguration. "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." Christ hath personal accomplishments and

acquired worth, as was formerly observed, therefore he is the immediate object of the Father's complacential delight.

Christ, having clothed his people with the robe of righteousness, and the garments of salvation, "they are the excellent on the earth, in whom he placeth all his delight." "The king's daughter is all glorious within, her garments are of wrought gold." She hath that which the King himself delighteth to honor. To adopt the language of the song of Solomon, saith Christ, "Thou hast ravished my heart, [taken away my heart] my sister, my spouse, thou hast ravished my heart with one of thine eyes, with one chain of thy neck. The King is held in the galleries." Once more, "I am come into my garden, my sister, my spouse; I have gathered my myrrh with my spice, I have eaten my honey-comb with my honey: I have drunk my wine with my milk. Eat, O friends; drink, yea, drink abundantly, O beloved."

But, to lay aside the language of metaphor: Christ takes pleasure in admitting his people to communion with himself, "which is an exchange of love between him and us. On his part, he engageth our graces, pours afresh into our comforts, and draws us out after himself. On our part, it is promoted, in due desires towards him, admiration of him, for the glory of his nature, the lowness of his condescension, for what he is, and what he does. It sometimes rises into assurances that he is ours, and we are his; and these are still more powerful as the soul flies up with them into a better world, where we shall not only have a glory *from* Christ, but a glory *with* Christ."*

His people shall be "before the throne of God, and serve him day and night in his temple; and he that sitteth on the throne shall dwell among them."

5. The Father's love to Christ is *unchangeable*. Like his nature, "It is the same yesterday, to-day, and forever." Thus he spake in prophecy, "My faithfulness and mercy [love] shall be with him." "He was faithful who promised." He sent angels to sing him into the world, where he came to die, to guard him down to Egypt and back again, to minister to him in the wilderness, and strengthen him in the garden. And as has been repeatedly observed, the Father himself declared his love to him at his baptism, and transfiguration. Nay, in the hour of his distress, when it pleased the Lord to bruise him, he was then very dear to the divine majesty. "Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life that I may take it again." Even then there were visible and awful evidences of the Father's love. "When he died, nature itself groaned under a thick darkness, the sun was hid, the sky covered, the rocks rent, the graves opened, the earth shook, the temple unfolded, and the veil of it rent in twain, at the fall of him who was greater than the temple. And these poured arguments upon the centurion, to make him cry out "Verily this was the Son of God."

Lastly, By taking him from a cross and a grave, and placing him at his right hand, the Father proved that his love was *immoveable*.

Here it is proper to observe, that though the Father was carrying on a design of *satisfaction*, and therefore must have a full security to the glory of his *justice*; at the same time, he had no disgust at Christ's *person*. They were united closely in nature, love, communion, and interest. Thus, when the Son was on the brink of the pit, he said, "Father, the hour is come; glorify thy Son, that thy Son also may glorify thee."

Christ's love to his people is *unchangeable*. "He rests [is silent] in his love." "Jesus having loved his own, which were in the world, he loved them to the end." Being "the offscouring of the world does not

* Bradbury.

break the relation. If our graces be not hindered by afflictions, how should they be any interruption to his love? Nay, "Whom the Lord loveth, he chasteneth."

This surmise often starts up in the troubled soul, "that if Christ had any love towards him, his lot would have been smoother in this world. He looks like a forlorn, desolate person. Such a long train of afflictions, speaks some disgust of Providence. Certainly a Saviour's heart would have taken up sooner, or given a chastisement of a gentler sort." When this is your opinion, bring it to the words of Christ himself. "As the Father hath loved me, so have I loved you." "He endured the contradiction of sinners," and the Father's displeasure too, "against himself." But still he was no outcast or enemy. The relation was never broken, though it was sometimes clouded. He was still "the only begotten Son, in the bosom of the Father."

Thus it is with believers. No adversity can dissolve the mystical union, break the covenant, or extinguish the grace contained in it. Saith the Psalmist, "Blessed is the man whom thou chastenest, O Lord, and teachest him out of thy law. That thou mayest give him rest from days of adversity, until the pit be digged for the wicked, for the Lord will not cast off for ever, nor will he forsake his inheritance. But judgment shall return unto righteousness, and all the upright in heart shall follow after it."

Christ's sorrows were absolutely necessary for his *satisfaction*. Our's are upon condition, "If need be." And though no chastening for the present seemeth joyous, but grievous; nevertheless, it yieldeth the peaceable fruits of righteousness unto them which are exercised thereby."

Therefore, when it is the will of Providence to give us a cup of affliction, let us remember, it is but the same that was put into our Saviour's own hand. "Though he were a Son, he suffered." And the exhortation speaketh unto us as children, "My Son, despise not thou the chastening of the Lord, nor faint when thou art rebuked of him."

6. The Father's love to Christ is *without end*. As it had no beginning, so it will have no end. There is a harmony of love between the Father and the Son, as he is God, and also as he is Mediator; and both these are seen by their sitting on the same throne of majesty, to reign jointly and harmoniously, for ever and ever.

The Father sent the Son into the world upon the great errand of man's redemption, and having finished the work that was given him to do, he received him back again, according to his own promise. "I will make him my first born, higher than the kings of the earth. My mercy [love] will I keep for him for evermore, and my covenant shall stand with him." Accordingly, as he was obedient unto death, even the death of the cross, so God highly exalted him, [*over-raised* him, not above his personal dignity and worth, but above all parallel,] and gave him a name which is above every name. That at the name of Jesus, [by *faith* in his name] every knee should bow, of beings in heaven, and beings in earth, and beings under the earth. And that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, [Jehovah] to the glory of God the Father."

The love of Christ to his people is also *without end*. It was without beginning, and it will be without end. This is the express language of his own covenant, and oath. "In a little wrath I hid my face from thee for a moment; but with everlasting kindness will I have mercy on thee, saith the Lord thy Redeemer. For this is as the waters of Noah unto me: for as I have sworn that the waters of Noah shall no more go over the earth; so have I sworn that I will not be wroth with thee, nor rebuke thee: [that is, totally and finally as a judge and an enemy] "For the mountains shall depart, and the hills be removed; but my kindness shall not

depart from thee; neither shall the covenant of my peace be removed, saith the Lord that hath mercy on thee."

Christ said to his disciples, "I will come again, and receive you to myself, that where I am ye may be also." Thus, "we shall be ever with the Lord." "In his presence there is a fulness of joy; and at his right hand are pleasures forevermore." What a happy eternity will the saints have with Christ! Then all his promises will be accomplished, and his prayers answered.

We shall conclude with the words of Christ himself, which are quite above all our present thoughts and imaginations; but eternity will declare them.

"Father, I will that they also, whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am; that they may behold my glory, which thou hast given me; for thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world. I have declared thy name, and will declare it: that the love wherewith thou hast loved me, may be in them, and I in them."

QUISLIBET.

ART. II. *Remarks on an Article, headed "Repentance, a Tract, by the Rev. Alexander Bullions, D. D., Cambridge, New-York," in the 7th and 8th Nos. of the present volume of the Monitor.*

MR. EDITOR,—Your Magazine is professedly "devoted to the principles of the Reformation;" from which I would understand, that any essay or article, the direct and proper tendency of which, was to advance the knowledge of those principles, would fall within your plan; but that any thing of a contrary tendency, would not be admitted to a place in your columns. Of the general tendency of the remarks which I now submit, to advance some of the doctrines of the Reformation, I trust I am not mistaken. But of their particular appropriateness for your miscellany, I must leave you to judge, which I most cheerfully do. But whatever may be your judgment concerning them, I can assure you that they are written with the most sincere intention of promoting the cause of truth, and of vindicating some particular truths of the gospel, which I hope are precious to many of your readers. And although it is with diffidence that I submit these remarks, yet I do it under a full conviction that some defence, or at least some explanation, is necessary, respecting certain points lately presented to the public, in the pages of the Monitor. And I hope that the very respectable individual who is the writer of the article to which I refer, will not feel himself hurt by being thus noticed. For it is my earnest desire, that in all I may say, I shall be so directed as neither to wound the feelings of an individual causelessly, or prejudice any of the precious truths of the gospel of salvation. I sincerely hope, that the tendency of these remarks will not contradict the intention with which they are written—that they will not turn the attention of any reader to any individual, but to the *doctrines* brought into view.

Yours, &c.

A READER.

With the literary merits of the tract I do not intend to meddle, unless when it may be necessary in ascertaining the meaning of expressions which may occur. But I must confess, that when I saw the tract, appearing among the original communications of the Monitor, with the writer's name and titles in full, by himself, I supposed the article must either exhibit some peculiarly clear and striking view of the Scrip-

ture doctrine of Repentance, or that the literary execution of it was such, as to challenge criticism; or else, why should the writer give his name and titles himself, in full, in a work where this was not the usual practice. But it is the sentiments which appear of injurious, or at least of doubtful tendency, which most concern us.

I read the first part of the tract with as much attention and interest as I usually read the original articles, in the Monitor. And, although in it I did not find much to satisfy an awakened inquirer after the Scripture doctrine concerning the grace of repentance; yet I did not find much to offend against that "sound speech, that cannot be condemned." I am persuaded, however, that most serious persons, under a due feeling of reverence for the word of God, would be grieved to see the manner in which a sentiment from a heathen is introduced and confirmed—p. 208. The knowledge of sin, said an Epicurean philosopher, is the beginning of safety." This, I admit, may be understood in a sound sense. But there is no sound sense in which it can be understood, but what the sentiment; which I hope was intended to be conveyed, could be found as well, if not better expressed by an *inspired* writer. And what reader, seeking for instruction in the things which belong to his eternal peace, would not feel more comfort, and rest with more confidence, in having his attention directed to the language of the word of God, than to the most rounded expression of the most accomplished heathen that ever lived? But besides, the expression of the Epicurean, as it there stands, is susceptible of an erroneous meaning. There cannot even be legal repentance, for there can be no repentance at all, without the knowledge of sin; for where the Holy Spirit gives repentance, he first brings sin to remembrance. And the Scripture no where warrants us to believe that there is any *safety* in that *repentance which must be repented of*. The native tendency of all legal repentance is to "work death." 2 Cor. vii. 10. And the Scripture most plainly assures the sinner, that there is no *safety for him, while he is under sentence of condemnation*. And this is the condition of every sinner, until he is in *Christ Jesus*, his only refuge. Rom. viii. 1.

Again. There is a knowledge of sin, which so far from being "the beginning of safety," directly hurls into the vortex of despair. Judas had come to a knowledge of his sin, when he returned to the chief priests and elders, and said, "I have sinned, in that I have betrayed the innocent blood." And what did he do? "He went out and hanged himself." Matth. xxvii. 4, 5.

The expression, then, is dangerous, so far as it is calculated to lead the sinner to the conclusion that because he knows he has *sinned*, or is a *sinner*, he may take comfort to himself that he has attained to some degree of safety: at least he is in possession of the beginning of it. This we dare say is contrary to the experience of every true penitent, as well as to the word of God. The true penitent is convicted, that the beginning of his safety, his whole safety, and his only safety, is Christ Jesus. He knows he is a sinner—but *this knowledge* only shows him his danger. It does not even show him where nor what his safety is. And he never considers himself enjoying any safety until he is safely anchored on the Rock of ages. Hence, there is no sense in which the Epicurean could use the expression, which would be sound theology. And even in the mouth of a Christian it would be very doubtful and equivocal. But the confirmation of the expression is also exceptionable, and ought to be noticed, in an age like this, when there appears a general tendency to mix things divine and profane.

"This is as true as gospel." If Dr. B. meant by this nothing more than to express his belief of the truth and applicability of the sentiment quoted, it is faulty as to the manner, and calculated to grieve serious

persons, who never think but with reverence and solemnity of the *truth* of the gospel of the Son of God. The expression is a proverbial phrase, used on the most trite and trifling occasions, by the profane, and such as scoff at the solemnity of the truth of the glorious gospel. And although serious people are in the habit of continually meditating upon and frequently speaking about the infallible truth of God, in the gospel offer of his Son for the salvation of perishing sinners—yet in doing so, they are generally found to avoid the language and phrases of the profane and the scoffer. Under certain circumstances, the utterance, or the manner of the utterance, of even a truth, by the irreligious, is unsavory to the people of God. And on this account, their phrases and their language should be avoided, when treating of solemn and interesting subjects. But we are convinced this was a mere inadvertence in Dr. B. The sentiment quoted from the heathen is liable to convey error, and calculated to lull to rest the sinner, where the word of God assures him of no safety. And consequently, it is not "in doctrine, showing that sound speech which cannot be condemned."

But had it not been for the recurrence of frequent expressions in the latter part of the tract, which appear of still more doubtful and dangerous tendency, the writer of these remarks would not have considered himself called upon to defend, in this manner, what he considers important points among the principles of the Reformation—principles which he believes to be agreeable to and founded on the word of God. And I may here, once for all, remark, that I do not believe that Dr. B. himself entertains unsound sentiments on these points—the principles of the church to which he belongs, and in which he has professed his belief—correct sentiments expressed in the same tract, and often almost in the next sentence, forbid me to entertain a doubt as to the soundness of his own belief. But this, instead of diminishing, rather magnifies the danger. Unsound sentiments, coming from a source where error is not suspected, and erroneous expressions mixed up with sound scriptural language, are often more liable to mislead the unwary, than more palpable errors, under other circumstances. And these, too, appearing in a work reputedly evangelical, increases their dangerous tendency. A few grains of arsenic is more dangerous, even when mixed up in a large dish of food, in itself wholesome, than many ounces unmixed in the apothecary's jar.

In page 240, where Dr. B. is giving an account of what Christ, as Mediator, has done, and is doing, he says: "As a Priest, he has appeased the anger of Jehovah, and has opened a way for the return of the guilty to his favor." Now it is true, that Christ, as our great atoning High Priest, has reconciled God to his people—and that he has, through himself, opened up a way of access, for guilty sinners of Adam's family, to God. But still this would be but a partial statement of what Christ, as our great High Priest, has done for us guilty sinners of Adam's race. And all such partial statements of Christ's work or offices, ought not to go forth alone. If not necessarily explained by the connection, some cautionary expressions should accompany the statement, showing that it was not intended as a *summary* one. And this is the more especially necessary, when a *partial* statement is made, in language which errorists are in the habit of using. Upon this ground we consider the expression quoted faulty, and calculated to convey error. The Arminian and the Universalist would readily agree to it, and if taken as a summary statement of what Christ as a Priest has done, they would adopt it as their creed, without hesitation.

Again, on the same page, speaking of legal repentance, Dr. B. says,— "In adults this [legal repentance] is properly the precursor and preparation for evangelical repentance." And again, on the same subject, in

the next page, he says,—“Legal repentance may, and generally, if not uniformly, does precede faith,” &c. Now it is true, that legal repentance may have existed in many elect persons, before either faith or evangelical repentance; but it is also true that it may have appeared in many persons, in whom, neither faith, evangelical repentance, nor any other saving grace, ever existed. For there are, perhaps, few of the reprobate, hypocrites, or openly profane, unless sunk in the grossest heathen darkness, who have not, at some time or other, experienced the workings of legal repentance. But both the expressions quoted appear to intimate some kind of necessary connection between legal repentance and saving grace. To say that “Legal repentance is *properly the precursor and the preparation* for evangelical repentance, that it generally, if *not uniformly does* precede faith,” is calculated to lead into very important mistakes and errors concerning our own cases, or the cases of others with whom we may have to deal. Am I to take comfort to myself, or to administer it to others, because I or they have experienced some legal repentance for sin? Am I thence to conclude evangelical repentance will soon follow, because I have experienced its *precursor*, [its forerunner?] I am now in a state to receive gospel repentance, for I have experienced *preparation, &c.* Surely, if an inquiring and anxious soul could be persuaded thus to view legal repentance, its tendency would be to lead to fearful and fatal delusions. And from Dr. B.’s definition and other remarks concerning legal repentance, we are not at liberty to suppose that he has confounded *legal repentance* with such *gracious convictions* of sin, as shows us our absolute need of Christ and his salvation. For Dr. B. had defined it to be such as was found in reprobate men, as Cain and Judas. Surely in these instances, it was neither the precursor, nor the preparation of any grace at all.—But *it was that sorrow of the world which worketh death.* 2 Cor. vii. 10.

In the sentence which commences at the foot of page 240, I have no doubt but the natural order and arrangements of the words convey a sense altogether different from what Dr. P. intended to express. The sentence reads thus: “It is a sight by faith of Christ as crucified, and of God as reconciled, that produces that kindly sorrow which true penitents feel, and which brings them to Christ.”

Without troubling the reader with the grammatical rule that would require the last *which* in the sentence to refer to the same word to which the preceding *which* does, viz., *kindly sorrow*, it is evident that this is the only connection which the words would bear, taking the sentence by itself. I presume that by “that kindly sorrow which true penitents feel,” Dr. B. means godly sorrow for sin, or repentance itself. And it would then be to this, that the last *which* would naturally and grammatically refer: which would make the sentiment expressed be, that it is “repentance or the kindly sorrow which true penitents feel, that brings them to Christ.” And although, as I have already said, I do not believe that Dr. B. entertains this sentiment, yet it is the sentiment expressed by his words. And the danger from it is nothing the less because it proceeds from an error in the use of language. But this is the more faulty as the error in doctrine which the words express, tends to subvert the whole gospel plan of salvation, is exceedingly congenial to the pride of the corrupt heart, and is extensively embraced by errorists of the present day. To teach that it is repentance, or the *kindly* sorrow of true penitents, that brings them to Christ, is directly calculated to keep the sinner away from Christ until he should experience this sorrow: and thus to destroy free grace altogether in the gospel offer, as constituting the sinner’s warrant to accept of Christ for life and salvation.

If any person wishes to see this subject fully handled, and the unscriptural character and dangerous tendency of the above sentiment fairly set

forth, let them examine what is commonly called the Marrow controversy, as it was agitated in the Church of Scotland, a little before and about the time of the Secession. The principal papers connected with this controversy have been collected by the Rev. John Brown, of Whitburn, Scotland, and published in a small volume called *Gospel Truth*—re-published in this country by A. Munroe, Canonsburgh, Pa., 1827.

Again: Under the head, "Motives to repentance," p. 243, the first motive is expressed in the following words: "Till we repent we remain under God's sentence of condemnation, and must perish." We are bound to consider Dr. B. as here speaking of the individual grace of repentance. This, namely, the individual grace of repentance, was announced in the beginning of the discourse as the subject to be treated of. And the rules of good writing forbid the use of the word under these circumstances, in a different signification in the same discourse. And especially when no notice is given of such a change. I make this remark, because there is no sense in which the word *repentance* can be understood in this sentence, consistent with its use in the preceding part of the discourse, that would make the sentiment expressed by the words, sound theology. The plain import of the expression, understanding the word *repentance* in the sense in which it had been used throughout the discourse, would be, *that repentance is the condition of our justification before God, to the exclusion of the righteousness of Jesus Christ, imputed to us.* And several expressions below would almost induce the belief, that Dr. B. had, by some unaccountable oversight, actually fallen into the sentiment.

A little below, on the same page, and in the same connection, he says, "For till the heart is weaned from sin, it cannot accept of the grace of the gospel, or bow to the supremacy of God in the law, and thus remaining impenitent under the dominion of sin, cannot find admission into heaven, and is utterly unprepared for any of its enjoyments. Life and death, then, are suspended on repentance. Remaining impenitent we are condemned; repenting, our sins are blotted out, and we ourselves are saved." Now what does all this mean, if it does not make repentance the sole condition of the pardon of sin, or the sinner's justification? Admission into heaven, capacity for its enjoyment, the pardon of sin, life and salvation, are all spoken of, and if they are ascribed to any thing, it is to repentance; for there is not one word about the righteousness of Jesus Christ. And what is justification, if it is not included in these? "Pardon of sin," and "admission into heaven," or acceptance with God, is justification. But I shall have to refer to this passage again.

Another expression which seems susceptible of no other interpretation than the above, we find on page 285, where he says, "In short it [repentance? for surely Dr. B. cannot mean that death does so.] opens, (though not meritoriously, but by the gracious constitution of God, the gates of Paradise for the reception of the penitent." Now upon what does this direct the sinner to place his hopes of heaven? Surely not on the merits of a crucified Redeemer. Very differently does our Lord himself speak of the way to heaven. John xiv. 6. "Jesus saith unto him, I am the way, and the truth, and the life; no man cometh unto the Father but by me."

And again, from the very next sentence, it would appear that Dr. B. supposed that repentance in man, and the exercise of *mercy* in God, were all that are involved in the salvation of the sinner. And that it is the repentance of the sinner which causes the mercy of God to flow. If this doctrine be true, where was the necessity for the sufferings and death—the justice-satisfying righteousness of the Son of God? If these passages do not contain the very essence of Legalism and Arminianism, our

fathers of the Reformation, and of the Secession, the Erskines, the Wilsons—to which list we may add the names of Boston, Hogg, and all the Marrow men, with many others of the same period, must have been laboring in the dark, and contending for nothing. The Westminster Assembly has taught us, and we are persuaded on good scripture authority, that "the righteousness of Jesus Christ, imputed to us and received by faith," is alone the ground of our justification, and consequently that by which God's sentence of condemnation is removed. See also Rom. viii. 1. "There is, therefore, now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus, &c." Now it is faith that is the means or instrument of this relation to Christ Jesus. And consequently the means or instrument of our justification.

And Dr. B. has told us, page 241, correctly too, that "gospel repentance precedes not, but follows faith." And page 240, "There is a looking to Christ by the eye of faith, previous to mourning for sin." But the first motive which he presents to the sinner to repent, places repentance not only *before* faith, as it respects the order in which the Holy Spirit bestows grace—but assigns to it the very place which, in the scheme of redemption, belongs to the *justifying righteousness of Jesus Christ*. Dr. B. does indeed cite, in support of the expression, Luke xiii. 3 and 5. It is admitted, that without repentance man must perish; but it by no means follows from this, that repentance precedes justification, or that men remain under God's sentence of condemnation *till* they repent. Besides the words *except* and *till* are very different in their import. See Scott, Gill, Doddridge, &c. on the place. The other passage quoted from the same page, as coinciding in sentiment with this, is also chargeable with another error, of an equally dangerous tendency. It not only places repentance before faith, but seems to make *sanctification* precede *faith*. "For," says Dr. B., "till the heart is weaned from sin, it cannot accept of the grace of the gospel, or bow to the supremacy of God in the law." Now what is "weaning of the heart from sin," but *sanctification*? And what is "accepting of the grace of the gospel," but the exercise of faith? Can the sinner then not lay hold on Christ, as set before him in the gospel offer, until he has found his heart weaned from sin? In vain, then, is Christ in the gospel offered for sinners, if there can be no accepting of him, until the heart it weaned from sin. Where, then, is that *free salvation*, that *free grace*, that *free gospel offer*, of which we have been accustomed to read and hear, if there can be no accepting of it, until the connection between sin and the sinner, be dissolved; until he finds himself holy? The only tendency of this doctrine is to keep the sinner forever from Christ. Because, if he is persuaded that he cannot claim Christ and his salvation as his, until he finds his heart weaned from sin, he will never find this while he has the gospel in his offer. For the heart can never be said to be fully weaned from sin, until sanctification is completed, and this is not till death. How different from this did Christ teach!—"I, says he, am not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance." Matth. ix. 13. And how different the gospel offer, invitation, and promise! "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." Matth. xi. 28. "Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth." Isa. xlv. 22. See extracts from the Act of the Associate Presbytery concerning the doctrine of grace, and extracts from Boston's Sermons, particularly the Gift of Christ to sinners of mankind—the gospel order of repentance, as extracted in *Gospel Truth*.

I trust Dr. B. will at once see the necessity of a speedy, frank, full and public retraction or correction of these expressions, so fraught with danger to the eternal interests of mankind.

There are other passages in the tract upon which I had intended a

few remarks, particularly some of the asseverations under the head of the reasons of repentance. But perhaps I have extended them sufficiently to put the reader on his guard against the most dangerous expressions contained in the piece. There is, however, a *want* in the discourse which I cannot pass without a brief notice. In the introductory part of it, Dr. B. tells us, in substance, that the essay would exhibit fully the Scripture view of the subject. But he does not any where in it show his readers where nor how this grace is to be sought or obtained: a want which would give a legal character to any essay which proposed to give a full view of the subject, however free from errors in other respects. An essay proposing to give a scriptural view of this subject, should, in a very special and particular manner, direct the sinner to look to and depend upon Jesus Christ for this grace. This is a point of the utmost importance in a discourse on this subject. The sinner should be taught that the exhibition of Christ in the gospel offer, gives him a good and sufficient warrant to look to Christ for the grace of repentance, as well as for his justifying righteousness or sanctifying grace. And that as Christ will certainly give to all God's elect, faith to accept of him, so he will as certainly give them repentance to turn to him. Accordingly, it is the duty of every gospel hearer to be continually waiting upon Christ for this grace, and seeking it from him. "Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins." Acts v. 31.*

* It is believed the following extract from the writings of the Rev Ralph Erskine, as given in Gospel Truth, page 298, will set this matter in a true light. Under the head, "Faith and repentance not a condition of salvation," Mr. E. says:

"This they cannot be, as they are leading parts of it. By grace ye are saved through faith, and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God; and Christ is exalted to give repentance. None are saved without faith and repentance, because all that are saved of the Lord are saved thereunto; they are saved from unbelief, and brought unto faith; saved from impenitency, and brought to repentance. Faith and repentance are the beginnings of this salvation, and salvation cannot be completed without having a beginning: but both beginning and end are what God gives for his name's sake.

Faith and repentance are evangelically distinguished. These graces are to be considered three ways:

1. As they are conditions, I mean, made so by men, they belong to the covenant of works, which is the conditional covenant, and though the covenant of works required nothing less than perfection as its condition, nor accepts of repentance, yet men make a new covenant of works to themselves, when they make faith and repentance the conditions of life. Now, as conditions of life we have nothing ado with them, for the only condition of our eternal life is Christ's obedience unto God.

2. Consider them as duties, and thus they belong to the moral law in the hand of Christ, and the dispensation of the gospel, or to the gospel largely taken, which comprehends all the duties of the moral law; and in this sense we are still under obligation to do these duties—for Christ came not under the law as a rule, to dissolve our obligation to obedience to it; though he came under the law as a covenant, to dissolve our obligation to it as a condition of life.

3. If you consider them as graces, then they belong to the gospel, strictly so called, for they are both promises thereof, even as all grace and glory are promised therein.

Gospel repentance is not necessary in order to justification. We hear a great deal of noise made about the necessity of gospel repentance, before, and in order to justification, and that even as a condition and qualification. Here is, indeed, a new scheme of divinity, of which there is no foundation in our standards of doctrine. It is true, repentance is so necessary that none can expect pardon without it. That legal repentance, or humiliation, and conviction, and sense of sin, does go before justification in order of divine operation, is plain, and that habitual sanctification, or regeneration, and the infusing of all grace into the soul, is previous, is not denied; but that gospel repentance, or any part of actual sanctification, is necessary in order to justification and pardon, I do not see how it is possible to maintain that, without running into the Roman camp, and fighting with Popish weapons, and inverting the order of our text, 1 John iv. 19:—"We love him, because he first loved us;" making any part of our love to God necessary first, in order to God's first loving us. But sure God's method of doing will stand in spite of hell and earth. Why, say you, must we not repent and reform before God set his love upon us? And ought we not to work up ourselves to something of this, in order to our obtaining the favor of God? Alas! for such ignorance, and such gospel-darkening religion, as is like to come in fashion in this generation. O! is not repentance as much the gift of God, and fruit of his love, as any other graces and fruits of the Spirit? Acts v. 31, Christ is exalted a Prince and a Saviour by the right hand of God, to give repentance to Israel, as well as remission of sin."

In conclusion, we have no doubt of Dr. B.'s good intention in writing and publishing the tract; yet taking it as a whole, we are satisfied that its tendency cannot be to subserve the interests of true and vital religion, or advance genuine piety. The Christian, who has experienced the saving grace of which it treats, can neither be edified nor comforted with it; the awakened inquirer cannot be rightly instructed or directed by it, and the Legalist will rise from its perusal more confirmed in his views, and farther from the truth than before.

ART. III. *The Life of Mr. John Livingston, minister of the gospel; written by himself during his banishment for the cause of Christ.*

(Continued from page 341.)

During all that time, from May 1632 to May 1634, I stayed at first some while in Killinchie, and not only had some private meetings in several parts of the parish, but sundry sabbaths conversed with them, and prayed in the church, and after one had read a chapter, I spoke thereon. But finding I could not long be suffered to do so, I went to Scotland, and as I had done before, went from place to place, as I had invitations to preach, or to be at communions in those places where I had haunted before, and some others. My chief residence at that time was in the town of Kilmarnoc, with the worthy lady Boyd, and the while I was there I preached ordinarily on the sabbath once, being desired by the master, I was also frequently in Lanerk with my father, and in Cumbernauld, and other places; and sometimes in Edinburgh, where were frequent private meetings of Christians.

I never had of stipend, in Killinchie, above four pounds sterling by year, and enjoyed that but a short space, yet I bless the Lord I never wanted money to supply my necessities, and to bear my charges in going to and again. My father was not able to supply me, having a great charge of other nine children, whereof seven were daughters. Those from whom I got, at several times, supply of money, were, the lady Boyd, the countesses of Eglinton and Wigton, and the lady Innertail.

During these two years, I went twice or thrice over into Ireland, to visit the parish and friends there. The last of these times, having come to Ireland, February, 1634, our friends in Ireland seeing no appearance of being delivered from the yoke of the *prelate's tyranny*, had some mind to transport themselves to New-England; but resolved first to send a minister and a gentleman thither, to the governor and council, to try the condition of the country, and to agree for a place to settle in. And, accordingly, they pitched upon William Wallace and me to go straight to London, and go from thence with the first ship in the spring, and return with the first conveniency. Therein I perceived, howbeit I trust the Lord did accept and approve of our intention, yet wonderfully he stopped our design: for had William Wallace come to me in Groomsport, in Ireland, at the time prefixed, we might easily have reached London before the first ship went. But he staying two days, taking leave of his family, all which time the wind was fair; so soon as he came the wind became contrary for a fortnight; but after that we came to Scotland, and made all the haste we could to come to London. But the ships were gone—only three were to go within a fortnight or so. The first we met with who had interest in those ships, was Mr. Humphrey, who urged much that we should go with him in his ship. We told him we would advise. After

that, Mr. Belinham having a greater ship, offered us better accommodations; yet because Mr. Humphrey spoke first, we agreed to go with him. Had we gone with Mr. Belinham, we had gone forward; but Mr. Humphrey, to gain time to do some business, and to eschew some tossing at sea, did not go aboard when the ships loosed, but took us with him to Dorchester, that when the ships should come over against Weymouth we might go aboard; on a Sabbath forenoon, the three ships came to Weymouth, the other two went forward with a spread sail: Mr. Humphrey desired his ship to cast herself in the stays, till we should hear Mr. White, of Dorchester, preach in the afternoon. We went on board, but by this means when a storm and contrary wind came on us on Wednesday night, the other two ships being past Lands-end stood to the east, and we were forced to come to an anchor in Plymouth, and stayed there eight or ten days with contrary wind. During the time, William Wallace fell sick, and was both advised by doctors not to go to sea, and was somewhat averse to it himself; and our friends in Ireland had condescended that I should not go alone without him; wherefore we both resolved to return. When we were coming back, I told him I apprehended we should get our liberty in Ireland; and accordingly when we came we found that we four who had been deposed, were restored by the deputy's letter on May, 1634.

Shortly after, on June 23, 1634, the Lord was pleased to call home worthy Mr. Jonas Walsh; I heard of his dangerous sickness on Sabbath afternoon before, and came to him to Temple-Patrick, about eleven o'clock at night; two hours after came Mr. Blair. He had many gracious and edifying discourses, as also some wrestlings; one time when he had said, *O for hypocrisy!* Mr. Blair said to the great company of christians present, *see how Satan nibbles at his heel, when he is going over the threshold of heaven.* A little after, I being at prayer at the bedside before him, and the word victory coming out of my mouth, he took hold of my hand, and desired me to cease a little, and clapped both his hands, and cried out, *Victory! victory! victory! forevermore;* and then desired me to go on in prayer, and within a short time he expired.

Mr. Blair and Mr. Dunbar were again deposed within half a year; I continued preaching, in Killinchie, for a year and a half, till Nov. 1635. During my abode in London, I got acquaintance with my Lord Forbes, Sir Nathaniel Rich, Sir Richard Saltonstall, Sir William Constable, Sir Phillip Stapleton, Sir Matthew Bennington, Dr. Gouge, Dr. Sibs, Mr. Phillip Nye, Mr. Thomas Goodwin, Mr. Harris, Mr. Ross, and several others. I was often with Dr. Alexander Leighton, who was prisoner in the fleet. He dissuaded us from going to New England; and told us he was confident of the downfall of the bishops in Scotland; which came to pass within three years: some other things he then told me, which, whether yet come to pass I know not.

In June, 1635, the Lord was graciously pleased to bless me with my wife, who, how well accomplished every way, and how faithful a yoke-fellow, I desire to leave to the memory of others. She was the eldest daughter of Bartholomew Heming, merchant in Edinburgh of most worthy memory, whose brothers were John Heming, merchant in Edinburgh, and Mr. James Heming, minister at the Bathings. Her father died at London, 1624, and was laid hard by Mr. Jonas Walsh, and these two only of a long time, had been solemnly buried without the service book. Her mother, Marion Hamilton, was a rare godly woman, who had also three religious sisters, Elizabeth, married to Mr. Richard Dickson, minister at the West Kirk of Edinburgh, after that at Kinniel; Barbara, married to John Main, merchant in Edinburgh; and Beatrice, married to Mr. Blair. Her brother, James Heming, a gracious and

hopeful youth, died in the year 1640, and a while after, her sister *Marion* after she had been some while married to Mr. John McClelland, minister at Kirkubright. Her mother, with her second husband, John Stevenson, and her family, came to Ireland in the end of the year 1633.

When I went a visit to Ireland, Feb., 1634, Mr. Blair propounded to me that marriage. Immediately thereafter I was sent to London, to have gone to New England, and returned the June following. I had seen her before several times in Scotland, and heard the testimony of many, of her gracious disposition. Yet I was for nine months seeking, as I could, direction from God about this business; during which time I did not offer to speak to her, who, I believe, had not heard any thing of the matter. Only for want of clearness in my mind, though I was twice or thrice in the house, and saw her often at communions and public meetings, and it is like I might have been longer in such darkness, except the Lord had presented me an occasion of our conferring together; for in Nov., 1634, when I was going to the Friday meeting at Antrum, I met with her and some others going thither, and propounded to them by the way, to confer on a text whereon I was to preach, the day after at Antrum; whereon I found her conference so judicious and spiritual, that I took that for some answer of my prayer to have my mind cleared; and blamed myself that I had not before taken occasion to confer with her. Four or five days after I propounded the matter to her, and desired her to think upon it. And after a week or two I went to her mother's house, and being alone with her desiring her answer, I went to prayer, and urged her to pray, which at last she did. And in that time I got abundance of clearness, that it was the Lord's mind that I should marry her; and then propounded the matter more fully to her mother. And though I was fully cleared, I may truly say it was about a month before I got marriage affection to her; though for personal endowments she was beyond many of her equals, and I got it not till I obtained it by prayer; but thereafter I had a great difficulty to moderate it.

In summer 1635, her mother and she went to Scotland, and I followed; because on both sides we were to have the consent of friends in Scotland. We were married by my father, in the West Kirk of Edinburgh, June 23, 1635; and though some told me some days before that *Spotiswood*, who was then Chancellor of Scotland, had given orders to a *Macer* to apprehend me; our marriage was very solemn and countenanced with the presence of a good number of religious friends, among whom was also the Earl of Wigton and his son my lord Heming, in the house of her uncle John Heming, who did as great a duty as if she had been his own daughter; and providence so ordered, that thereafter I was with him and his eight daughters, on their death-bed, and clearly discerned in them all full evidence of the grace of God, I was also at the death of her gracious uncle, Mr. James, minister at Bathings. From Edinburgh we went over to Ireland, and I remained in her mother's house, being at the *Iron Furnace at Milmore*, twelve miles from Killinchie, because there was so little appearance I might continue in my ministry there. For in Nov. 1635, I was again deposed by Mr. Henry Lesly, called bishop of Down, and some while after excommunicated by his order, by one Mr. John Melvin, minister at Down; and for any thing I know, that sentence stands in such force as it can have to this day; but bless the Lord, the curse causeless hath not lighted on me. And I have found since, the Lord's blessing on soul and body, on family, name and goods. Yea, when, after the rebellion, I was sent into Ireland, in the year 1642, that Mr. Melvin was the first that welcomed me ashore, and professed his grief, that he had had a hand in such a wicked act. Notwithstanding the censure of the bishops, I continued preaching every

Sabbath in my mother's house, whither severals resorted. Where Mr. Blair also preached, for he and his wife came also, and remained in my mother's house. This winter perceiving no appearance of liberty, either to preachers or professors, from the bondage of the prelates; a minister of the north of Ireland, and some few out of Scotland, resolved to transport ourselves to New England. Others of our friends being minded thereafter to follow us. We had got letters from the Governor and Council, full of kind invitations and large promises of good accommodations. We built a ship near Belfast, called the *Eagle-Wing*, of about a hundred and fifteen tons, and were minded to have set out in the spring of 1636. But through the difficulties that used to arise in such undertakings, in preparing the ship and our other accommodations, it was the September following, before we set out. We were all to go passengers, at that time about 140 persons, of whom the chief were Mr. Blair, John Stuart, provost of Air, Mr. Robt. Hamilton, afterwards minister at Kirkubright, Charles Campbell, John Somervell, Hugh Brown, and several other families and single persons; among whom was one Andrew Brown, of the parish of Lern, born deaf and dumb, who had been a very vicious, loose man; but when it pleased the Lord to work a change on several in that parish, a very sensible change was observed in him, not only in forsaking his former loose courses and company, but joining himself to religious people, and all the exercises of God's worship, public and private, and ordinarily morning and evening used to go alone to prayer, and would weep at sermons, and by such signs, those who were acquainted with him understood, he would express many things of the work of God upon his heart, so that upon his earnest desire, by the consent of all the ministers who used to meet at Antrum, he was at last admitted to the ordinance of the Lord's Supper.

I was abundantly clear in my mind, that the Lord approved our intention, and endeavor, and was as ready in making all sorts of preparation as any of the rest; yea, during all that time, Mr. Blair, and we that were in my mother's house, spent one day in the week in fasting and prayer for a blessing to our undertaking: yet I often told my wife long before our outsetting, that it gave me in mind, we would never go to New-England; but I laid not so great hold on that, as after I found I had reason to do.

Finding it would be the end of summer before we could be ready to go, I went in March, 1636, to Scotland, to take leave of my father, and other dear friends there; and went to most of all the places where I haunted before, and found, in the midst of much mutual grief, my heart often well refreshed, both in public and in private. I came back in the end of April. In August all the rest of the parish ministers were deposed, viz: Messrs. Cunningham, Ridge, Bryce, Hamilton and Culvert.

June 30, my eldest son was born, and was the next day, after sermon, baptised in our own house.

We had much toil in our preparations, and many hindrances in our outsetting, and both sad and glad hearts, at taking leave of our friends. At last, about the month of September, we loosed from Loch Fergus, but were detained some time with contrary winds, in Lochryan in Scotland, and grounded the ship to caulk some leaks in the keels of the boat. Yet thereafter we set to sea, and for some space had a fair wind, till we were between three and four hundred leagues from Ireland, and so nearer the banks of Newfoundland than any place in Europe. But if ever the Lord spake by his winds, and other dispensations, it was made evident to us, that it was not his will that we should go to New-England. For we met with a mighty heavy rain out of the northwest, which did

break our rudder, (which we got mended) with much of our *gallows-head*, and *forecross-trees*, and tore our *fore-sail*, five or six of our *champlets* made up, a great beam under the *gunner-room door* broke, seas came in the *round house*, and broke a plank or two on the deck, and wet all them that were between decks; we sprung a leak, that gave us seven hundred strokes in two pumps, in the half-hour glass; yet we lay at hull a long time, to beat out that storm, till the master and company came one morning, and told it was impossible to hold out any longer, and though we might beat out that storm, yet we might be sure, in that season of the year, to meet with one or two more of that sort, before we could reach New-England.

After prayer, when we were consulting what to do, I propounded an overture, wherewith I was somewhat perplexed thereafter, viz: "That seeing we thought we had the Lord's warrant for our intended voyage; howbeit it be presumptuous to propose a sign to him, yet we being in such a strait, and having stood out some days already; we might yet for twenty-four hours stand to it, and if in that time he were pleased to calm the storm, and send a fair wind, we might take it for his approbation of our advancing: otherwise that he called us to return." To this they all agreed; but that day, and especially the night thereafter, we had the worst storm that we had seen: So that the next morning, so soon as we saw day, we turned and made good way with a main course, and a little of a foretop-sail; and after some tossing, we came at last, on the third of November, to anchor in Loch Fergus. During all this time, amidst such fears and dangers, the most part of the passengers were very cheerful and confident; yea, some in prayer had expressed such hopes, that rather than the Lord would suffer such a company in such sort to perish, if the ship should break, he would put wings to our shoulders and carry us safe ashore. I never in my days found the day so short as all that time, though I slept some nights not above two hours, and some none at all; but stood most part in the gallery astern the great cabin, where Mr. Blair and I and our families lay. For in the morning, by the time that every one had been some while alone, and then at prayer in their several societies, and then at public prayer in the ship, it was time to go to dinner, and after that we would visit our friends in the gunner-room, or those between decks, or any that were sick, and then public prayer would come, and after that supper and family exercise. Mr. Blair was much of the time weakly, and lay in time of storm. I was sometimes sick, and then my brother, Mr. McClelland only performed duty in the ship: several of those between decks being thronged were sickly. An aged person and one child died, and were buried in the sea. One woman, the wife of Michael Culvert, of Killinchie parish, brought forth a child in the ship; I baptized him on the Sabbath following, and called him *Sea-born*. My wife went aboard with her son sucking her breast, being about fourteen weeks old, yet she had milk abundance for him, and to help others. Mr. Blair was much affected with our returning, and fell into a swoon that day we turned back, and though we could not imagine what to make of that dispensation, yet we were confident, the Lord would let us see somewhat that would abundantly satisfy us. Our outward means were much impaired by this disappointment, for we had put most of our stocks in provision, and somewhat of merchandize, which we behoved to sell at low rates at our return, and had provided ourselves with some servants for fishing and building of houses, whom we behoved to turn off.

That which grieved us most was, that we were like to be a mocking to the wicked; but we found the contrary, that the prelates and their followers, were much dismayed and afraid at our return; but neither

they nor we knew that within a year, the Lord would root the prelates out of Scotland, and after that out of England and Ireland.

Mr. Blair went and dwelt at the store in Belfast; others elsewhere. I came back and removed at my mother's house, and preached each Sabbath that winter, as I had done before.

[To be Continued.]

ART. IV. *The Secession Testimony abundantly consistent with Liberty of Conscience, in a Letter to a Friend.*

"The wisdom that is from above," &c. James iii. 17.

MR. EDITOR—I send you for insertion in the Monitor, a letter of Rev. James Morrison, one of the fathers of the Secession. It is so lucid and appropriate an elucidation of the principles held by the first Seceders on the extent of the Magistrates' power in revealed religion and national covenanting, that it seems to me a very seasonable document to be laid before our churches at this time, when some are finding fault with our Synod for their deed declaring themselves in union with the Synod of Original Seceders in Scotland. The coincidence of sentiment, and even of language between Mr. M.'s letter and the Testimony of Original Seceders is striking; and I think must convince every attentive reader who will compare them, that the Testimony of Original Seceders has advanced no new nor strange doctrine on those subjects in the Secession Church. The letter is as follows:—

D. C.

Dear Friend—It is a considerable time since I resolved on writing you an answer to your letter as what I judged myself called to in providence. Various things, however, have prevented me from setting about it till now. The difficulty which my friend, and perhaps others, labor under, I imagine is in general this: The doctrine which I have advanced in the sermons on covenanting, and on the acknowledgment of sins, concerning the duty of magistrates in matters of religion, is inconsistent with the doctrine of the Confession of Faith, and of our covenanting ancestors on the subject. I allege, that the civil magistrate has no title to dictate to his subjects in matters of conscience—to control the proceedings of the established church, or to infringe the natural liberties of peaceable dissenters from it—whereas it is asserted in our Confession, (chap. 23, sec. 3.) "That he hath authority, and it is his duty to take order, that unity and peace be preserved in the church; that the truth of God be kept pure and entire; that all blasphemies and heresies be suppressed, all corruptions and abuses in worship and discipline prevented and reformed; and all the ordinances of God duly settled, administered and observed; for the better effecting whereof, he hath power to call Synods, to be present at them; and to provide, that whatsoever is transacted in them be according to the mind of God." I assert "that our covenants, *in a religious view*, could not be warrantably enforced with civil pains or punishments; whereas our covenanting ancestors, whose successors we give out ourselves to be, enjoined the swearing of our solemn covenants under all civil pains."

As the above is an abstract of all that I maintain, having the least apparent inconsistency with the doctrine of our Confession or covenanting ancestors, I imagine it will readily be allowed that I have stated the difficulty in the utmost strength thereof. Indeed, I was all along aware, that some such doubts might arise in people's minds, and therefore I laid my thoughts on the subject in such a manner as I conceived to be best calculated for obviating them. Some of those whose principles were esteemed high enough on the head of the Magistrate's power in religion, are very well satisfied. But others, it seems, on the opposite side, are not so. There are two things, however, of which, I flatter myself all will acquit me—

1st. Of going out of my way in order to foist in a matter extraneous to the subject of which I was treating. If I had not found it necessary for the vindication of our principles, nay, and even of the measures of our reforming forefathers, particularly in the place with which I have a particular connection, I had never written a word upon the thorny subject. And, indeed, in no other view is there any occasion for meddling with it, in our present circumstances.

2d. Of publishing any thing inconsistent with the avowed principles of the Associate Judicatories. If I be wrong, the whole Associate Synod, with all the presbyteries

and sessions subordinate thereto, are also wrong, as all the members of said Judicatories are solemnly engaged, at their respective ordinations, to the very same doctrine, by the adherence which they then testify to *Answers by the Associate Presbytery to Mr. Nairn's Reasons of Dissent, with the Declaration and defence thereto subjoined*. The whole of that valuable part of the scripture-testimony is full to my purpose; particularly page 71 where it is said, "The public good of outward and common order in all reasonable society, unto the glory of God, is the great and only end which those invested with magistracy can propose, in a sole respect unto that office. And as, in prosecuting this end, civilly, according to their office, it is only over men's good or evil works that they can have any inspection; so it is only over those which they must needs take cognizance of, for the said public good; while at the same time, their doing so must be in such a manner, and proceed so far alienarily, (only) as is requisite for that end: without assuming any lordship immediately over men's consciences, or making any encroachment upon the special privileges and business of the church. And, moreover, as the whole institution and end of their office are cut out by and lie within the compass of natural principles; it were absurd to suppose, that there could or ought to be any exercise thereof towards its end, in the aforesaid circumstances, but what can be argued for, and defended from natural principles; as indeed there is nothing specially allotted and allowed unto magistrates, by the word of God, and the confessions of the reformed churches, but what can be so." If this doctrine hold, (and indeed it is the basis of that whole declaration and defence in which it is contained, the very hinge on which the controversy with the anti-government people turns;) all that I maintain on the subject, follows of course, or rather is manifestly imparted in it.

But I imagine, the difficulty which my friend and others labor under does not lie here. If I understand you right, they are for ascribing as little authority to the magistrate in matters of religion, as I have done. But they cannot reconcile what I have published upon the subject, in conformity to the above quotation from the *Declaration and Defence* subjoined to the *Associate Presbytery's Answers to Mr. Nairn*, with the forementioned section of the Confession or the approbation which is given of the solemn league period in the Judicial Act and Testimony. Their scruple, I conceive, is with the *Confession and Testimony*.

I shall begin with their difficulty about the Confession. And I shall, in the first place, remove some stumbling blocks out of the way, in the following observations:

1st. That the Confession ought in justice to be allowed to explain itself; without a sole respect to the writings of the divines of the last century, as the undoubted sense of it. Though I should grant, that some of the compilers of it at *Westminster*, as also some of the approvers of it in *Scotland*, retained a sad tincture of *Erastian* or persecuting principles, it will not follow, that the *Confession itself* contains such principles. At the same time, that every lover of truth must pay great veneration to their memory; all who are but tolerably acquainted with their writings on other subjects, must have observed a variety of mistakes in them. This will not be called in question. That all their mistakes (or errors, if you will) upon other subjects are contained in the Confession, nobody will say. Yet as few, I believe, will venture to assert, that they wittingly and willingly contradicted that Confession which they received with so much joy and gladness. Now, why should it be thought that their mistakes or errors on this head must needs be contained in the Confession? Why may it not be allowed, that they inadvertently published doctrines not duly consistent with the Confession on this, as well as on other heads? To illustrate this by one instance,—it is well enough known, that some of the abovementioned divines maintained faith to be the condition of the covenant of grace; in such a sense as all Seceders, and even most Calvinists, will now allow to be very incautious, if not quite unsound. The *Larger Catechism*, however, asserts faith to be the condition of that covenant. But are we therefore to conclude, that the incautious and unsound sense of the aforesaid divines must needs be the true and undoubted sense of the *Larger Catechism* on the subject? It is certainly but justice, that we should hear the *Catechism itself*: "The grace of God is manifested in the second covenant, in that he freely provideth and offereth to sinners a Mediator, and life and salvation by him; and requiring faith as the condition to interest them in him, promiseth and giveth his Holy Spirit to all his elect, to work in them that faith, with all other saving graces; and to enable them unto all holy obedience, as the evidence of the truth of their faith and thankfulness to God, and as the way which he hath appointed them to salvation." It is thus plain, that all that the *Catechism* means, is, that faith, and faith alone, is the means of interesting sinners in Christ, the head of the covenant. And I hope, ere all be done, to show that the Confession is as clear of *Erastianism*, as the *Catechism* is of *Legalism*.

Further, I am so far from thinking, that the writings of the forementioned divines are to be sustained as the undoubted meaning of the Confession on this head, that I do not hesitate to say, that some of them are quite contrary to it. I shall give one instance of this, because it is to be found in a well known book. Mr. David Dickson,

in his *Truth's Victory over Error*, (if that book, as we have it, be indeed Mr. Dickson's,) lays it down as an error of *Quakers* and *sectaries*, to judge it anti-christian, "that the civil supreme magistrate, with the assistance of the church and her censures, should, by his coactive power, force and oblige all his subjects to a reformation of religion, and to a conformity to the true worship, and sound doctrine and discipline of the church;" and maintains, that "though it be the sinful practice of the church of Rome, to force men and women to be of their religion, which is superstitious and idolatrous; yet it is not so to others, who have the true religion among them." And he gives this as the very sense of the forecited article of the Confession. But are we therefore to think, that the *Confession* is *Erastian*, or that it warrants persecution for conscience sake? Are we, because Mr. Dickson has put such a construction upon it, to believe, that it teaches us to imitate *Papists*, in forcing people to be of our religion; or, in other words, in forcing them to be *hypocrites*, (for forcing them to be *Christians*, or even safe members of the church, never can be done.) Nay, are we not rather to conclude, that even the aforesaid eminent divine mistook the meaning of the Confession, and taught doctrines for which it gave him no warrant or authority? It is very true, the Confession teaches, that such and such are the duties of the christian magistrate. Hence the aforesaid author concludes, that it cannot be but by force and compulsion that he must perform them. But this is entirely an addition of his own—quite beside this article, and manifestly contradictory to the very next, as we shall see presently. There are other means, besides compulsion, by which all that is here ascribed to the magistrate, may be very well performed by him. Upon the whole, it is plain the doctrine of the divines of the aforesaid period, as well as ours, is to be judged of by the Confession, and not the Confession by their or our doctrine. And hence I cannot but admire the providence of God, in so overruling the spirits of those who were employed in compiling the Confession, that the mistakes on this subject under which it really appears they labored at that time, were not engrossed into the Confession by them. I cannot but look upon it as a proof of the *Lord's eyes being on the truth*, of the divine warrant for Confessions of faith, and (may I add?) of the mercy which he had in reserve for these lands. But to return, we observe,

2d. That every part of the Confession, even as every part of the Bible, is to be understood in connection with other parts of it, as it is only in this way that it can be understood in a consistency with itself; and special respect must be had to what is the primary scope of each part, in connexion with the whole. Now, though the primary intention of this section of it be, to declare the magistrate's duty in reference to religion; yet it is in the first place asserted, "that he may not assume to himself the administration of the word and sacraments, or the power of the keys of the kingdom of heaven." This, at least, implies two things. In the first place, that as it is the duty of the magistrate, (that is, as I all along understand it, of the whole legislature,) to give positive countenance and encouragement only to the true religion; or in other words, to give the legal establishment unto it, and to be of the communion of the church which makes a due profession of the true religion; so he can have no authority to control her proceedings, because this would be equivalent to a taking the administration of the keys of the kingdom of heaven into his own hand. In the second place, that in this case, the judicial cognizance of what is truth and what is error does not belong to him. And thus I think the established church is pretty safe. It is added, "Yet he hath authority, and it is his duty to take order," &c., as formerly quoted: that is, he is to do so by all means that are lawful, or which are competent unto him, without going out of his sphere as only a civil head. For the meaning cannot be, that he is to do so by all the ways and means in which it is possible to be attempted to be done, because some of these are already in the first place carefully excepted. Further it is asserted in the very next section, that "infidelity, or difference in religion, doth not make void the magistrate's just and legal authority, nor free the people from their due obedience to him." From which it unavoidably follows, that infidelity, or difference in religion, doth not make void a subject's just and legal privileges, nor free the magistrate from an obligation to protect him. Suppose a magistrate, who makes profession of christianity, turn infidel or heretical—subjection in all things of a civil nature is still due to him. Just so; though a subject, who makes profession of christianity, turn infidel or heretical, the protection of all his natural rights, life, liberty and property, is still due to him. This is a natural construction of this article; and must be allowed to be the meaning of it, unless we would palm this gross absurdity upon the Confession, that more is requisite to make a subject fit to be protected, than a king fit to be obeyed. Now, as this is the unquestionable sense of this article, nothing can be meant by the latter part of the preceding section, but what is consistent with it: that is, it cannot be warrantable for the magistrate to prosecute the duties therein ascribed to him—in the way of persecuting even his infidel and heretical subjects, while they continue peaceable subjects otherwise. And thus I think dissenters from the establishment are pretty safe.

3d. Though it were allowed, that some of the measures of the forementioned period savoured of attributing an Erastian power to the civil magistrate, and of persecution for conscience sake, it will not therefore follow, that the Confession authorized such measures. There are mistakes in every administration, whether in church or state; and our covenanting ancestors, however single and wise, were not infallible in conforming all their acts and proceedings to the Confession more than to the Bible. It is easier to lay down a good rule than to follow it. Indeed the more I consider even what are sometimes looked on as the exceptionable measures of those times, I can find the less ground of exception against them. But surely it were the height of fondness to imagine, that they were all an exemplification of the Confession and other standards; and consequently it were the height of folly to judge of the Confession and other standards by them, and not rather of them by the Confession and other standards. In so far as the acts and proceedings of a church are agreeable to her standards, they are good explications of them, as being a drawing of them as it were forth into life; but in so far as they are beside or contrary to them, they are rather a darkening of them. What a strange idea would one have of the standards of the church of Scotland if he formed his judgment of them by her present proceedings?

4th. Though the passages of scripture cited for proof of the aforesaid declaration of the magistrate's duty, may appear to some to make his duty more extensive than it is asserted to be in the Confession—they are not to be understood as obligatory upon him in any larger extent than is represented in the Confession. The Confession, according to the nature of it, is the sense of those passages of scripture in all their applicableness to our times and circumstances. This must be allowed, unless we would maintain, that the Confession is chargeable with a wicked mincing of the meaning of scripture, even in a most momentous duty. The scriptures quoted on this article are mostly taken from the Old Testament. Now, it is an undoubted truth, that circumstances under the Old Testament and under the New, are so very different, (as is explained towards the close of the first sermon on covenanting,) that no argument can be drawn from what was the practice of the Jewish kings to what is the duty of Christian magistrates, except in so far as their practice was required by the moral law, the common rule to them and us.

These stumbling blocks being thus removed out of the way, I shall now, in the second place, endeavor to show, that the magistrate may do all that is here said to be his duty to do, without dictating to his subjects in matters of conscience, controlling the proceedings of the established church, or infringing the natural liberties of peaceable dissenters from it. It is such a magistrate as is also a Christian, making a due profession of the true religion, that is here spoken of. In order to a vindication of the duty here ascribed unto him, we shall consider him in this two-fold capacity, as a magistrate, and as a Christian.

I. He is to be considered as a magistrate, and there is no doubt but, even in this capacity, it is incumbent on him to do whatever is here said to be his duty to do. All the difficulty lies in stating how far he is to go in doing it. Now, you will observe, I take it here for granted, (1st.) That he must not go beyond his sphere, as only a civil head. For otherwise he would act out of character, and go out of the station in which providence hath placed him. And the absurd doctrine, that the civil magistrate is head of the church, or supreme judge in all causes, ecclesiastical as well as civil, has been all along maintained to be quite contrary to the Confession. What cruel barbarities did our worthy forefathers suffer in the last persecuting times, for refusing to acknowledge the king's ecclesiastical supremacy! And the Confession expressly declares, "that there is no other head of the church but the Lord Jesus Christ." Chap. xxv. sec. 6. So whatever authority the Confession ascribes to the magistrate, it doth not attribute an ecclesiastical supremacy to him. 2d. He must not claim authority to control or overrule the office bearers of the church in the discharge of their respective functions; nor take upon him, in order hereunto, to judge, when they are in the due and regular discharge thereof, or when they exceed or fall short in it. Though he must judge for himself, in order to a Christian practice; he must not presume to judge as a magistrate, in order to an impeding of them in their ministrations, or a counteracting of their decisions. The doctrine of ministers of the gospel, the servants and ambassadors of the King of kings and Lord of lords, is not cognizable by the civil magistrate as such, except in so far as it is of a seditious or injurious nature. They do not plead their sacred character as an exemption from his authority, in any thing that is cognizable by him; but in things of a spiritual and heavenly nature, they are servants of another master, even Christ. Nor are ecclesiastical judicatories subject to civil judicatories, as courts of review. Neither of the two are subordinate to the other; but both of them are supreme in their sphere, and in their own matters. See Acts 25: 10. 2 Chron. 19: 11. Mat. 22: 21. This observation is nothing more than the necessary consequence of the former. 3d. Religion is not entrusted to his care, as it is a matter of supernatural revelation; but only as the free and public profession of it is the most precious natural right belonging to him and his subjects. Or,

in other words, it is not supernatural religion itself, but the liberty of professing it, that is committed to his charge. As the maintenance of it in the former respect, against all secret or open corrupters of it, belongs directly and chiefly to the ministers of the gospel, with the ecclesiastical courts of divine institution : so the maintenance of it in the latter respect, against all that would mar or hinder the free exercise and progress of it, belongs directly and chiefly to the civil magistrate. The true religion, in all the integrity and purity of it, has a divine title to be maintained in a state of safety from all hinderers and disturbers of it. Thus, Cyrus' proclamation opening a door for the pure worship of the true God, is for the imitation of all magistrates. In this respect, it is asserted in the second book of discipline, Chap. 10—"Although all the members of the kirk be holden, every one in their vocation, and according thereto, to advance the kingdom of Jesus Christ, so far as lieth in their power; yet chiefly christian princes, and other magistrates, are holden to do the same. For they are called in the scripture, nourishers of the kirk; for so much as by them it is, or at least ought to be maintained, fostered, upholden and defended against all that would procure the hurt thereof." See Isaiah xlix : 22, 23.—Thus, I say, the liberty of professing the true religion is the proper object of the magistrate's care and encouragement.

(To be continued.)

ART. V. *The Centenary of the Secession.*

[The following article is copied from the *Edinburgh Presbyterian Magazine*, for Jan. 1884, with which Dr. McCrie is supposed to be connected. Arrangements have been made by which we expect to receive this work regularly hereafter, together with the *Theological Magazine*, published under the auspices of the United Secession Church. Should we not be disappointed in the reception of these works, it is believed they will enable us to give additional interest to the pages of the Religious Monitor. The reader will probably be no less surprised at the manner in which the Centenary of the Secession was celebrated at Edinburgh, than at the *heterogeneous materials* engaging in the celebration. And some will probably be led, by reading this account, to indulge the fear that the great body of the Secession Church in Scotland is no longer what it once was.]

On the 6th of December in the year 1733, the first four seceding ministers, Messrs. Erskine, Wilson, Moncrieff, and Fisher, formed themselves into a Presbytery, and raised the standard of the secession. With many tears, and fastings, and prayers, were the foundations of this building laid. Though, in common with many of their brethren, they had long groaned under the evils and the defections of the Established Church, still they had clung in fond attachment to her communion, and would, in all likelihood, have continued to do so, had they not been tyrannically expelled by the prevailing party in the Supreme Court, and denied all ministerial freedom in testifying against her corruptions. The step which they felt themselves compelled to take involved the renunciation, not only of temporal advantages, but of the dearest ties and the holiest associations. To burst the bonds of ministerial and Christian fellowship—to bear the responsibility of erecting a separate communion—to endure the reproaches, the censures, the calumnies of those whom they had left;—such were the sacrifices and trials to which they submitted by adopting this decisive course. The reluctance which they felt to encounter them, though overcome by a high sense of duty, and rendered less painful in the final struggle by their being forcibly ejected from ministerial communion with the national church, is still sufficiently visible in their published acts about this period. "Notwithstanding," say they, in their deed of secession, November 16, 1733, "notwithstanding of our being cast out from ministerial communion with the Established Church of Scotland, we still hold communion with all and every one who desire with us to adhere to the principles of the true presbyterian covenanted Church of Scotland, in her doctrine, worship, government and discipline. But in regard the prevailing party in this established church who have now cast us out, are carrying on a course of defection from our reformed and covenanted principles, &c.; therefore we do protest that we are obliged to make a secession from them." In another paper, they repeat the statement, "We have made a secession from the prevailing party—our secession is not from the Church of Scotland." With this noble testimony they went out; and though invited to return, it was under such restrictions, and with so little prospect of seeing the evils of which they complained either properly testified against or removed while they remained in the church, they deemed themselves called upon in providence to maintain the advantage which their separate standing afforded

them of testifying with all freedom, and in a judicial capacity, for the work of the Reformation. Still, however, they took every opportunity to declare that they were not dissenters from the constitution of the church; and there was no charge from which they were more anxious to vindicate themselves, than that of being schismatics and secessionaries. They hated the very garment spotted with this corruption; they testified, wrote, preached and prayed against it. And it was their dearest wish that a change in the administration of the establishment might afford them an opportunity of wiping off the slander, by returning to the bosom of the church, from which nothing but dire necessity had driven them. It need only be observed farther, that, in their Acts for Fasting, many of which they issued, and which their successors, till of late years, continued to issue, they bewailed, in the most sincere sorrow, the perseverance of the Church of Scotland in her defections, which rendered the continuance of Secession still necessary, and even added to the strength of its original grounds other causes of lamentation.

On the 10th of December 1833, there was held, in the Waterloo Hotel, Edinburgh, a convivial meeting of ministers and private gentlemen, to celebrate the Centenary of the Secession. Dr. John Brown was in the chair, supported by Dr. Jameison and Dr. Wardlaw: Dr. John Ritchie acted as croupier. After prayer—we beg pardon—after the cloth was removed, and the healths of the royal family being drank with all due honours, Dr. Brown, in a neat and appropriate speech, introduced the toast of the day. In the course of his speech, the reverend Doctor took occasion to allude to the very different aspect presented by the great body of the Secession in the present day from that assumed by the original Seceders. “The fathers of the Secession,” he observed, “seem to have expected it to terminate when reform should be effected in the National Church; but he believed the majority of their descendents had made up their minds to the greater probability of this event taking place by a dissolution of the National Establishment.” (Cheers.) He then proceeded to express his hope and belief that the name of the Secession Church would be merged, first, into that of the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland, and next, into that of the Church of Christ in Scotland. The reverend gentleman then proposed a toast, “The Secession, and may it last as long as there is any need for it, and no longer.” (Renewed cheering.) He was followed by Dr. Ritchie, who, after some ineffectual floundering about Establishments, ended by observing, that “he would not say more, recollecting, as he did, the building on the other side of the street,” (meaning, it was supposed, the jail,) and by proposing, “The memory of the founders of the Secession, Messrs. Wilson, Erskine, Moncreiff and Fisher!” which toast was drank in solemn silence.

Thereafter, the health of Dr. Wardlaw having been toasted, that reverend gentleman, after acknowledging that he himself had, in the days of his ignorance, been a Seceder, but had seen it his duty to turn an Independent, hinted, in no very obscure terms, that he hoped to see them all, in a short time, following his example. “I rejoice,” he said, “that the Seceders have now become, to so large an amount, DISSENTERS.”—With the view of hastening this consumation, we told them what his views of church-communion were, which, if we may judge from his brief confession of faith, must have presented to his admiring auditors a tempting paradise of Independent sweets, a rich and rare combination of charity and fidelity, pliability and firmness, suggesting a capital scheme for filling their own churches at the expense of others—all prizes and no blanks! “I confess,” said the Doctor, “that in the matter of church communion, I was never able to lay down to myself any other rule than this, that I cannot refuse to have fellowship with an individual on earth with whom I expect to have fellowship in heaven. At the same time there may be causes to keep us asunder while we are one in heart; but I would cheerfully have communion with an individual, though I could not with the church of which he is a member; and while I do this, I give to the Christian world a proof of love to the individual, though not of approbation to his corrupt system.”—In other words, Dr. Wardlaw, would be most happy to admit any individual of the present company to his communion-table and church in Glasgow; but catch him going to any of theirs! Suppose some worthy scion of the Secession, warmed by the Doctor’s eloquence and the hilarity of the table, had spoken up to the following effect, “Well, my dear Doctor, you have made a convert of me this moment to your principles: I mean henceforth to lay down to myself the rule of admitting any individual to my fellowship on earth with whom I expect to have fellowship in heaven; you are certainly one of that number: will you come and join with me and my flock next Sabbath, and be so good as bring along with you any of your friends?—I shall be happy to receive them on your recommendation.” “Ah! my dear Sir,” would the Doctor reply, “that is another story; I said I would be glad to see any of you coming to my chapel, not that I would come to yours. You belong to a corrupt system, which I am happy to find you in the way of reforming, but until you bring your churches into a perfect agreement with mine, in other words, become out and out Independents, I can have no communion with you.” Here we may suppose Dr. Ritchie, or some other wag, to interpose by exclaiming, that the Doctor’s charity was something like the lawyer’s swelled jaw, all on one side.

The subject, however, is really to serious for laughter. We cannot, indeed, trust ourselves to speak of the exhibition we have described in the terms, which it deserves,—an exhibition which has filled the bosoms of all sensible and reflecting men with mingled feelings of astonishment and disgust. We say nothing of the unseemly example set by a body of grave divines, meeting in a tavern, and discussing the most solemn of subjects in the midst of the excitement and merriment of a public feast. We say nothing of the palpable incongruity of Seceder ministers, (if such they are now to be called) some of them too members of Temperance Societies, countenancing some of the most foolish, if not positively sinful, ceremonies of the festive board, and repeatedly pledging, in bumpers of wine, the *memories* of our reforming ancestors! We say nothing of the strange selection of such an occasion as the anniversary of the Secession for launching violent invectives against the Church of Scotland. We can say nothing, from absolute and unabated surprise, at the infatuation which could convert into an occasion of feasting and rejoicing, what had ever before been matter of penitential fasting; and at the effrontery which could lead men, with such sentiments in their mouths, to drag in, as parties in their unhallowed orgies, the names of our departed worthies, whose spirits may be justly supposed to have looked down on their doings with mingled pity and indignation.

ART. VI. *Correspondence between the Lords and Commons in the Parliament in England, and the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland; also between said Assembly and the Assembly of Divines met at Westminster, 1643—1648.*

(Continued from page 320.)

Letter from the Synod of Divines in the Kirk of England to the General Assembly.

Right honorable, right reverend and dearly beloved Brethren in Jesus Christ.—The blessing and comfort of that inviolable union which our gracious God hath vouchsafed to both churches and nations, gave us opportunity, the last year, to breathe out some of our sighs into your compassionate bosoms; and such have been the soundings of your bowels, as have offered violence to heaven, by your effectual, fervent prayers, and brought many sweet refreshings to our languishing spirits by your pious and comfortable letters in answer to ours.

This makes us studious of all means of acknowledging your tender sympathy, and of laying hold on all opportunities of repairing again to the same streams of consolation: for which end, as we cannot but confess, that in the midst of those boisterous waves wherein we have been daily tossed, we have met with many gracious and unexpected encouragements; so we must needs renew our former mournings, and rend our hearts afresh unto you, with greatest instance for all the assistance that your prayers, tears, learning, piety, and largeness of heart can possibly contribute to your poor afflicted and still conflicting brethren. And this we the rather beg of you, who, having been first in the furnace of affliction, and are come out of great tribulation, are meekest to commiserate, and best able to comfort others in any trouble, by the comforts wherewith you yourselves have been comforted of God.

It was in our desires to have presented to your venerable assembly, some of our dearest respects, in writing, by that eminently learned and much honored commissioner of yours, the lord Waristoun. But his departure hence was so sudden to us, and unexpected by us, that we could not have time, as his lordship can inform you, to tender by him such a testimony of our brotherly and intimate affections, as may in some measure suit with your manifold and most affectionate expressions towards us, when our sighings were many and our hearts faint. For such hath been your love that no waters can quench it, and such the undertakings of the whole kingdom of Scotland, through your furtherance, that we already begin to reap the fruits of all that piety, prudence, and valor, which at this day render your nation worthily renowned in the Christian world; and us, exceedingly straitened and restless in ourselves, until God please to open a way for our endeavors to make some more answerable returns.

Toward this, our thoughts and hopes were to have made, ere now, some proceedings of our assembly legible in yours. But such are the continued distractions which lie upon our spirits, by means of the sad and bleeding condition of this kingdom, as have cast us much behind our own expectations, and hindered that expedition which the necessities of this nation, and the desires of our brethren abroad, do earnestly call for at our hands.

Sometimes, through God's goodness, we have a prosperous gale. Sometimes, again, we sail like Paul and his company, *very slowly many days*. And even then, when we draw near the fair havens, some contrary winds put us out into the deep again. We walk in paths that have hitherto been untrodden by any assembly in this church. We therefore are enforced to spend more time in our inquiries, and in seeking of God a right way for us, that at length we may put into that highway, the way of holiness, wherein wayfaring men, though fools shall not err. And we will wait upon our God before whom we have been this day humbling our souls, until he lead us into all these truths which we seek after; and we shall labor to be yet more vile in our own eyes, as finding by experience that it is not in man to direct his way.

Those winds which for a while do trouble the air, do withal purge and refine it: And our trust is that through the most wise Providence and blessing of God, the truth by our so long continued agitations, will be better cleared among us, and so our service will prove more ac-

ceptable to all the churches of Christ, but more especially to you, while we have an intentive eye to our peculiar protestation, and to that public sacred covenant entered into by both the kingdoms, for uniformity in all his Majesty's dominions.

Which work we carry on, against whatever difficulties are cast in our way, with more ease and comfort, by the great sedulity and seasonable assistance we daily receive from your noble and reverend commissioners sitting among us: Their prudence will, we doubt not, sufficiently furnish you with more particular information touching our affairs. And here we cannot but acknowledge that the assiduous presence of these our learned and highly esteemed brethren among us, and their free and faithful contributing of their counsels to us, do oblige us much to a double duty; the one of thanks, which we now heartily render to you, for sending to us such excellent helpers; the other of request, which we earnestly make for their continuance with us, until the work be brought up to the finishing cubit.

Now, the great master-builder, without whose almighty concurrence, the builders labor but in vain, accomplish and perfect all his own glorious work in your hands, and in ours, also to his own glory, the peace and edification of all the churches, and the comfort of ourselves over all our travails and sufferings.

Your most affectionate brethren and servants in the Lord, by the direction, and in the name of this whole assembly.

William Twisse, *Prolocutor*, Cornelius Burges, *Assessor*, Henry Robrough, *Scriba*, Adoniram Byfield, *Scriba*.

Westminster, May 17, 1644.

The General Assembly's Answer to the Right Reverend the Assembly of Divines in the Kirk of England.

Right Honorable, right Reverend, and most dearly beloved in our Lord, we do thankfully acknowledge your respectful remembrance of us by your letters at all occasions, and not a little rejoiced to see that happy correspondence and christian communion so sweetly entertained amongst us, which is so acceptable in the sight of the Lord, so pleasant and profitable, especially when kept and entertained betwixt kirks and kingdoms about affairs of the highest and most public concernment and interest: We have nothing more in our desires than to entertain that harmonious correspondence, that christian sympathy and compassion, that sounding and resounding of bowels, which well besemeth kirks and nations, united by a solemn league and sacred covenant, for mutual endeavors, by all lawful means to a further unity in that faith once delivered to the saints, and greater uniformity in divine worship, discipline, and government, according to the pattern.

The case and condition of your bleeding kingdom is no less sensible to us, than if ourselves were in affliction with you; but we trust all is working to your best, and to our Lord's glory. That some of you have fallen, it is to try you, purge you, and make you white. If the Lord by those means be with that reformation of his ordinances, bringing also along that other reformation of hearts and lives, should it not be welcomed with all joy, although it be upon the expence of blood and lives? The Lord will turn the bygone rage of man to his glory and your spiritual good, the remnant of rage will he restrain. The Lord delivereth his own by degrees, *he is with them in trouble, and delivereth them, and honoreth them.* He who hath been sensibly with you hitherto, and upheld you in your trouble, will, we trust, yet deliver you, and honor you. The more ye sow in tears, the greater shall be your harvest of peace and joy, when the Lord, according to the days wherein he hath afflicted you, and the years wherein ye have seen evil, shall make you glad, and his work to appear unto you, and his glory unto your children, and the beauty of the Lord your God to be upon you, and shall establish the work of your hands; yea, even establish the work of your hands.

We should prove both unthankful to God, and unfaithful to men, did we not hold out unto you the Lord's gracious and powerful dealing with us in the like condition, and comfort you with the consolations wherewith we ourselves have been comforted. We were involved in the like difficulties—we had the strong opposition of highest authority set over two powerful kingdoms, beside this of ours; and the unhappy providence of our wickedly, wise and wary prelates, had done what in them lay, to make the ministry of this land sworn enemies to the intended reformation; so that we walked in a very wilderness, in a labyrinth, and as upon deep waters, wherein not only did our feet loose footing, but also our eyes all discovering or discerning of any ground; yea, we were ready to lose ourselves: Yet the Lord hath graciously rid us, and recovered us out of all these difficulties, and set our feet upon a rock, and ordered our goings. The experience we have had in our own persons, affordeth us confidence and hope concerning your affairs; and we trust this hope shall not be disappointed; it is our duty to hope upon experience, and it is the Lord's word and promise, that such an hope shall not be ashamed. It cannot choose but beget confidence in you, when ye shall consider, that ye have seen before your eyes your neighboring ship of this kirk and kingdom, having, as it were, loosed from your side, in the like or self-safe storm, notwithstanding all tossing of winds and waves, yet (*not by might, nor by power, but by the spirit of the Lord of hosts*) to have arrived safe and sound to the port and harbor; yea, and to have dared to put out again unto the storm, to contribute her weak endeavors for your help.

We acknowledge your impediments to be great and many; the sufferings of your brethren, the people of God, cannot choose but both damp your spirits, and divide your thoughts. Your walking in an untrodden and unknown way, must put you (though never so willing to go on speedily, yet) to take time and leisure to ask for the right way, and ye want not the opposition of some amongst yourselves, to whom, notwithstanding, we trust the Lord will reveal his truth in his own time. Nevertheless, much honored and dear brethren, go on courageously against the stream of all opposition; every mountain in the way of *Zerubbabel*, the Lord shall make

plain ; and as many of you as are perfect, be thus minded, that forgetting the things that are behind, and looking to the things that are before, you press hard towards the mark, as having before you, not only the prize of the high calling and recompence of reward, but also at the end of this race, these two precious pearls and inestimable jewels of truth and unity, and all the reformed churches beholding and looking on, not only as witnesses, but also being ready to congratulate and embrace you.

We were greatly refreshed to hear by letters from our commissioners there with you, and by a more particular relation from the Lord *Waristoun*, now with us, of your praise-worthy proceedings, and of the great good things the Lord hath wrought among you and for you. Shall it seem a small thing in our eyes, that the covenant (the foundation of the whole work) is taken ? That that antichristian prelacy, with all the train thereof, is extirpated ? That the door of a right entry unto faithful shepherds is opened ; many corruptions, as altars, images, and other monuments of idolatry and superstition removed, defaced and abolished ; the service-book in many places forsaken, and plain and powerful preaching set up ; the great organs at *Pauls* and *Peters* taken down ; that the Royal Chapel is purged and reformed, sacraments sincerely administered, and according to the pattern in the mount ; that your colleges, the seminaries of your kirk ; are planted with able and sincere professors ? That the good hand of God hath called and kept together so many pious, grave, and learned divines for so long a time, and disposed their hearts to search his truth by their frequent humiliations, continual prayers, and learned and peaceable debates ? Should not all, and each one of these, stir up our souls to bless the Lord, and render both you and us confident, that he who hath begun the good work, will perfect it, and put the copestone upon it ; that the beauty of a perfected work may shine to all nations, and we may say and shout, *grace, grace, unto it* ; that the time may be when full liberty and leisure shall be to all the builders of the house of God, to give themselves, with both their hands to the building up and edifying the people of God in these things that belong to life and godliness, to the making of them wise to salvation, and thoroughly furnished to every good work, and when the Lord shall delight to dwell more familiarly, and to work more powerfully in, and by his thoroughly purified ordinances ? That you afflicted and tossed with tempests and not comforted, shall have your stones laid with fair colors, your foundation with sapphires, your children shall be taught of God, and shall have great peace, and no weapon framed against you shall prosper, and every tongue that rieth against you in judgment shall be condemned ; that the Lord will awake as in the ancient days, as in the generation of old ; that the redeemed of the Lord shall come unto Zion with singing, and sorrow and mourning shall flee away.

And as we are confident that the Lord who heareth prayer, and hath promised to guide his servants in all truth, will bring your labors to a comfortable conclusion. So do all the reformed kirks, and the kirk, of Scotland above all others extremely long for the taste of the fruits of their pious labors and continual pains. And so much the more, that we have suspended some material determinations amongst ourselves, upon expectation of uniformity ; and that in the mean time so many scandalous papers come to our view, and to the hands of the people here, for liberty of conscience, toleration of sects, and such practices as are contrary to the doctrine, government and peace of all the reformed kirks. For stopping and suppressing whereof, as we doubt not, but your wisdom, and the authority of the honorable Houses of Parliament will use some more effectual means ; so do we hope that your determinations shall carry such evidence of divine truth and demonstration of the spirit, that those unhappy clouds of darkness shall be so scattered, that they shall be no more gathered nor appear hereafter, to the dishonor of God, the prejudice of his truth, and the scandalizing of so many souls for which Christ hath died.

We do with hearty thankfulness resend all the kindness and respect you have shown to our commissioners, and your high esteem of them in love for the worksake ; although their presence here would be very comfortable unto us, very steadable to the public, and necessary in respect of their great and important particular charges and stations ; yet do we willingly dispense with all, yea, nothing shall be too dear unto us, so that this work be finished with joy, and *Jerusalem made the glory and praise of the whole earth : because of the house of the Lord our God we will seek her good. For our brethren and companions' sake, we will now say, peace be within her walls, prosperity within her palaces.*

Subscribed in name of the General Assembly of the kirk of Scotland, by the Moderator of the Assembly.

Edinburgh, Jan^y 4, 1644.

ART. VII. *Commission of Synod.*

MR. EDITOR—I am directed to communicate to you, for insertion in the Monitor, the following proceedings of the Board of Directors of the Theological Seminary, for the information of the several presbyteries and congregations interested, you will please give it a place in your pages.

At a meeting of the Board of Directors of the Theological Seminary of the Associate Church, on the 28th of March, 1834, the following named students having completed the full term of study, were directed to be taken on trial for license, viz : Messrs. John S. Easton and Alexander T. McGill, by the Presbytery of Philadelphia ; Mr. Thomas S. Kendall, by the Presbytery of Miami, and Mr. James Patterson by the Presbytery of Chartiers.

A scale of appointments extending to the meeting of Synod in October, was adopted as follows, viz :
Mr. Easton, (in case of license) in the Presbytery of Philadelphia, July, August. Albany, September.

Mr. McGill, Philadelphia, till meeting of Synod.
 Mr. Kendall, Miami, till meeting of Synod.
 Mr. Patterson, Ohio, July; Muskingum, August, September.
 Mr. David Thompson, having been licensed by the Presbytery of Chartiers in the month of March last, was appointed to the Presbytery of Muskingum, April and May; Ohio, June, and Miami, July, August and September.

By order of the Board.

THOMAS HANNA, Sec'y.

P. S. For the information of all concerned, I may add that the new building for the Theological Seminary, now in progress, is expected to be in complete readiness for the reception of the professors and students at the commencement of the next session.

T. HANNA.

ART. VIII. *Something like Irvingism.*

At a recent meeting in Cortland Co., N. Y., a young man addressed a large assemblage, which was before him, with great vehemence and fluency. He declared the following doctrines.

"That there was not a single church of Christ upon earth, and that the churches (so called,) as they now exist, are anti-christ, possessing all the qualities of the mystical Babylon. That there had not existed a true church since the decay of the primitive church the date of which however he did not fix.

"That no church could be a true church which had a single *imperfect* member in it, and that all the present ministry were impostors. But that Christ had now appeared the second time, *without sin* unto salvation, and that this appearance was in him (the speaker,) and in many others who had received him. So that he dwelt personally in them, their eyes being Christ's eyes, their ears Christ's ears, and their tongues Christ's tongues. That they were holy men as God is holy, so that they committed no sin, and that they never could commit any.

"That Christ within them constantly directed them what to say, and what to do, and he vehemently urged all members of churches present to come out from them and receive Christ as they had done. He was followed by five others, one of whom claimed for himself and his companions the power of discerning spirits; and another declared himself commissioned immediately from heaven to preach the gospel forever and ever.

"Opposition was then challenged and any one individual to speak who chose. I (the writer) availed myself of the permission to ask the following questions:

"Do you consider Paul as having been a perfect and holy man.

"Yes, perfectly holy.

"Was Peter a perfectly holy man?"

"Yes, perfectly holy.

"How then was it that Paul "withstood him to the face for he was to be blamed."

"The first reply was, "they were perfect in Christ Jesus." But when I hoped for "a definition of perfect holiness as consistent with blame-worthy conduct," I was only answered by a torrent of ranting professions of their own sinlessness. One indeed said he "had nothing to do with what happened eighteen hundred years ago."

"These people I understand are already quite numerous, and are increasing. There is a number of them in De Ruyter, several hundred in Delphi, some at Salina, Oswego and many other places. They claim the gift of prophecy, and I am told attempt to work miracles. Several of those whom I heard evidently possess some little talent, and are remarkably fluent in quoting Scripture. They threaten us with an alarming progress of their heresy. Am I wrong in imputing the rise of this sect to New Divinity and new measures? I think not."

ART. IX. *Anniversary.*

AMERICAN BIBLE SOCIETY.—*Receipts.*—The amount from all sources is \$68,600 82; of which sum, \$31,052 34 were from the sale of books; \$3,303 62, from legacies; \$21,891 80, ordinary donations; \$27,485 22, towards foreign distribution; \$4,867 84, from various other sources, detailed in the Treasurer's Report.

Grants of Money to Print the Scriptures in Foreign Countries.—It was mentioned in the last report, that the Board had pledged the sum of \$30,000, towards promoting foreign distribution, in case this sum was furnished by friends and auxiliaries.

The whole of the above named sum has been subscribed, and \$27,485 22 of it paid into the Treasury. From this money has been granted towards printing the Scriptures at Bombay,..... \$3,000
 Do. at Ceylon,..... 2,000
 Do. in Burmah,..... 5,000
 Do. "China,..... 5,000
 Do. at the Sandwich Islands,..... 5,000
 Do. in France,..... 2,000
 Various other sums have been appropriated, making a total of \$25,019 81 towards the above object. The remainder of the \$30,000 will be disbursed as soon as paid in, and as many *additional* sums as may be furnished.

INDEX.

A	
A Burning Heart.....	121
A Fact.....	158
Abihu, Sis of.....	198, 277, 290
Act condemning Slavery.....	257
for a Fast.....	170
respecting Marriage.....	180
Agreement and difference between the Love of the Father, to Christ, and Christ's love to his people.....	358
Albany, Presbytery of.....	165
Allegany, Presbytery of.....	173
American Bible Society.....	382
An Examination of Christ's words to Peter..	21
Anniversaries.....	82
Answer to protest in case of Mealy... ..	178
Answers to protest against act condemning Slavery.....	261
Appointments, scale of.....	179
Arminianism.....	57
Assembly, general.....	31, 64
Westminster.....	253, 317, 379
of Church of Scotland..	253, 317, 379
Associate Synod, Ministers of.....	161
Atonement, doctrine of Calvin respecting... ..	90
remarks on proceedings of..	216

B	
Baltimore, Popery in.....	351
Bible Society, American.....	382
report of Treasurer.....	163
Brownlee, Rev. Dr.....	320

C	
Calvin, doctrin of respecting the atonement	90
Cambridge, Presbytery of.....	164
Canada Mission.....	174
Carlsbuhl.....	127
Centenary of the Secession.....	377
Chartiers Presbytery of.....	167
Christ's words to Peter.....	21
Christian Examiner.....	349
Minister's, Soliloquy.....	312
hints to writer of.....	141
strictures on.....	144
of Scotland.....	129
Church, doctrinal difference in.....	315, 342
in our owe time considered..	7, 65, 97
modern errors in.....	814
of Scotland.....	128
Cincinnati, Synod of.....	222
Church, Reformed Presbyterian.....	255
Commentary on book of Psalms.....	284
Commission of Synod.....	381
Compromise.....	93
Congregationalism, in Presbyterian Church	813
Controversy between Protestants and Pa- pists.....	73, 320
Converts, Popish.....	346
Correction.....	95
Correspondence, between Westminster As- sembly and Church of Scotland	253, 317, 379
Correspondents.....	123, 159, 382
Covenanting.....	78
Craig, life of.....	88

D	
Danger of Latitudinarian schemes.....	117
Death-bed repentance.....	127
Difference and agreement between the love of the Father to Christ, and Christ's love to his people.....	353

Digest of principles in controversy with the Reformed Synod.....	185
Discourse of a minister to himself in trou- ble.....	201, 284
Dissertation on the Psalms.....	49
2d Psalm.....	84
Divine love.....	43, 103, 321
Doctrinal differences in the Presby. Ch.	315, 342
Doubtful expressions.....	304, 329
Dr. Brownlee.....	320

E	
Ecclesiastical notices.....	224
Record.....	96
Effects of superstition.....	288
Establishments, Scotland.....	91
Examiner, remarks on an article in the....	349

F	
Fact.....	158
Faith, inquiries respecting.....	192
Fast, act for.....	170
Fault finding.....	288
Franklin College.....	192
Funds, report on the.....	181

G	
General Assembly.....	31, 64
Gutzlaff's voyages.....	163

H	
Happy poverty.....	124
Heart wandering.....	335
Helps to devotion.....	49
Hints to J. A., author of Church and State..	144
Hireling Priest.....	289

I	
Improper expressions considered.....	304, 329
Indulgence, Popish.....	28
Influence of Arminianism.....	57
the Jesuits.....	125
Inquiries respecting Faith.....	192
Intelligence from Scotland.....	63
Ireland, Synod of.....	288
Irvingism.....	382

J	
Jesuits, influence of... ..	125

L	
Latitudinarian schemes.....	117
Letter from Rome.....	8
Scotland.....	252
Letters on Roman Catholic controversy....	320
Livingston, life of.....	308, 337, 368
Life of Mr. John Livingston.....	308, 337, 368
Love, divine.....	43, 103, 321

M	
Marriage, act respecting.....	180
Mealy, case of.....	177
Members, present at meeting of Synod.....	161
Miami, Presbytery of.....	164
Minister's discourse to himself.....	201, 284

Minutes of Synod	161	Romanism	288
Mission to Canada	174	Rome, Letter from	3
Western	167		
Modern errors	314	S	
Mormonism	192	Scale of appointments	179
Muskingum, Presbytery of	169	Scotland	63
N		Church of	128
Nadab and Abihu, sin of	193, 277, 296	General Assembly of	253, 317, 379
Notice, Ecclesiastical	224	Letter from	252
Notice of commentary on Book of Psalms ..	284	Scottish Covenanters	116
		Secession, centenary of	377
O		Synod, Ireland	287
Obituary	224	Testimony consistent with liberty	
Ohio, Presbytery of	170	of conscience	373
Omission in Owen's exposition of Hebrews ..	128	Sin of Nadab and Abihu	193, 277, 296
		Sketch of the life of Mr. John Craig	88
P		Slavery	257
Parental fault finding	288	Soliloquy	312
Parts of the Revelation, that exhibit the		Some improper or doubtful expressions con-	
church in our own time	7, 68, 97	sidered	304, 329
Philadelphia, Synod of	223	Something like Irvingism	3-2
Plenary indulgence	28	Standard	190
Popey in Baltimore	351	State and Church	14, 33, 141
Popish method of making converts	346	strictures on	129
Poverty	121	Statistical tables	187
Prayer for the prosperity of Zion	225	Statistics of Presbyterian Church	160
Presbyterian Church	342	Sterrit John, case of	176
Congregationalism in	313	Strictures on a dissertation on the 2d Psalm	
Statistics of	160	an article entitled Church and	
Presbytery of Albany	165	State	129
Alleghany	173	Superstition	286
Cambridge	164	Synod, commission of	361
Charters	167	meeting of	161
Miami	164	of Cincinnati	222
Muskingum	169	Philadelphia	224
Ohio	170		
Philadelphia	162	T	
Priest, hiring	2-9	Tales of my Landlord, review of	110
Prophetic times	242	Testimony, Secession consistent with liberty	
Protest against the act respecting slavery ..	258	of conscience	373
Protest in the case of Mealy	177	Times, prophetic	242
Protestants and Papists	78	Tract on repentance	206, 289
Public social covenanting	78	remarks on	361
R		V	
Record, ecclesiastical	96	Vindication of Scottish covenanters	110
Reformed Presbyterian Church	255	Voyages, Gutzlaff's	153
Synod	185		
Religious establishments, Scotland	91	W	
Remarks on an article in Ch. Examiner ..	349	Wandering of heart	335
the proceedings of Synod	216	Western mission	167
Repentance, a tract	206, 239	Westminster Assembly	253, 317, 379
remarks on	361		
death-bed	127	Z	
Report on the Funds	181	Zion, prayer for	235
Review of the tales of my Landlord	110		