

THE
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,

AND

EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY:

DEVOTED TO THE PRINCIPLES OF THE REFORMATION,

AS SET FORTH IN THE

FORMULARIES OF THE WESTMINSTER DIVINES,

AND WITNESSED FOR BY THE

ASSOCIATE SYNOD OF NORTH AMERICA.

Edited by a Minister of the Associate Presbyterian Church.

VOLUME XII.

Thus saith the 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. JER. VI. 16.

ALBANY:

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY CHAUNCEY WEBSTER.

1835—6.

ANDOVER HARVARD
THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY
CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

Period. 1718.55
v. 12
1835-1836

THE

RELIGIOUS MONITOR,

AND

EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

JUNE, 1835.

ART. I. *The Love of the Holy Spirit, displayed in our Salvation.*

“When the Spirit is come, he shall glorify me: for he shall receive of mine, and shall show it unto you.”—*John xvi. 13, 16.*

Divine love, displayed in our salvation, is such a sublime, extensive, and delightful subject, that it can never be exhausted. To those in whose hearts it is shed abroad by the Holy Spirit, it is like ointment poured forth, whose savor is always sweet and pleasant. This love cannot be contemplated *all at once*—we must take it by *parts*. As we proceed in searching the scriptures, one field of love appears successively after another. In every one we may wander at large, with distinguished pleasure, and at last sit down with delicious wonder. How great is his goodness—how great is his beauty! All the persons in the Godhead, distinctly and jointly, display this love. We have contemplated the love of the Father, and of the Son, and now proceed to contemplate the love of the Holy Spirit, displayed in our salvation. His love is as important as that of the Father and the Son. He inspired the prophets, qualified the Saviour, concurred with him in all the branches of his wonderful undertaking, and applies to his people the great salvation: as Christ himself saith, “When the Spirit is come, he shall glorify me; for he shall take of mine, and shall shew it unto you.” It does not mean that he shall confer any glory upon Christ; but he shall manifest, open out, and declare his glory, the glory of his person, as *Emmanuel*; of his character, as *Mediator*; and the fulness of his grace and salvation, as will appear when we get more fully into our subject. But, alas! it has been, and is at present, greatly corrupted.

The opposition to the whole doctrine concerning the Holy Spirit and his operations, has been managed by different persons in various ways.—Some confess his *personality*, but deny his *divinity*; others deny *both*. The ancient Arians confessed that he was a divine person, but affirmed that he was *produced or created* by the Father and the Son. Thus they denied his *Supreme Deity*. The Mahometans acknowledge his *personality*, but affirm that he is the highest of all *created* spirits, and that he is called the *Holy Spirit*, on account of the work to which he is appointed, i. e. to sanctify the church. This notion they learned from the Macedonian heretics.

The Quakers reject the whole doctrine concerning the personality, divinity, gracious and powerful operations of the Holy Spirit, and pretend to be enlightened and directed by a spirit *within* them, according to whose fruits they expect pardon and salvation; and thus they coincide with some of the *heathen*. "There is a sacred spirit residing within us, who is the *observer* and *guardian* of all our good and evil: according as he is treated by us, he will treat us."*

The Jews, Socinians and Unitarians deny both the personality and divinity of the Holy Ghost, and affirm that he is an *attribute* of the divine nature, or the *influential power* of God.

That we may contemplate with knowledge and pleasure, *how* and *when* the Holy Spirit displays his love in our salvation, we must begin, by removing all that corrupt and filthy rubbish which the adversaries have thrown upon this delightful subject, as the Lord hath commanded us: "Cast up, cast up the highway; gather out the stones; lift up a standard for the people." Therefore, let us search the scriptures, *dig deep*, as the original word signifies, but with *prudence* and *modesty*; that is, "not intruding into those things which we have not seen, vainly puffed up by a fleshly mind;" yet, with accuracy, care and diligence, "comparing spiritual things with spiritual." And, lastly, asking and depending on the Holy Spirit *himself*, to enable us to discern and gather what he hath revealed in his word, concerning himself, and the displays of his love in our salvation. He is the best interpreter of his own book. And here, we have the advantage of his adversaries; for it is not to be supposed that he will condescend to teach those who blaspheme the glory of his nature, by denying the *divinity* of his person.

All that we propose, is briefly to mention some of those *truths*, and the arguments by which they are supported, to make this subject plain and easy for our contemplation. "If men prevail in the opposition they make to the personality and divinity of the Holy Ghost, it is not worth our while to concern ourselves about his operations."

Having searched the scriptures in the *manner proposed*, we are happy to present the reader with the following important truths concerning the Holy Spirit and his operations. We have gathered that he is not a breath or a power, but a *person*—that he is a *distinct* person in the God-head. He is neither the Father nor the Son. He is not a *created*, but a *divine person*. He is the *third person* in the order of subsistence in the divine nature. In his *natural* character, he proceeds from the Father and the Son. Though in his *official* character, he is *sent forth* by both, yet he applies himself to, and accomplishes his work, as a voluntary sovereign and supreme agent. Lastly, the work to which the Holy Spirit is sent by the Father and the Son, consists in the acts of his power and love, which he displays in our salvation. Reader, what do you think of all these particulars? Consider, and speak your mind. But, "that your faith may not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God," let us prove distinctly, that we have *gathered them all* from the holy scriptures. They declare plainly,

1. That the Holy Spirit is not a breath, a power, but a *person*. Indeed, the original word, both in the Hebrew and Greek, is used in a great variety of significations, in the scripture; such as the wind, our rational souls, our breath, angels good and bad, and several other particulars, not necessary to be mentioned; because, in the places where it is thus used, the signification can easily be known from the connection. The word is also used to express the divine nature, or essence. "God is a spirit;" i. e. he is of a pure, spiritual, immaterial nature, not confined to any place.

* Seneca, Epist. 41.

He is distinguished from every other spirit, as he is the Father (Creator) of them all. But there exists in the divine nature, *one* who in a particular manner is distinguished by the name SPIRIT. When the apostle saith, "There is one God, even the Father, and one Lord," (i. e. Jesus Christ,) he adds, "There is one Spirit." And, in another place, "One and the self-same Spirit." He is called the "Spirit of the Lord," (Jehovah,) and the "Spirit of God," i. e. the *Father*, as he partakes of his essence, and proceeds from him. He is "the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father." He is also called "the Spirit of the Son," because he proceeds from him also. And, by way of eminence, the *Holy Spirit*. Let us now prove that he is a *person*.

(1.) This is evident, because *personal properties* are ascribed to him. An *understanding*, and the effects of it: "The Spirit searcheth all things, even the deep things of God." A *will*: "All these worketh that one and the self-same Spirit, dividing to every one as *he will*." "What can be spoken more fully and plainly to describe an intelligent person, acting voluntarily, with *freedom and choice*, I know not."* *Power* is also ascribed to the Holy Ghost. As to the works of nature, "He garnished the heavens:" "He established the earth by his power." And also, in the works of grace. He formed the human nature of Christ. Thus said the angel to Mary: "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the *power of the Highest shall overshadow thee*." This does not mean that he is the *influential power* of God; but only in answer to Mary's inquiry, "How can this be, seeing I know not a man?" Saith the angel, the Holy Ghost, exerting the power of the Most High, or the infinite power of God, shall accomplish it."

(2.) That the Holy Ghost is a *person*, is plain enough, because those acts which are characteristic of a person are performed by him—such as teaching: "The Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall *teach you all things*." *Leading*—"As many as are *led* by the Spirit of God, are the sons of God." *Witnessing*—"The Spirit *himself* beareth *witness* with our Spirit that we are the sons of God." *Sanctifying*—"Ye are *sanctified* by the Spirit of our God." *Comforting*—"I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another *comforter*, even the Spirit of truth." Once more, "When the Spirit is come, *he* will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment." "He shall glorify me," saith Christ, "for *he* shall take of mine, and shall show it unto you." Therefore, he is not a breath, a power, but a *person*. In fine, to this truth we shall add two testimonies, to which, one would think, all the sophistry of men would not dare to reply. One, you find, Acts, xiii. 2—4: "As they ministered to the Lord and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, Separate *unto me*,"—as it should be read, "Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto *I* have called them." Thus the Holy Ghost plainly declares that he is the *person, unto whom*, and whose work, Barnabas and Saul were called by himself. To say that "these words are ascribed to the Holy Ghost because the prophets that were in the church at Antioch spake therein, by his inspiration," is of no force against our argument; for we do not merely argue from his being said to *speak*, but from what *is spoken by him*. "Separate unto me Barnabas and Saul to the work which I have called them." And this is confessedly the Holy Ghost. Correspondent to this is that other text, Acts xx. 28. It is expressly said, that "the Holy Ghost *made* the elders of the church the overseers of it."†

We have expressed the preceding particulars as fully and concisely as we could, to guard the unlearned and unwary reader from being deceiv-

* Dr. Owen.

† Dr. Owen on the Spirit, Book 1, chap. iii. sect. 26.

ed. If we lose the *personality* of the Holy Ghost, we may shut our Bibles as soon as we have opened them; for it is in vain to think of contemplating any displays of his love in our salvation, if we deny him to be a *person*. This is the foundation of all; and the truth of it will still more fully appear, in the illustration of all the following particulars—for we observe,

2. That the Holy Ghost is a *distinct person* in the Godhead. We have as many arguments to prove that he is a distinct person, as we have to prove that the Father and the Son are so. 1. We read of *properties* peculiar to each person. As it is the personal property of the Father to *beget* the Son, and the personal property of the Son to be *begotten* of the Father, so it is the personal property of the Holy Ghost to *proceed* from the Father and the Son. 2. We read of *distinct internal acts*, in which one person is the object of another's acts. Thus, "The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hand." "No man knoweth the Son but the Father, neither knoweth any man the Father but the Son." There is also a mutual knowledge and love, as to the Holy Ghost. "And he searcheth the deep things of God." In these mutual actings of knowledge and love, the blessedness of the holy God principally consists. 3. We also read of *distinct external acts* and operations, as to the several persons in the Godhead. Thus, the Father gave the Son to be the propitiation for our sins. The Son *himself made* the propitiation, and the Spirit enables us to improve it, by faith, for pardon and salvation. Lastly, the Holy Ghost is not the Father, but *sent* by him. He is not the Son, but *another Comforter*. We know Christ no more after the flesh, but here is one who shall abide with us forever. 4. When the doctrine of the Trinity is mentioned in scripture, the Holy Spirit is always mentioned as a distinct person. We are told what Christ says, in view of his incarnation: "The Lord God and his Spirit hath sent me." Does not the very sound of the words lead us into some *distinction* between the *Lord* and his *Spirit*, as if there was a concurrence of two *agents*?—Was it ever said that a man and his spirit gave out a commission?—that a king and his soul published a decree? The Spirit was present, as a *distinct person* at Christ's baptism. He descended in a bodily shape upon him, and performed an action peculiar to himself, as Christ himself saith. "The *Spirit* of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel." Thus, we are baptised "in the name of the Father, the Son, and the *Holy Ghost*." All these three persons are mentioned distinctly in that short account, that "Christ, being raised by the right hand of God, hath received of the *Father* the promise of the *Holy Ghost*." We proceed to observe,

3. That the Holy Spirit is a *divine person*, equally with the Father and the Son. 1. All the *names* expressive of Deity are, in their original glory, ascribed to him. He is expressly called *God*. Peter said to Ananias, "Why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Ghost? thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God." He is called *Lord*, the Spirit. If it had been in the Old Testament language, it would have been *Jehovah*. Moses, when speaking of the people in the wilderness, saith the Lord (Jehovah) did lead them. And yet Isaiah, speaking of the same people, at the same time, saith, "The Spirit of the Lord did lead them." Therefore, the Spirit of the Lord is Jehovah. 2. All the divine attributes are ascribed to the Holy Ghost; such as *eternity*—He is called "the eternal Spirit." *Omniscience*—"The Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God." *Omnipresence*—"Whither shall I go from thy Spirit? or whither shall I flee from thy presence?" *Omnipotence*—"He is the Spirit of counsel and of *might*." As he is the *author* of faith, so the work of faith is with *power*—*may*, "the exceeding greatness of pow-

er." 3. All divine works are ascribed to the Holy Ghost. He is the Creator of the universe. "He moved upon the face of the waters, garnished the heavens, and established the earth by his power;" was one in the great council. "Let us make man." For Elihu saith, "The Spirit of God hath made me, and the breath of the Almighty hath given me life."

There was an old foolish piece of philosophy, called *anima mundi*, the soul of the world; of which they who wrote against it, and they who wrote for it, could make nothing. But it seems as if they would ascribe no *personality* to the Creator of all things. We, in opposition to them, say that the Father, Son and Holy Ghost made the creation. The Holy Ghost has the sway of providence: he reneweth the face of the earth. He is also the *author* of the *new creation*. He inspired the prophets, qualified the apostles, formed and purified the human nature of Christ.—Believers are born of the Spirit. He sanctifieth and sealeth them to the day of redemption. 4. Divine worship is ascribed to the Holy Ghost. Baptism is administered in his name, equally with the Father and the Son. He also, with them is the object of prayer. Saith the apostle, "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all. Amen." Nay, he is sometimes addressed *personally, alone*. "Come from the four winds, O *breath*, and breathe upon the slain, that they may live." (Ezek. xxxvii. 9.)

Thus, reader, you see what plentiful evidence we gathered from "the scriptures of truth," that the Holy Ghost is not a *breath*, an *attribute*, or the *influential power of God*. Nay, not a *created Spirit*, but a *divine person*. And, as it is all given out by himself, we may firmly believe that it is neither false nor imperfect. But examine and judge for yourself, in this age of error and blasphemy. "Search the scriptures daily, whether these things are so."

4. The Holy Spirit is the *third person* in the order of subsistence in the divine nature. So it is expressed in the form that is given for our *manner of worship*. "Baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." This does not imply any *inferiority* in the Son and the Holy Ghost to the Father, but rather, plainly, an *equality*. Indeed, some affirm that it is the personal glory of the Father to be the first person in the Trinity, in the order of subsistence. But these writers are extremely mistaken; for, first, though the Son, as Emmanuel and Mediator, has a distinct *personal* glory, "God raised him from the dead, and gave him glory;" yet there is no *separate* personal glory in the persons, as existing in the Godhead, as our divines teach in their excellent Catechism. "The Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, are the same in substance, *equal* in power and *glory*."

Secondly, to be the first person in the order of subsistence, is the *property*, the *peculiar* of the Father, but glory is the *attribute* of a nature which is common to all the persons in the Godhead.

Thirdly, it cannot be the glory of the Father to be the first person, as to *time*; for as the Father never existed without the Son, so the Son is called the everlasting Father. It is not the name of a *person*, hut the attribute of a *nature*. And, as the Father and the Son never existed without the Spirit, so he is called "the eternal Spirit."

Again: it cannot be the personal glory of the Father to be the first person, as to *dignity*; for as we read of the Father of glory, so the Son is called the Lord of glory, and the Spirit, the Spirit of glory. In fine, to affirm that it is the personal glory of the Father, that he is first person in the Trinity, is a slide towards the Arian blasphemy. "These people declare that the Father created the Son, and that the Father and

the Son created the Spirit." Some affirm that "it is the personal glory of the Father that he is simply of none, being the first in the order of having life. In this sense, he is called the fountain of the Deity." But "in the beginning (i. e. from eternity) was the word," and then "in him was life." "He is that *eternal life* which was with the Father." Saith Bradbury, "It is dangerous to say that the Father is of none, and the Son is not. The phrase, 'the fountain of the Deity,' is not worth keeping, and ought to be laid aside. We have no warrant for it in scripture. God is said to be the 'fountain of life,' and the 'fountain of the water of life,' but to talk of divinity being *derived* by *one*, and *springing* from *another*, is a jar upon the proper idea we ought to have of divinity." But, when we say that the Holy Ghost is the third person in the Trinity in the order of subsistence, we mean that it is his peculiar property *alone*. For we observe,

5. That in his natural and personal character, he *proceedeth* from the Father and the Son. Thus saith the Son himself: "The Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me." And, being the Spirit of the Son, he proceedeth from him also. This expresseth his relation to both persons. He is *of them*, by an eternal *emanation* or *procession*. The *manner* hereof cannot be comprehended by us. "The Spirit, who proceeds from the Father and the Son, himself never began, because his procession is continued, and is from him who never began."*

Here observe, "that this procession or emanation does not include any *separation* of the divine nature, but only expresseth a distinction of subsistence, by a property peculiar to the Holy Ghost."† Though the persons in the Godhead be distinct, the nature is *one*. Thus baptism is administered not into the *names* of three, which might have led us to suppose a distinction of *nature*, but into the *NAME*, as only of one. And yet the form itself tells us of no less than *three*. The ordinance reveals all under one name, and that is no less than the Most High God. To suppose that baptism is administered into a *breath*, an *attribute*, or even into the *name* of a *creature*, is a visible and daring insult upon the first and great commandment, "Thou shalt have no other God before me."

"The Spirit is neither said to be unbegotten, nor begotten; lest if he were said to be unbegotten, two Fathers would be understood as existing in the Trinity: if he were said to be begotten, as the Son, two Sons would be viewed as existing in the Trinity. But that our faith concerning the Father and the Son may be safe, he is only said to *proceed*. But he does not proceed into the Son, and from the Son, to sanctify a creature, as some vainly imagine, but he proceeds from both; because, as the Father begat a Son, as from himself, so the Holy Ghost is said to proceed from him also."‡ But we must leave this subject under a veil of incomprehensibility, believing, admiring, and adoring "what the Spirit himself saith (concerning it) to the churches."

6. Though the Spirit, in his official character, is *sent forth* by the Father and the Son, yet he proceeds, applies himself to, and accomplisheth his work, as a voluntary and sovereign agent. This brings us full upon the blasphemy of the Socinians and Unitarians, who affirm that the Holy Spirit is the influential power of God; and also upon the notion of one who, although he differs from these heretics, in granting that the Holy Ghost is the third person in the Trinity, yet he agrees with them in pulling him down from being a *supreme*, to be only a *subordinate* agent.—Saith he, "We read of the Father and the Son breathing, expressive of

* Ambrose. † Dr. Owen. ‡ Augustine.

their performing certain works, by the agency of the Spirit. The very reverse of this will appear, by comparing the mission of the Spirit, by the Father and the Son, and the compliance of the Spirit himself, to accomplish his work, as expressed in the scriptures.

1. God is said to *give* the Spirit. Saith Christ, "Your heavenly Father will give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him." Thus, believers are said to *receive* him: "We have received the Spirit which is of God." Correspondent to this giving and receiving, the Spirit is said to *proceed*. Saith Christ, "The Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me." Had it been only said that he was *given*, we could not have known that there was any thing of his own *will* in what he did. But, as he proceedeth of his own accord unto his work, his own will and commission is plainly declared. "He divideth to every one as he *will*."

2. God is said to *send* the Spirit. "The Father will send the Holy Ghost in my name." This is also spoken of the Son himself. "I will send unto you the Comforter from the Father." This does not imply any local motion, but only has respect to the special work he is to accomplish in and for a person, such as in the conviction and conversion of sinners. Saith Christ, "I will *send* him unto you, and when he is come, he will reprove the world of sin," &c. Nay, the Holy Ghost may be in persons in one respect, and yet *sent* to them in another. Christ promised to send the Holy Ghost to his disciples, as a *Comforter*, whom they had received before, as a *Sanctifier*. Saith he, "I will send him unto you, and ye know him, for he dwelleth in you." Correspondent to this, he is said to *come*: "If I go not away, the Comforter will not come."—Again, "When the Comforter is come." So he is said to *come* upon persons: "The Spirit came upon Amasai." (1 Chron. xii. 18.) "The Spirit clothed Amasai, possessed his mind, as a man's clothes cleave unto him." So again, "The Holy Ghost came on them, and they prophesied." (Acts xix. 6.)

3. God is said to *minister* the Spirit. Gal. iii. 5, "He that ministereth the Spirit unto you;" that is, he that gives you continual or abundant supplies of the Spirit; as the apostle saith, "I know that this shall turn to my salvation, through your prayers, and the additional supply of the Spirit." Agreeably to this, the Spirit is said to *fall* upon men: "The Spirit fell on all them that heard the word."

4. God is said to *put* his Spirit in or upon men. "I have put my Holy Spirit upon him." The word signifies his *actual bestowing*. He doth not send him, and leave it to their will and power whether they will receive him or no; but he puts him *in* or *upon* them, as they shall be actually made partakers of him, for the end to which he is designed. Being come, he is said to *rest*: "The Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him;" that is, abide and remain upon him, (i. e. Christ.) Thus, at his baptism, "the Spirit abode upon him." Saith the apostle, "The Spirit of glory and of God (the glorious Spirit of God,) *resteth* upon you." Where he *rests*, he abides. "He shall abide with you forever."

5. God is said to *pour* him out. "I will pour out my Spirit unto you." Again, "I will pour my Spirit upon thy seed," &c. Correspondent to all these particulars, he is sometimes said to *depart*. So he departed from Saul, and gave him no more qualifications for the civil government. So he departs from some who have been under convictions, and made a profession of religion, but complying with the temptations of Satan, and fulfilling their own lusts, he leaves them to perish eternally. David prayed, "Take not thy Holy Spirit from me." But, as to the saints, though he may withhold the manifestations of his love, and the communications of his grace, in some degree, and for a time, yet he will not totally and

finally depart from them. "The Spirit that is given to them shall be in them a well of water, springing up to eternal life."

Thus we have proved, from the scriptures of truth, against all gain-saying, that though the Holy Spirit, in his official character, is sent forth by the Father and the Son, yet he applies himself to, and accomplisheth his work as a voluntary and sovereign agent, "dividing to every one as HE WILL." And as we could not do it in a more plain and concise manner, we have borrowed the preceding particulars from that steady and uniform writer, Dr. Owen, who was rooted and established in the faith, "as he had been taught," and abounded in it.*

Reader, this is the true grace of God in which you stand; therefore, be not moved away from this fundamental doctrine of the gospel. We observe,

6. Lastly, that the work to which the Father and the Son send the Spirit, consists in acts of his power and love, which he voluntarily displays in our salvation. Though this contemplation is limited principally to the *love* of the Spirit, yet this power cannot be excluded, but is always included. And by every act of his power, he displays the greatness of his love, both with regard to the person and work of Christ himself, and the application of the great salvation to his people, as will fully appear from the next branch of our subject.

[To be continued.]

ART. II. *Cause of Apostacy.*

[Continued from Vol. XI.]

Others are continuing in a sound profession, and in some thoughts about the Lord's way, under the force of custom. We are sometimes attached to a thing, because we have been long accustomed to do it, and it has become easy to us; and this is more likely to be the case, if it has been our fathers' custom before us, and we have seen nothing different from our earliest recollections. There is something of antiquity about it, which strengthens our attachment.

It is to be feared that there are many who have nothing stronger or better binding them to a sound profession. This brings up at the stated time a sufficient quantity of apparently serious thoughts to satisfy their conscience, and carry them through the form of Christianity, and make them appear to be as good and religious as their fathers before them—and this is enough. There are some of God's real children to whom much more than a sound form is not given, though truly desired and sought by them; but these here have no wish or concern about any more—they are content. Neither the events of Providence, nor their own varying necessities, make any difference to them; their thoughts and expressions are fixed as the stars in the heavens. All their religious feelings and all their exercises are for set times, and they feel no need or desire for them till the time come again.

Others continue their profession, and have their thoughts and meditations on the subject, chiefly by the influence of society and of connections. They have no affection, love or desire to the peculiar doctrines of their profession, for its own sake. They pretend not to any great delight in ordinances or private duties; but conscience would not be satisfied

* Dr. Owen on the Spirit, Book 1, chap 51.

without paying some attention to religion. They have no very particular fault to such a profession; and it is the profession of the place where their lot is cast, or of the family in which they have been brought up, or of that one in which they have formed their connections, or of that community on whose custom and patronage their success in business depends. And without making this profession, and some endeavors at religious exercises, they would not have so much esteem, happiness or success as they desire, nor would it be in any respects so convenient for them. Therefore, they continue to make the profession, and to muster up some trite thoughts and expressions to answer for their occasions to appear friendly to the doctrines of the Reformation. But so soon as the force of these things is withdrawn, or shall be exhausted, they can without difficulty or remorse dro the whole matter.

May not this explain the reason why numbers that professed Secession principles all their days, in Scotland, and for aught that could be seen about them were as zealous as their neighbors, so soon as they enter this free country, feel themselves liberated at once from all that characterized them as members of the Secession?—why others, upon moving into a new neighborhood, feel no difficulty in falling in with a new profession? and why some, when they are only for a few days from home, on some business, can try, with little or no compunction, to play their part at any thing, if so be only they think there is no one present that *knows* them.

There are others held to Reformation principles by the intellectual pleasure which they derive from contemplating the beauty of its abstract truths. They consider it pretty much in the same light that philosophers do a very beautiful theory, or as a mathematician does a fine demonstration in Euclid. They can speak well upon the subject, and seem to have satisfaction in doing it. Some of these may write, and perhaps preach Reformation doctrine to good purpose; and they may, if nothing come to drive them away, continue doing so all their days. But the heart does not *obey* the truth: it pursues its own course in an independent manner; and this explains their otherwise unintelligible conduct. When they speak on religious subjects, they seem to be really interested; but when they act in their occasions of life, you cannot think that their conscience feels any force of the truth at all. And when the interests of their profession draws against the interests in which their hearts are engaged—their money, their business, or whatever else it is—they are found standing by the latter, and the former is left to shift for itself. For serious, godly conversation, and for the practical part of personal religion, and the duties of brotherly love, sympathy, compassion, they seem to have no taste at all. All these things seem very surprising to those who do not advert to the ground of their attachment to religion—mere intellectual pleasure.

And it is much to be feared that another very numerous portion of professors are held to it merely by the spirit of opposition and the desire of victory. They will argue their points with zeal, and strenuously contend for every thing in the compass of their public profession. But when those exercises of religion that are far more congenial to the new creature are called for, they are perfectly inactive. That is not their element. For plain, direct acts of christian fellowship, they have no taste. But let these same things become matters in controversy, and presently they are all on fire again.

Second. When the heart ceases to keep the Lord's way, as above described, *exertion in its behalf will be greatly diminished.* This will hold as a universal truth, with regard to any subject. If it is a system of truth, or if it is only some temporal interest, or some calling, as sure as

the affections and desires and delight of the heart in it decline, so sure will the thoughts and meditations on it be less frequent, and exertion in its behalf less vigorous and effective. Perhaps I cannot refer to any fact that will bring this general truth more readily and clearly before the mind of all readers, than to the experience of high politicians. So long as the electors consider the success of their party, or (but I need scarcely now use the phrase) their country's good identified with their candidate, their thoughts, like an overwhelming torrent, would bear him over every obstacle to his official elevation, and their exertions in his behalf are untiring, and almost unlimited. But so soon as he is separated from the interest of the party, all the busy thoughts and untiring efforts in this same man's behalf, are suspended. He who but yesterday was every where met by cheering salutations, to-day finds every one cold, stiff and formal—dry civility and polite evasions.

It is now easy to understand how we will treat the *way in which the Lord leads*, when it is no longer "in the midst of our hearts." Our prayers will be less earnest and frequent in its behalf. We will be less watchful against the dereliction of truth and duty, or the entrance of innovations and corruptions, by ourselves or others. We will not go so far, or labor so hard for it. We will not spend so much time upon it.—We will not give so much of our money to its support. We will search out excuses for our delinquencies, and affect to be injuriously treated when they are not sustained. We will be more ready to catch at the real or apparent delinquencies of others, and more hotly pursue them.—We will be much less troubled about the interests which future generations have in it. Is not this what we are every where witnessing, and that, too, every year increasing?

Some generations ago, there were many individuals and families who fasted frequently on account of the affairs of the church, or any heavy affliction sent on the congregation or on the family. Private meetings for prayer and spiritual conversation were a very common thing in most congregations. Heads of families and schoolmasters painfully labored to instruct the children in the truths of the Reformation. Poor laboring people frequently contributed liberally out of their hard earned pittance to the support of the public cause of truth. They travelled great distances on foot to enjoy sealing ordinances, and the preaching of gifted ministers; and would be cheerful and content with any accommodations they could obtain, and they frequently passed their nights in the fields, when there was no place for them, or when there were so many strangers that they could not all be accommodated. They did not grudge three or four days lost upon a sacramental solemnity. They were frequently exposed to bad weather, yet they thought it no sufficient excuse to stay at home. They labored hard, lived sparingly, dressed plainly, and denied themselves every superfluity, that they might be enabled to do these things. But now the general course of conduct is surely greatly changed. Are not family and personal fasts and private meetings for prayer and conference extremely rare? Religious instructions, especially in the *way the Lord has led*, are banished from the day schools, and almost from the family. A few drowsy, languid efforts are made to have the Shorter Catechism committed, and a Psalm or two, and the important work is done with thousands of parents.

Now we must all dress and live as others do, and appear like the world, if we should go in debt for it, and therefore the interests of the Secession cause may call and beseech us, by all their scriptural excellency, and all their pressing necessity, as loudly and pathetically as they please, we have not at any time but little, and oftener nothing at all to spare to them.

We cannot go over a mile or two to meeting on foot. We cannot be exposed to the weather *for sake of going to hear a sermon*, or to attend a sacramental occasion. We grudge to spend so many days. We must have a fine church, crimsoned, cushioned and carpeted; we must have correct singing, or going to church would have no relish to our sons and daughters.

But again; when the necessary comforts and conveniences at a place of worship are *really wanting*, there is not enough of spirit for the public cause to procure them. We have neither money to spare for your Monitors and old standard books, Testimonies, Confessions, &c., nor have we time to read them.

Is not this the state of matters very generally? And, after all the pains taken to excuse the matter to the conscience, and persuade fellow men that our plea of exemption is honest, the only cause sufficient to account for all this lack of energy, this frigid indifference, is the *want of heart*. "I said this people eris in heart." Where professors are as truly interested, and find all their spiritual joys and delights as much identified with the cause of God, as men find their temporal prosperity with diligence in their business, their efforts in support of it *will be* similar.—Not more certainly does the shadow follow the body, than energy and activity in support of an object will answer to the measure of love and affection to that object. If the Reformation principles be in the *midst of the heart*, the *widow* will give to their support her "two mites," even all her living; but if not there, the *rich* will put them off with being exceedingly sorrowful that they *cannot* give any thing.

But it is needless to dwell on that which is every where seen and felt.

Third. When the heart ceases to be delighted with the Lord's way, the *knowledge* of it will decline. This is a necessary consequence. That subject in which we feel little interest, and on which our thoughts scarcely ever turn—in behalf of which we do not feel disposed to do much, must soon slip out of our particular knowledge. When men are dead or long absent, they seldom come into our mind, and we forget their manner of life, personal appearance, countenance, voice, and every thing about them. If we go to live in a foreign country, we will forget the language in which we were born. So it must be in regard to the subject of which I am speaking, when our esteem for it is gone. When parents feel little interest in it themselves, they will be at little pains to instruct their children in it, and they, in turn, with diminished interest in it, will be at less pains to teach it to *their sons*; and in process of time we may expect a race to arise that know and care nothing at all about it. And I appeal to all who have turned their attention to these things, if such a race be not *now* upon the earth, and in the bosom of churches called Reformed! even the very soundest and clearest on doctrinal truth! In the same congregation, you may find individuals in all the several measures of knowledge and of interest that have marked the retrograde course of the churches since the purest and best days of the Reformation.—Some few are still to be found (long may they continue,) possessing clear views of the doctrines, distinct and extensive historical knowledge of the way and manner in which, and the persons by whom the Reformation itself was brought about, and likewise of the wretched state of bondage, political and religious, in which the world was held by the Pope of Rome and his creatures, immediately before it. They know the mighty change which it produced, and they appreciate duly the ameliorations which it wrought in the state of society, and the unspeakable privileges which it restored to the people of God, and their *heart* is in it, and they are now weeping over it. But they are very few.

There is another class, more numerous, in whose minds the impressions

of all these things are faint and scarcely intelligible. They have heard the old people talk about the Reformation, and about the Reformers, as very bold and extraordinary men. They have some tolerable knowledge of the leading doctrines of grace. They think it is "well enough for the church to have a Testimony—they see no harm in it;" and the measure of their interest in it may be inferred from their own words, which are often repeated, viz: "they see no use in being so strenuous about *points* as their fathers were: some of them sacrificed their lives foolishly," &c.

There is a third class, which I fear is the major part of many a congregation, who know nothing more of it than the name; nothing of the mighty struggle between Bible truth and Popish blasphemy; nothing of the hardships, persecutions and deaths of the gifted, self-denying men, by means of which the God of our Lord Jesus causes them this day to enjoy freedom, civil and religious. They know not the reasons why they are not this day prostrating before some image of the Virgin Mary, beseeching her to use her interest with her Son, or obtaining absolution from a priest, with a sum of money. Neither are they sensible of the obligations that lie on them, for the happy difference of their condition—nor the weight of their responsibility to continue it to their children. It is with difficulty they make a few correct statements of their belief to a minister and Session, when admitted to the Lord's table; and if charitable allowance were not often made for weak faith and small attainments, they could not be admitted at all. 'Tis but one or two heads of doctrine that they do clearly understand.

They know not why there should be a public Testimony—why a scriptural Psalmody only—why public religious covenanting: without any fixed belief or distinct apprehension in their minds, they can gravely assent to every proposition, as it is read and explained before them; they can promise the whole course of life required by their profession, and yet at the same time heartily mean and purpose *nothing*. And, as they do not have the knowledge of the *Lord's way*, it is impossible that they can esteem it in their hearts, or exert themselves in its behalf. It is like a dead language, of which indeed they can name the letters and pronounce the words, but they know not their meaning, and of course can neither be convinced nor persuaded by the argument in them, nor moved by their eloquence. To these you may explain and teach with all diligence and painfulness, all your life long; it is all *vox et præteræ nihil, nothing but sound*. The sense of duties sits lightly on their minds.—Sometimes they have it in a small degree, but often they have it not, and almost any thing can drive it away, and duty is easily forgotten, or through carelessness omitted. They can be now and then from the public preaching, upon the most trifling grounds. Family worship is not observed morning and evening; secret prayer is seldom practised. Almost any worldly business can deter them from attending a meeting of the congregation for public business. They are defective in the measure of support which they *promise* to the ordinances, and negligent in fulfilling even that; and very many of christian duties are never attempted at all.

There is a fourth class, in what is called religious community, more numerous than the preceding, that know *nothing at all* of Reformation principles, and *care* nothing at all about them; and from all that can be learned of their mind from their actions, they are determined *not to know*. They appear to be afraid lest truth should force itself upon their convictions, ere ever they are aware of it, and therefore shun every appearance of it. Introduce it into conversation, in the most inoffensive and winning manner possible, and they are as silent as if their thoughts had all become instantly extinct, and their soul had become inert. Explain

it to them in a set discourse, and they are scarcely conscious of hearing you speak. Offer it to them in a book, and they will not buy it. Lend it to them, and they will not read it. As a last resort, ask a little money from them to carry on this work and way of the Lord, seeing they are very liberal to any thing and every thing else, and all at once they become very economical, and cannot spare it.

Of this sort, you will find not a few of the sons and daughters that have been baptised in the Associate church, and have lived to years of maturity under the eye of her members, in full communion. But as for them, they care nothing about the vows of baptism, or the profession; and if they were to *think* of the thing, they consider any other profession just as good as this. When they become the head of a family, they keep aloof from all religious exercise together: no secret prayer, no family worship, no asking a blessing before meals, is in their habitation. Not the least regard is paid to any thing spiritual or christian. You would be tempted to imagine yourself transported into the heart of Hindostan, where the gospel has never reached, although it is but the next door to a dwelling in which you were in the company of the righteous, where "is heard the melody of joy and health."

But it is only a small proportion of this sort that have any kind of connection with the Associate church, or any other orthodox body. They meet you every where in the protestant world, by thousands; in Scotland, England, Ireland, Europe and America; in every Congregational, Presbyterian and Episcopal connection; in every grade of society, and every office in the church. You will find them in the pulpit, in the judicature, at the press, and possessing a prevailing influence over public opinion. These are the people that "will not endure sound doctrine;" that "have turned away their ears from the truth, and are turned unto fables;" and "by reason of them, the way of truth is evil spoken of."—(2 Tim. iv. 4; 2 Pet. ii. 2.)

Now, reader, let me here stop to ask you a question. Suppose the Pope be now mustering all his forces, in order to crush the Reformation at once, and suppose that nine-tenths of the Protestants who have to stand in defence are people of the above description, what have we to expect? Look to it, for this is the true state of the case. They, the Catholics, are pouring into this country, with the knowledge and design of the popish Holy Alliance, by hundreds of thousands, every year. They are supplied with abundance of money. Their religion is adapted to the taste of sinful men and women—their cause is daily becoming more popular. And this is not all: they are the *sword of God Almighty*, which he is drawing out of his scabbard, to avenge the quarrel of his covenant; for we Protestants have lightly esteemed the freedom which he wrought for us in the Reformation, and cast it behind our backs; and it is but just that we should be made again to feel and know the difference between his service, and the service of the Pope and the *mother of harlots* and abominations of the earth. "What will ye do in the day of the Lord's anger?" What will any of the fore mentioned classes of professors, (one excepted) do to save the world from being again trampled under the feet of his Holiness at Rome? What will your liberal views, your unions, your compromising policy, your banishing of all party distinctions and sectarian principles, do to fortify the minds of Protestants against the assaults of his "*all deceivableness of unrighteousness*," or sustain their souls under the pressure of his "violence?" The words of the prophet come forcibly to my mind here: "Thou also shalt be drunken; thou shalt be hid; thou also shalt seek help, because of the enemy; all thy strong holds shall be like fig trees with the first ripe figs; if they be shaken, they shall even fall into the mouth of the eater. Behold thy people in the

midst of thee are women; the gates of thy land shall be set wide open to thine enemies; the fire shall devour thy bars." (Nahum iii. 11, 12, 13.)

Had the prophet lived in our times, and been sent with a warning, threatening voice to the Protestant part of community, I cannot conceive any terms in which he could have more truly set forth our danger, and our perfect weakness to meet it. Such is our profound ignorance of Reformation principles, and our disesteem for them, and to such a length has the mad spirit of licentiousness carried us, that we—millions of us—are as ready to fall into Roman Catholic sentiments, as the first ripe fig was to fall into the mouth of the eater. And those who still have some head knowledge of these things, are in respect of attachment to them, and strength of heart to defend them, *but as women*.

But to return. There is still a large portion of what is called Christian community, whose character has not been fully taken up under any of the preceding descriptions, because they have passed them a great way in their apostacy from God. Nor do I well know how to bring them fully before the reader.

I must go back to the point from which I started, and state first, that the Lord's way has no place in their hearts. Their meditations, affections, desires, love and delights are all empty of it. They acknowledge not its authority, and yield it no obedience. Their hearts feel at liberty to embrace whatever objects they choose, among the many that present. Each chooses according to his own taste, or, more properly, according to his reigning passion or lust, and therefore there is a great variety.—Let us look at it for a moment, as it is foretold in 2 Tim. iii. 2, 3, 4: "For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, proud, boasters, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, truce breakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce despisers of those that are good; traitors, high minded, lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God," &c. Had the great apostle been a great painter, and had a large portion of the present generation sat for their likeness, he could not have drawn them so accurately as they are in this moral picture. He does not in each expression give you, it is true, every feature of the character of each class, but he gives the most prominent and leading one in such vivid colors that no man of discernment can fail to recognize the original.

"*Lovers of their own selves*"—selfish to an extreme. There is no way of inducing them to engage heartily in behalf of another, or in any public cause, if their own interest is not to be promoted by it.

"*Covetous*." So greedy of gain, so ardently desirous to be rich, that it pains them to see another obtain an advantage. They have no time for family religion—nothing to spare for "him that needs." It is all a saving that can be kept back from support of gospel ordinances. If produce or trade bring not in so much as they expected, they are almost ready to say that Providence has wronged them out of their own.

"*Proud*." They despise others, and the things and doings of others. There is nothing done, if *they* have not done it; nothing is worthy of notice, if it is not *theirs*; nothing puts them in greater distress than to make others equal to *them*, especially in that thing in which their pride delights peculiarly to dwell.

"*Boasters*." It is difficult to give such instances of boasting as will place them fully before the reader's mind, because almost every thing is matter of boasting now. We boast of "our enlightened age," and the "march of mind;" our "rapid improvements," our "independence," our "republican institutions," our "happy country." And this is not all; we might be borne with to this extent of folly; but we boast still more

loudly of *our* "charitable views" and "liberal sentiments," *our* "freedom from a sectarian spirit," "*our* benevolent associations," and "*our* liberal donations." We are a large body; we have our *improved mode* of conducting public worship, and of illustrating doctrine; and the praises of our religious meetings, down pourings of the Spirit, hopeful conversions, and fervent piety, might rend the very heavens.

"*Blasphemers,*" that is, those who speak evil of any of God's names, titles, attributes, ordinances, word or works. If the Reformation was a work of God, (and who dare dispute it,) then this generation cannot satisfy itself with enough of evil said of it. The sole use of the inspired Psalms in the praise of God, is, we know, one of his ordinances. Some are proud to be perfectly ignorant of them, and ask with an air of curiosity, "if they are made use of in your churches." Others charge upon them the most grievous things, such as hindering devotion, breathing a revengeful spirit, and being unfit for christian worship. If the Sabbath be his ordinance then are there many blasphemers of it. If the doctrines of a free salvation, be, in substance, a part of his word, then we know they are evil spoken of, in the most solemn and deliberate manner from the pulpit, the press, and in the private circle. The names and titles of God are exceedingly profaned in common conversation, in almost every circle.

"*Disobedient to parents.*" It is not obedience to parents to submit to their authority until the age of twenty-one, merely because the law of the country will compel us to do so, or because it is commonly done. It is not obedience to parents, if we do it from the same disposition with a slave. It is not, unless we do it from love and veneration, and a sense of gratitude; nay, not unless we "obey them in the Lord," and if this be a correct statement, then disobedience to parents has become one of the great transgressions of this generation; and out of it springs that impudence that mocks at superiority, and that bold licentious daring which sets all law at defiance. Children put on the airs of men, and treat men like children, just because they have been allowed to trample on parental authority. The first human beings we should esteem, and esteem the highest, is our parents; and if our turbulent passions are allowed to disregard *them*, it is impossible that we should be expected to esteem any other according to their place or station.

"*Unthankful.*" That is the same as ingratitude, which is a base disposition in the estimation of all men. To say nothing of what is done in private, if a man would give away a whole estate in aid of what are called benevolent associations, he will get no thanks. It is enough for him that he escapes the reproach of being behind the spirit of the age.—Humble petition has almost grown into a *demand*, and voluntary donation into a *debt*. And it were the less a matter, if the name of charming benevolence were in many cases not used to conceal base hypocrisy, selfishness and down-right villany. But we ought to wonder the less at ingratitude towards men, when the countless benefactions of God himself are overlooked and abused, to the service of sin, his greatest enemy, or altogether denied. *His* air which we breathe, his light which we behold, his earth which we enjoy, his rain &c., is nought, or ours of right. *Our* fine country, our abundant crops, our prosperous trade, our national prosperity, free institutions, &c., all are *ours*. It is our right hand and our arm that has done all—as much as if there were not a God in heaven at all! Reader, the utterance of such a sentiment in the light of your *understanding* may well make you startle, but it is indeed the language of many hearts. And as for religious freedom and pure gospel ordinances, who and where is he that is careful to bless God for them? Generally speak-

ing they are rather matters of tolerance than of gratitude, and it is quite enough if men give to them a yawning drowsy attendance.

“*Unholy.*” If allowed vanity be as defiling as it is disgusting, if covetousness be equivalent to idolatry which is spiritual whoredom, if carnal talk on a Sabbath-day be an unholy thing, and if a carnal mind through the wreck be a troubled ocean “continually casting up mire and dirt;” if, when the sow that was washed, again wallows in the mire, and the dog returns and eats his own vomit; or, when we confess and pray and fast, and then deliberately return to the commission of the same sins again, it is by all reckoned abominable,—then what multitudes of *unholy* people are there.

ART. III. *Vindication of the Principles of the Church of Scotland, in relation to Questions presently agitated: An Address by the Associate Synod of Original Seceders.*

(Continued from Vol. XI.)

The Synod having thus declared their disapprobation of what is denominated the “Voluntary System,” consider themselves called upon to express their views regarding the corruptions which attach to the religious establishments of this country, and particularly that of Scotland, from which they are more immediately in a state of secession. And they cannot enter on this subject without premising, that one reason why they regret the extreme to which some Seceders have of late proceeded, is the tendency which it has to discredit and weaken the force of that testimony which they still continue to bear against these corruptions, and to induce the members of the Establishment, in self-defence, and from the dread of revolutionary efforts, to color over, to support, and to cling to, what otherwise they might have been disposed to condemn and remove.

It was quite natural that ministers and members connected with this Synod should have been led, in the contest which has lately arisen, occasionally to co-operate with those of the Establishment in opposing the scheme which aims at a divorce between religion and government; and to take part in meetings and petitions for the repeal of the law of patronage—a grievance which affects men as citizens as well as church members. Had they remained passive and indifferent as to this last article, which entered so immediately into the ground of the contentings of their fathers, and the causes of the secession, they would justly have exposed themselves to the suspicion of insincerity in the testimony which they have borne against that evil, if not also to the suspicion of wishing it to hang as a millstone on the neck of the Establishment, or to remain as a ground of perpetual separation. Some have taken occasion, from this circumstance, to represent the ministers of this Synod as ready to return to the Established church; if lay patronage only were abolished, and a door opened by the church herself for their reception. To remove this misrepresentation, to give direction to the people under their charge in a critical time, and to let all men know what are their principles and views, they think it necessary to be explicit on this head.

Our objections to the Established Church of Scotland are not confined

to her administration. We cannot unreservedly approve of her constitution, as it was established at the revolution. Though our fathers were in communion with that church; yet they, together with many faithful men who died before the Secession, and some who continued in the Establishment after that event, were all along dissatisfied with several things in the settlement of religion at the revolution, and in the ratification of it at the union between Scotland and England. The first Seceders, in their Judicial Testimony and Declaration of Principles, specified several important points with respect to which that settlement involved a sinful departure from a previous settlement of religion in Scotland, which distinctly held forth as exhibiting the model, in point of scriptural purity and order, of that reformed constitution to which they sought by their contentings to bring back the church of their native land. This Synod occupy the same ground with the first Seceders. They are aware that the Established Church of Scotland has it not in her power to correct all the evils of the revolution settlement, which they feel themselves bound to point out; but they cannot warrantably quit their position of secession, until the Established church show a disposition to return to that reformed constitution, by using means to correct what is inconsistent with it, so far as it is competent to her, in the use of those powers which belong to her as an ecclesiastical and independent society under Christ, her head, and by due applications to the State for having those laws rescinded or altered which affect her purity and abridge her freedom. It will be found, on a careful and candid examination, that a great part of the evils, in point of administration, which are chargeable on the Church of Scotland, may be traced, directly or indirectly, to the defects and errors cleaving to her Establishment at the revolution; and, as it is her duty, so it will be her safety, seriously to consider these, and, following the direction of scripture and the example of our reforming ancestors, to confess them before God, and seek their removal.

The revolution settlement came far short of embracing the former attainments of the church and nation in religious reformation. In general, its grand defect lay in wholly overlooking the civil and ecclesiastical reform attained to between 1638 and 1650, generally termed the period of the Second Reformation.

The Synod are not disposed to judge harshly of men who had recently escaped from the furnace of persecution, and who had strong temptations to contend with; but truth compels them to say, that the proceedings of the church at that period were also marked by sinful defects, which, from the injurious influence they had on her future history, demand especial notice. Pleased with what they had obtained, and afraid of offending the civil powers by what might be construed as unseasonable interference, the first General Assembly which met after the revolution, in the year 1690, sat down under the above Establishment, without making a single remonstrance against its defective character, or exerting their intrinsic powers as a court of Christ, to supply, so far as lay within their own province, what was wanting. No act was passed approving of the several steps of reformation during the second reforming period, confessing the defections made from it by the church and nation, or vindicating it from the indignities cast on it in the great apostacy of the two preceding reigns. Though the royal prerogatives of Christ had been then daringly invaded, and the whole government of the church impiously usurped by the crown; yet that Assembly neither formally condemned these usurpations, nor expressly asserted the sole headship of Christ over his church, or her intrinsic power, as his spiritual, free and independent kingdom. Nor did the Assembly, either at that or any subsequent meeting, assert the perpetual obligation of our national covenants, or even the

morality of these deeds, in the perfidious violation of which all ranks had contracted so much guilt.

But what tended more perhaps than any thing else to swell the torrent of defection which overrun the Church of Scotland so soon after the revolution, was the tame submission of the church to the terms prescribed by the State for the admission of the Episcopalian ministers into her communion, simply on their subscribing the Confession of Faith, and their engaging not to seek the subversion of Presbytery, as being the only recognized government of this church. The consequence of this was, that hundreds of ministers were admitted into her judicatories who were either secretly attached to episcopacy, or destitute of all fixed principles on the subject of church government, justly suspected of error in doctrine, and chargeable with having given their countenance to all the defections and the tyrannical measures of the former reigns. The consequences of this unfaithful policy, particularly as it effected the northern parts of Scotland, where conformity to prelacy had chiefly prevailed, continue to be felt in the councils of the church down to the present times. Nor were persons excluded from acting as elders in these judicatories, who had dipped their hands in the blood of the saints, and gave no satisfaction for this and other sins. In consequence of the defects of the revolution settlement, and the neglect of the church to assert firmly and explicitly the divine right of church government, encroachments were repeatedly made on ecclesiastical liberty; and even when the State did not directly interfere by proroguing and dissolving General Assemblies, the church courts fell under political management, from which, and its baneful effects, they have not escaped to this day.— These causes led, at an early period, to the formation of what has been called the moderate party, which, for upwards of a century, has had the management of the judicatories, and has not only defeated every attempt to reform the church, but uniformly supported the encroachments of the State on her remaining liberties, and given its decided countenance to Arian, Pelagian and Arminian errors, vented by ministers in her communion. At the same time, the minority, who, from the pulpit or in the church courts, bore testimony against these evils, were subjected to censure for their faithfulness. And thus the leaven of heresy, publicly countenanced by the judicatures, soon spread throughout the church, pervading all her administration, till the most numerous, as well as the most influential party became the avowed supporters of doctrines eversive of the gospel. This charge is not brought against them by Seceders alone: it has been admitted by members of the Establishment themselves, among whom nothing is more common than to distinguish the opposing parties in the church by the names of *moderate* and *evangelical*. It was this rapid progress of error in doctrine, connected with the tyrannical administration of the church, particularly in the application of the law of patronage, which had been restored in the year 1712, that was the immediate cause of the secession in 1733—a step which our fathers considered absolutely necessary for the vindication of truth, and no less necessary for the relief of parishes groaning under the oppression of a system which intruded on them an unfaithful or unedifying minister.

This Synod have always condemned that article in the treaty of union between England and Scotland, by which the Scottish nation gave its consent to the perpetuating of the hierarchy in England, as inconsistent with a previous treaty, sacredly ratified, which provided for “the reformation of religion in the kingdoms of England and Ireland, in doctrine, worship, discipline and government, according to the word of God, and the example of the best reformed churches,” and for the complete abolition of prelacy, as the great obstacle to this most desirable object. In

consequence of the legislative union with England, the imposition of the abjuration oath and the test act, with other causes, the members of the Scottish Establishment were gradually led to look upon conformity with the Church of England as innocent, until at last all proper sense of the evils of prelacy, and of the semi-popish ceremonies with which it has always been combined, is in a great measure worn off their minds. After what the Synod have already advanced, it is hardly necessary for them to say that they feel no sympathy with such views. They look on the refusal of the English church to reform, and the obstinacy with which she continues to cling to flagrant abuses, as one great cause of the critical state into which our ecclesiastical establishments have been brought.— Had the plan of religious reformation and uniformity laid down in the Westminster standards been honestly carried into operation, it would have prevented that vast increase of dissent which now threatens, and at no very distant period may accomplish, the subversion of the whole English Establishment: nor, in that case, would Ireland have presented the humiliating spectacle, in the nineteenth century, of a nation forming so intimate a part of this Protestant empire, groaning under the miseries superinduced by papal ignorance and superstition. It is deeply to be regretted that the Church of England, which promised, in the reign of Edward VI., to become the bulwark of Protestantism, should have fallen into the hands of arbitrary princes and ambitious churchmen, who, by moulding it to suit their own worldly views, deprived it of the power of self expansion and self purification. As it is, the Synod must condemn the constitution of the English Establishment as decidedly Erastian, in consequence of the power granted to the king, as the temporal head of the church, and supreme judge in all causes ecclesiastical. The civil places and power of churchmen, and in particular the appointment of the bishops as a constituent portion of one of the estates in Parliament, under the denomination of lords spiritual, we consider to be as detrimental to the interests of religion, as it is inconsistent with the nature of Christ's kingdom, which is "not of this world." The whole frame of the hierarchy is without the shadow of foundation in scripture; a corruption of the primitive order instituted by Christ in his church, which originated in human invention, and was carried to perfection under antichrist; a government in which the discipline and laws of Christ's house, for maintaining truth and purity, are deprived of all force; and which, therefore, may be abolished without endangering the existence or marring the beauty and efficiency of the English Establishment. We have not overlooked, nor have we contemplated with an indifferent eye, the late increase in the number of evangelical and zealous ministers within the Established churches of England and Ireland; but on the other hand, we cannot conceal from ourselves that these Establishments, as presently constituted, are fitted to be the tools of statesman; that their bishoprics and other rich benefices will generally be bestowed on those who have the greatest political influence, and that it is vain to expect that an effectual check will be to put to pluralities, non-residents and sinecures. While, therefore, we disclaim all connection with the principles of those who are now seeking the subversion of the Establishments of England and Ireland, we are equally unprepared to join in the latitudinarian scheme, which, regarding all forms of church government as indifferent, would perpetuate the hierarchy, in the vain hope of seeing it converted into an effective organ for reforming the church, and diffusing the blessings of religion throughout the nation.

To return, however, to the Scottish Establishment, in which we are more immediately interested, the Synod readily admit that, of late years, there has been a revival of evangelical doctrine within her pale, and it

gives them much pleasure to observe other movements, particularly as to chapels of ease, which are of an encouraging nature ; but they regret to see that no measures as yet proposed for that purpose strike at the root of the evils which have long tarnished the glory and marred the usefulness of the Church of Scotland, or promise to remove these so as to prepare the way for their return to her fellowship. A scriptural reformation never did, and never can, take place in a church by half measures. The call of Christ addressed to the church of Ephesus, is applicable to all churches in similar circumstances, "Remember from whence thou hast fallen, and repent, and do the first works." Little or no disposition, however, as yet appears, at least in the Courts of the Established Church, to return to her reformed and covenanted constitution. In the recent defences of the Establishment by its ministers and members, references are sometimes made to the first Reformation, but seldom to the second, though it not only comprised all that was excellent in the first, but carried the church forward to higher attainments. Though it is undeniable that, at that period, the reformation of the Church, combined, as it then was, with a reformation of the State in matters connected with religion, was blessed by heaven for the revival of practical godliness, to a degree that has seldom been equalled in this or any other country,—there seems, even among the most zealous reformers within the national Church at present, an aversion to the measures then pursued, and the principles then maintained, which affords us little ground to hope for a similar revival of the Divine work.

At the second Reformation, the scriptural origin and authority of Presbytery was distinctly asserted and demonstrated, in opposition to prelacy. This ground, however, has been generally abandoned, even by the evangelical party in the Church ; and it would appear from the language of some of the late most strenuous defenders of our Establishment, that they would have been equally pleased had Episcopacy been the established religion. This may be traced partly to causes already stated ; partly to the latitudinarian views adopted by the orthodox during their unsuccessful struggle with the moderate party in the eighteenth century. The Synod lament this indifference, not only as manifesting a want of gratitude to God for the deliverance granted to Scotland from prelatic domination, and of proper respect to the memory of our ancestors who shed their blood in this cause, but as indicating much ignorance of the real importance of the controversy maintained in this country between presbytery and prelacy, which involved the liberties of the Christian church and the rights of the Christian ministry, and as obliging the friends of the Church to fight their "Voluntary" adversaries at great disadvantage, while they occupy the low ground of expediency, both as to an Establishment and the Church established.

During both reforming periods, solemn public engagements, and the renovation of them, were remarkably blessed for promoting reformation, and reviving it when nearly overthrown by its enemies. Proceeding on the principle which lies at the foundation of national establishments of religion, that organised society, whether civil or ecclesiastical, is the subject of God's moral government, as well as individual persons, and, as such, capable of social engagements and public faith ; and that society thus constituted, is recognised both by God and man as a permanent body, whose moral identity is unaffected by the constant change taking place among the individuals composing it,—our reforming ancestors considered that our national covenants, having a permanent object, must be of perpetual obligation on all ranks in these lands to the latest posterity : and many of them sealed their testimony for this sublime truth with their blood. The same doctrine is held by this Synod ; and so long as this

doctrine was held by Seceders in general, they never once dreamed of waging war against the principle of Establishments. But how much soever the ministers of the present Establishment disagree with the advocates of the "Voluntary" system in other respects, the most of them seem to go hand in hand with them, in treating with neglect, if not with contempt, these national deeds. We cannot avoid declaring, that they have in so far abandoned one of their principal strongholds as a national Church. They hold their temporal emoluments by a national grant made to them at the time of the Reformation; but can they with a good grace plead the permanent obligation of the national faith pledged in that grant, so long as they overlook or deny the permanent obligation of our national engagements in support of the Reformation itself? If the nation has proved unfaithful in the one case, and they have kept silence, without testifying against breach of covenant as a great national sin, can they reasonably expect that it will prove faithful in the other? By abandoning the Reformation as a covenanted work, and dropping from her profession the continued obligation of these national deeds, the present Church of Scotland has done more to pave the way for her own ruin, than all that has been done, or could have been done by 'Voluntary Associations,' had she pursued a different course. The National Covenant, as renewed in 1638, and the Solemn League and Covenant, though condemned by the law of the State, are approved by laws of the Church, which have never been set aside by any ecclesiastical authority: but these have long been a dead letter; and a party who refuses to renew a lawful contract which he has failed to perform, is viewed, in the sight both of God and man, as disowning it and setting its obligation at nought.

It was, moreover, the uniform practice of the Reformed Church of Scotland, in her purer times, when threatened with danger, from within and from without, to return to God, by making public confession of her own sins and those of the nation, and by renewing her covenant with God. The year 1596 exhibited the rare and edifying spectacle of a whole General Assembly publicly confessing, with tears, the sins with which they were chargeable in their station, and, with uplifted hands, renewing their former vows, preparatory to their engaging in a more extensive purification of the Church. All who are acquainted with the history of the Church know, that the same exercise was repeated, at various subsequent periods, and that the present standards of the Church of Scotland are the direct and intended results of the Solemn League. The Synod, however, are sorry to observe little or no disposition, as yet, in the national Church, to acknowledge the several steps of defection from her reformed principles and practice, and that, if alluded to at all, these are spoken of as abuses that have accidentally crept in during the lapse of time, and not as sins, highly dishonouring to the great Head of the Church. We trust, that many individuals in the Establishment feel very differently; but the general prevalence of this tone of feeling, even among the better party, gives little encouragement to expect a dutiful return to God. A Church which remains proud and unhumiliated, under threatened judgments and visible marks of divine displeasure, cannot be a reforming Church.

Farther, in former times, few things more distinguished the Church of Scotland than her faithfulness in maintaining the purity of Christian and ministerial communion, by purging the Church of unworthy members and erroneous teachers. The Synod, however, have too just cause to complain of the general relaxation of this ancient discipline in the present Establishment. The total want, in many places, of kirk-sessions, (where all discipline on the members of the Church ought to begin,) the want of due qualifications to the eldership generally, the prevalence of private

baptism, and the almost indiscriminate admission to sealing ordinances in numerous congregations, by means of which profaneness and inattention to religious duties are countenanced and encouraged, are evils which, from being overlooked, if not sanctioned, by the higher judicatories, amount to a systematic and allowed laxity of communion, very different from those incidental acts of mal-administration which are inseparable from the present imperfect state of the Church, and do not warrant separation. With regard to public teaching, it is notorious, that, for more than a century, Arian and Arminian tenets were taught from many pulpits of the Church of Scotland; and that even in the present time, the designation of Moderate, as applied to a large party in the Church, indicates a radical difference in doctrine, as well as in views of church polity, from the party styled Evangelical. We admit, that the Assembly of late discovered a laudable zeal in condemning what was called the Row Heresy. But we have to complain of the indefinite language in which that condemnation was expressed, as calculated to injure truth, especially when we consider, that it was founded on the act of Assembly 1720, condemning the Marrow of Modern Divinity,—an act which gave just cause of offence and alarm to some of the most excellent men then in the Church. Nothing tends more to obscure the gospel, or to perplex the exercise of serious persons, than to confound the assurance which a person may have of his being a Christian, with that appropriating assurance, or fiducial reliance on Christ, which is founded on the Divine testimony. This last, in common with all the reformers, we consider as belonging to the nature of saving faith. Had the late Assembly adverted to the fact, that their predecessors, in 1720, had, in their eagerness to guard against Antinomianism, contradicted an express doctrine of their own Confession, by condemning the assertion, that believers are wholly free from the law as the covenant of works, they would have chosen a safer guide in their procedure against modern errors. We are constrained to add, that nothing like the same zeal has been displayed in rebuking the errors which appear on the “Moderate” side of the house; and if we were to judge of the future faithfulness of the Assembly from the manner in which they dismissed the charge brought, at their last meeting, against a Reverend Doctor, of having published Arminian doctrine, on a simple disclaimer by himself,—a mode of proceeding similar to that employed by the courts, toward the close of last century, in the case of Dr. M’Gill of Ayr, we would have little encouragement to expect a speedy return of the Church of Scotland to purity of doctrine.

The late decision of the General Assembly on Patronage is also very discouraging. Perhaps no Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of Scotland ever before gave such positive countenance to this infringement on ecclesiastical liberties. Though they hardly expected that the Assembly was prepared to petition for the abolition of the law of Patronage, the Synod cannot refrain from expressing their surprise at the attempts made to deny that the Church of Scotland was originally, and by her constitution, opposed to that law. They had supposed that none, who had studied her principles and contentings, could fail to perceive, that not the abuses merely, but the very existence of lay-patronage in the Church, is condemned in her ancient standard books, and formed the ground of her continued protest, from the first dawn of the Reformation almost down to the conclusion of the last century; that, even in its mildest form, and when checked in every possible way by her own laws, it was felt and denounced as a grievous yoke and burden; that in short, it was condemned, not simply on account of its inexpediency, its injurious tendency, or its unlimited pretensions, but as, in its own nature, a sinful encroachment on the spirituality, the freedom, and independence of the

Church, and consequently on the royal prerogative of Christ, her Divine Head. To whatever extent our reformers may have differed, at different periods, as to the particular mode of ecclesiastical election, and whatever interpretations may be put upon the Books of Discipline and Acts of Assembly regarding this, there never existed a doubt or dispute about patronage, which they uniformly declared to be incompatible with the freedom of election in every form—an absolute and unmingled evil, which they found it necessary to tolerate as a grievance, but which, lest their toleration should be construed into a sanction of it, they never ceased to condemn as a usurpation on the part of the state, from which they prayed to be delivered. During the reign of “Moderation” at the close of last century, the instructions annually given to the commission of the Assembly, to seize every fit opportunity of petitioning the legislature for the repeal of the Patronage Law, were allowed to drop, on pretext of the fruitlessness of the appeal. But the last meeting of the Assembly, by refusing, in opposition to the general wish of the Christian people, and notwithstanding the prospect of success, to petition for that repeal, formally stamped on that law their seal of approbation. Nor is this remedied by their Declaratory Act concerning Calls. Viewing that act merely as a provisional measure to counteract the evils of patronage till its removal could be obtained, we would object to it as making the absence of dissent from the patron’s presentation, the ground of the Church’s procedure to settlement, instead of the call of the people. But our chief objection lies against it as a substitute for the protest formerly maintained against patronage, the continuance of which it contemplates, and attempts to perpetuate, by rendering it less obnoxious to the people in appearance; while the cumbrous appendage of rules by which it is proposed to carry the act into execution, is calculated to deter a prudent people from an opposition, which, how reasonable soever it might be in itself, would involve them in all the intricacies of troublesome and expensive litigation.

We find ourselves called upon, therefore, to re-assert the ancient doctrine of the Scottish Church, that the order of election, according to the word of God, “cannot stand with patronages and presentation to benefices;” which, as the barbarous names themselves would denote, “flowed from the pope and the corruption of the canon law only.” We maintain with our fathers, that lay-patronage must, from its very nature, be incompatible with the independence of the Church as a spiritual society; and that the State has no more right to elect the pastors of the Church, than the Church to elect the rulers of the State. How would it be tolerated, were the General Assembly to assume the power of nominating any of the king’s ministers and officers of State? or were a foreign prince to claim a similar power, even though a veto should be left in the king’s hand? What a mock would it have been thought, if the recently created electors had got only a veto! And why should the Church, the freest society on earth, the much-loved and honoured spouse of Christ, whose liberties have been purchased by the blood of her Divine Head, and secured by the charter of heaven, be subjected to a similar dictation on the part of the State? Is it because there is no king in the midst of her? or because it is thought that the rights of his kingdom may be more safely invaded and bartered away, than those of earthly sovereigns? Is it because the legislature presumed that her watchmen were become blind and dumb? or that her citizens were now prepared to crouch to a yoke, which formerly “neither they nor their fathers were able to bear?” It is impossible that a church can be truly free, so long as the initial appointment of her ministers is vested in a foreign power, over which she

has no control—so long as her pastors must ask admission into her pulpits, and her people must submit to receive them, at the hands of persons who may not be only aliens to the Church, but her avowed enemies, infidels, or profligates.

(To be concluded.)

ART. IV.—*The Sabbath Magazine.*

This is a work published Monthly in the city of New York, and edited by the Rev. James Irvine; and is designed to promote the observance of the Sabbath. Each number contains 16 pages, and the price is \$1 per annum in advance. The editor concludes a long and well written address as follows:

But the most alarming circumstance remains untold. *Professing Christians are chargeable with Sabbath violations.* “Even with us there are sins against the Lord our God.” The people of God have a moral influence which, when duly exerted, secures respect for every religious institution. This influence creates a great responsibility. But notwithstanding this responsibility, multitudes of professors, and even ministers of the sanctuary, can look with apparent unconcern upon the most dreadful scenes of Sabbath profanation. They can witness the triumphs of infidelity in weakening Sabbath sanctions, and yet exert little or no influence to shield this holy institution. There is with us more than this negative guilt. Professors of godliness can even join hand in hand with infidels in heaven-daring desecrations of this holy day! Ichabod, is an inscription characteristic of the times with regard to the Sabbath: “for the glory has departed.” And is it not for wo, when the Christian’s ark of glory thus falls into the hands of the uncircumcised? It is for our affliction, and their destruction.

From the great importance of this holy day, and the prevalence of its profanation, it must be manifest to every reflecting pious mind, that a *great Sabbath reformation is necessary.* If we would preserve all that is valuable in human attainments, and prevent the dark and murderous reign of infidelity; leave to our children the rich legacy of well regulated civil institutions, and further the eternal interests of generations yet unborn, we must speedily put forth all our energies to effect such a reformation.

To this great work the church must be excited. She must exert all her energies. From the pulpit and from the press, the Sabbath’s righteous claims must be urged;—and every private Christian must give all his influence in favor of the work. Well-informed holy zeal is requisite. This sacred fire, kindling from heart to heart, will soon reach thousands; and by its genial influence, warm them into life and activity in this cause of God and of the world. The fervent and importunate prayer of faith must be superadded. This will secure the shield of Omnipotence to cover and protect this holy institution; and engage, if there were need, legions of ministering spirits, to promote, in ways unknown, this holy work.

But reproach of conscience will effectually suppress the risings of holy zeal in any cause, and entirely prevent holy boldness at a throne of grace. Heavenly fire kindles only in purified hearts; and the hands that are lifted up without doubting, must be *holy hands.* The successful reformer, therefore must be self reformed. An exemplary observance of the Sabbath is the best recommendation that any Christian can give of this holy institution. And when the church “looks forth as the morn-

ing, fair as the moon, and clear as the sun," then is she "terrible as an army with banners."

When the church comes up rightly prepared for the work, and with all her energies exerted, it will soon be accomplished. The blessing of the God of Israel will descend upon her, and her labors will be crowned with abundant success. Her own numbers will be greatly increased, and her influence greatly extended. Then, a "fountain shall come forth of the house of the Lord, and shall water the valley of Shittim."

In every department of the great Christian enterprise, the genial influence of a Sabbath reformation would be felt. In the promotion of this holy cause the friends of every moral and religious institution should manifest a deep concern.

In a word, the best interests of our country, and of the world require such a reformation.

But in the accomplishment of an end so desirable, care in the selection of the most suitable means is highly requisite. The importance of a well conducted periodical publication, devoted expressly to this cause, can scarcely be doubted. The powerful influence of such publications, designed to promote special objects, has been felt in other departments of moral and religious reform; and this fact warrants the expectation of a similar result in this cause. Of this we have for a long time, been fully persuaded. Our belief is confirmed by the concurrent judgment of all whom we have consulted. And with the advice of several judicious laymen and clergymen of different denominations; and assured of their aid by articles for our pages, we have been induced to commence the publication of the SABBATH MAGAZINE.

Should it be objected, that such a work will not find access to those who need it most; we might reply, that this objection would stand with equal force against every publication designed to promote moral reform. But the objection is also met by the idea already advanced—that the work of Sabbath reformation must begin with professing Christians; and be promoted by the influence of *holy example* as well as of holy precept. But we add moreover, that we design, should we receive patronage sufficient to meet the expense, to strike off in tract form, and for gratuitous distribution among Sabbath scholars; children, youth, and others who may be found in the streets on the Sabbath; and all others who may stand in special need of such instruction, such articles from the Magazine as pious and judicious advisers may, from time to time judge to be suitable.

Should it be objected, that there are already many religious publications conducted by pious and experienced editors, who are warm friends to the religious observance of the Christian Sabbath; and that these are sufficient for all the purposes intended in the establishment of our Magazine:—We would reply—that we are happy to join in full commendation of the piety and ability of these respected brethren: but, as their publications are either of a general character, or, if particular, for other special ends, than by us intended, we consider the necessity of the Sabbath Magazine by no means superceded. We will bless God if we may be enabled to become auxiliary to them in advancing the cause of our common Lord. We feel the full force of the fact, that religious publications are so multiplied that it is difficult for less wealthy Christians to give encouragement to every department in the Christian enterprise. But we would plead the importance of our cause; and notice the small sum required from each subscriber. We also indulge the hope that several of the more wealthy and liberal friends of the Redeemer will enable us to send this work to the poor and needy.

Anticipating the desire of the Christian public to know the principles

of the Editor, and the manner and spirit in which he proposes to conduct this Magazine, we here distinctly state that we hold :—That, since the resurrection of our blessed Redeemer, the first day of the week, denominated in the New Testament the “ Lord's day,” is the Christian Sabbath : That the Christian Sabbath is of moral and perpetual obligation until the end of time : That its right observance requires us to desist from all worldly employments, except works of necessity and mercy ; and to spend the whole day in the public and private exercises of God's appointed worship :—And that Parents and Masters are bound to permit all who are subordinate to them to rest from their labor, and to encourage them to keep this day holy. And while it is our belief that, in the promotion of Sabbath sanctification, much more may be expected from moral suasion than from legal coercion, we nevertheless boldly maintain, that legal enactments in favor of the Christian Sabbath, and to prevent external violations of this consecrated rest, are not only right, but righteously required of all who are elevated to legislative authority in this Christian land.

Although we will fearlessly maintain these principles ; we purpose to avoid as far as possible, the controversial form. When we speak of the duties, or practice of those in civil authority, we purpose to do it in terms expressive of due respect. Even when we oppose the principles and practice of unbelievers, we purpose to bring no “ railing accusations ;” but to use the dictates of sober reason and experience, in connexion with the plain and forcible doctrines of divine revelation. These are the weapons which we have selected to use in defence of our avowed principles.

Every thing that is properly denominated sectarianism will be carefully excluded from the Sabbath Magazine.

Confiding more in the counsel and assistance of those who have kindly promised us aid than in our own wisdom or strength ; earnestly soliciting the prayers of all Christian brethren, and humbly, but firmly relying upon Him who can make effectual the means used to promote his own glorious cause—we enter upon this important work.

Yours most respectfully,

JAMES IRVINE.

NEW-YORK, A. D. 1835.

ART. V.—Thoughts on the Temper and Employments of the Lord's Day.

BY THE LATE WILLIAM WILBERFORCE, ESQ.

With respect to the *general temper* to be maintained on that sacred day, we ought, upon our first waking, to give it a peculiar welcome, rising with great alacrity, and, if we can, a little earlier than usual, hailing its return with joy. Then, dismissing worldly thoughts, we should endeavor to cherish those that are spiritual and heavenly, and to manifest throughout the day, in a more striking manner, a spirit of love, seeking to have the image of our heavenly Father more legibly impressed upon us, being followers of God as dear children, and walking in love, as Christ also hath loved us, and given himself for us. We should pray for more peace and joy in believing, and abound in hope through the power of the Holy Ghost ; thus proving to all around us the happiness we experience, and showing them that we are more in our proper element this day than on any other, and tacitly inviting them to partake of the same privileges. Our accents should be kinder, and our countenances should beam with

livelier joy, and each interval of social recreation should have a savor of our eternal Sabbath above.

With respect to our employments, *one of our earliest and most serious exercises, should be faithful and minute self-examination*, that we may ascertain in which direction we have been proceeding, and what has been our progress, marking our deficiencies in the past week, asking on what subjects our thoughts have turned at intervals of leisure, upon what objects our affections have been chiefly set, what has been the character of our conversation and the tendency of our influence; inquiring whether those with whom we may have associated can bear us witness that we have sought to lead them to greater love to God and greater devotedness to his service; as we shall wish we had, when we meet them in the eternal world; finding out what were our tempers, under any petty provocation to which we may have been subject, whether we exhibited the meekness of Christ, whether we were ready to deny ourselves when duty called, whether we have been more earnest in our secret devotions, whether we have wasted less precious time. Thus we should enter into detail according to our character and temptations. Various other points also should be looked into; I mention these only as a specimen.

Secondly, we should engage in *the public services of the church, with seriousness, prayer, and an anxious desire for improvement*; seeking in the prayers to have real communion with God, an unbroken interview, as it were, with him; hearing his word with humble desire to profit, and listening to the sermon, sensible of our own utter inability to profit by any means, without divine assistance, and looking to God to give the increase. After church, we must be on our watch, lest our great spiritual enemy robs us of the good seed that may have been lodged in our hearts. I think it a good plan, and I wish my dear children to remember it, to turn the heads of the sermon into prayer on our return home.

A third exercise for this blessed day, is, the numbering up and setting in order before the soul, all the mercies we have received from God, ever since we were born, to the present hour. There is no sin oftner reproved in Scripture, and none, I am persuaded, of which we shall be found more guilty at the last day, than ingratitude. Let us think of the time and country in which we live, of the numerous evils from which we are exempted, of the temporal comforts we enjoy, of our religious privileges, the means of grace in such abundance, and with such clearness the hope of glory. Let us consider all the ways by which the Lord has led us, all the long suffering he has shown towards us, all the strivings of his blessed Spirit, which we too often have resisted. Above all, let us praise him for his unspeakable gift, in so loving the world as to give his only Son for our redemption. It is indeed true that, when memory has done her utmost, ten thousand of His mercies will escape our recollection; but even such an imperfect retrospect as we can take will soften our hard hearts, and tune our voices to join with the heavenly choir in ascribing blessing, and honor, and glory, and thanksgiving, and power, unto Him that sitteth upon the throne and to the Lamb.

Intercession is a fourth sabbatical exercise, and to my mind one of the sweetest. To pour out our hearts before God for all classes of men, for all who are in sorrow or suffering, in spiritual darkness or bondage. To pray for the success of all good designs, and the wider extension of our Saviour's kingdom. It is cheering in this view to read, on a Sunday evening, missionary accounts, which show how it pleases God to bless the endeavors that are made to enlighten the heathen. Especially we should intercede for all those who are dear to us by the ties of nature or friendship, adapting our petitions to their respective characters and cases. My

dear children may think of me at nine o'clock on the Sunday evening, as mindful of them, and often also at three in the afternoon.

As a *fifth* exercise, I would suggest that towards the close of the day, we should direct our meditation to the heavenly state, that eternal Sabbath of which this on earth is but a type. Let us pray that the eyes of our understanding may be enlightened, while we dwell on some of those glorious descriptions which are given us in Scripture, of that rest which remaineth for the people of God. Take, for instance, that verse, "We shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is;" or that, "We shall know even as we also are known;" or, when our minds are saddened by the afflictions of beloved friends, "Sorrow and sighing shall *flee away*;" a beautiful image expressive of their haste to leave the regions of bliss. There "the inhabitant shall no more say, 'I am sick;'" "There shall be no night there;" or, if we have lost any very dear to us, let us dwell on that blessed declaration, "There shall be no more death," "Behold I make all things new," "A far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory," "A crown of glory that fadeth not away." Such meditations will sweetly refresh our spirits, and animate us to run the race set before us with renewed vigor the ensuing week. Thus, also, we may have a foretaste, even in this lower region, of those pleasures which are at God's right hand, and may drink of the living fountains of water by which the Lamb of God leads his flock in the heavenly pastures, and of which he sometimes gives them a prelibation on this side of the grave.

ART. VI. Convention at Pittsburg.

The convention was opened at the appointed time, with a sermon by the Rev. Dr. Blythe; after which, it was organized by the appointment of the Rev. Dr. Green, as president, the Rev. Mr. Witherspoon, as vice-president, and Messrs. Culbertson, of Zanesville, and Fairchild, of Redstone Presbyteries, as secretaries. After the appointment of a committee to receive and report upon the character, &c. of documents, the convention resolved to spend the succeeding day in acts of religious worship—that, as a convention, they might go directly to the source of all wisdom, and to the giver of all grace, for direction and support. It was a day of particular interest to God's people here, and if we may judge from the decided, yet mild and harmonious action of the body, it was a day pregnant with blessings to God's Zion. The Rev. Dr. Wilson, of Cincinnati, preached in the morning; a prayer meeting was held in the afternoon, and the Rev. Dr. Junkin, president of Lafayette College, preached in the evening. On Saturday morning, at nine o'clock, the convention assembled. The committee alluded to above reported certain documents, and recommended the reading of one which presented most, if not all the points of grievances under which the church groans, and from which it is desirable to relieve her. After some interesting discussion, it was resolved that Drs. Junkin and Wilson, and the Rev. Mr. Witherspoon, together with Messrs. Boyd, of Brooklyn, N. Y., Owen, of Bedford county, and George, of Baltimore, be a committee to prepare a memorial, to be presented to the General Assembly by the *individuals* composing the convention and any others who may unite with them, when the convention shall have decided on the points to be embodied therein. The following points have already been discussed and ordered into the hands of that committee, to be incorporated into said memorial, viz: the propriety and necessity of placing all institutions which are calculated to operate an influence in educating or supporting our ministry under the direct jurisdiction of some ecclesiastical supervision; of disannulling all bodies which have been formed on the schismatic principle of elective affinity; of taking measures to abrogate the plan of union of 1801, entered into between the General Assembly and the Congregational church of New England. So far the discussions have already proceeded, and during which some of the most fearful and startling disclosures have been made. Systematic measures for disorganizing the

church seem to have been in operation, not only under the eye, but the guidance and direction of men who had sworn to support and defend that church! Yes, Sir, part of a document was read from a Presbyterian minister, in which he combats a doctrinal opponent by denying that either he or his church adopts or believes in a Confession of Faith!—*Presbyterian.*

ART. VII. *General Assembly.*

PITTSBURG, May 21, 1855.

The General Assembly convened this day in the First Presbyterian church in Pittsburg, (Dr. Herron's) and was opened with a sermon by the Rev. Dr. Miller, from the text, "We have this treasure in earthen vessels"—a good and appropriate discourse. Rev. Dr. Lindsley, the last moderator being unable to attend the Assembly, requested the Rev. Dr. William A. McDowell, by letter, as the previous moderator, to preach the sermon and preside till another moderator was chosen. Dr. McDowell, being very unwell, requested Dr. Miller to preach the sermon; and before Dr. McDowell could take the chair, Dr. Ely stated that he was the *standing organ* of the Presbyterian church during the interval of the Assemblies, and stated that as Dr. Beman was the only previous moderator who was a member of the Assembly, he, by the constitution, should preside; he made a motion to this effect, and it prevailed. The Assembly then had recess till after dinner.

After recess, a motion was made to reconsider the motion appointing Dr. Beman. This gave rise to an animated and protracted debate, in which Drs. Miller, Magraw, Blythe, Junkin, with the Rev. Messrs. Witherspoon, Elliott, Winchester, and some others, contended that the chair ought to be occupied by Dr. McDowell; and by Dr. Ely, Mr. Darling and others, in opposition. The advocates of Dr. Beman took different grounds from one another. The second general rule for judicatories reads thus:

"If a quorum be assembled at the hour appointed, and the moderator be absent, the last moderator present shall be requested to take his place without delay."—*Rules for Judicatories*, p. 451.

Dr. Ely, in stating this rule, put in after the word "present," the following, viz: "being commissioner to the Assembly." The reasons why the motion to appoint Dr. Beman prevailed, were, 1st. The members did not know that Dr. McDowell was in the house. 2d. They supposed that Dr. Ely's interpolation was a part of the rule.—But during the discussion, some of the advocates of Dr. Beman took the ground that the rule related only to the last moderator immediately preceding, and therefore could not relate to Dr. McDowell. Others contended that these rules were not binding on the Assembly. Among these were Dr. Wisner, of Rochester; yet, as soon as the moderator was chosen, these very rules were, according to uniform custom, read to the moderator elect, as the ceremony of induction into office! However, the motion to reconsider prevailed, and the motion to appoint Dr. Beman was put again, and lost by about 40 votes. Dr. McDowell was then appointed, *nem. con.*

Dr. William A. McDowell, on taking the chair, said that he did not hold to the doctrine that Dr. Ely was the organ of the Presbyterian church during the intervals of the Assemblies.

Rev. Eliakim Phelps then nominated Rev. Mr. Leach, of Virginia, for moderator, and Dr. Miller nominated Dr. Phillips, of New-York; and Dr. Phillips (an Act and Testimony man) was elected.

For Dr. Phillips,.....117

Mr. Leach,..... 85

—52 majority.

I think Dr. Phillips will preside with great dignity and efficiency.

FRIDAY, May 22.

To-day Mr. Breckenridge presented the report of the Board of Education, which, although it contains some hard things for new school men and irresponsible association men to digest, was, contrary to the usual custom of referring it to a committee, referred without a word of discussion directly to the board, with orders to print it. The minute referring to Dr. Beman's illegal appointment yesterday, was referred to a select committee, to bring in a minute giving a true historical statement of the case.—*Presbyterian.*

ART. VIII. *Affairs of the Monitor.*

It is a matter of thankfulness to the publisher, that, under many disadvantages, and in the face of the popular current of the age, divine Providence has continued this work in existence for so long a period. Periodical works and newspapers, of a professedly religious character, which are nevertheless in many respects unfriendly to Reformation principles, have become so numerous, and many of them, owing to an extensive patronage, are afforded at so cheap a rate, and are so constantly urged upon the people by extraordinary exertions, that the field for circulating the Monitor is extremely limited. Yet, in reference to it, we are enabled in some degree to adopt the language of the apostle, "Having therefore obtained help of God, we continue unto this day, witnessing both to small and great."

Owing to a variety of causes, such as deaths, removals, inability to pay, and in some instances indifference, there is always at the end of each volume a number of discontinuances; and these must be supplied by others, or the work cannot be supported. Some suppose the work too dear; but its comparatively limited circulation, and the amount of losses are such, that it cannot be maintained for a less price. Others, again, suppose it might be improved, and because it is not in all respects perfect, they stand aloof. But such as look for a perfect work of this kind, look for what has never been, and never will be. And if any one should be slow to believe this, let him make the attempt to produce one more perfect. Every possible exertion has been made, and frequently at the expense of losing patronage, to maintain the peculiar principles of the Secession church; and the same course will still be pursued. There are but few who make any pretension to the general principles of the Secession, who do not admit in words the importance of those principles, while many such are as far removed from the genuine spirit, sentiments and practices of the early Seceders, as the modern Lutherans are from the principles of the intrepid Reformer whose name they are still proud to bear.

Respecting controversial articles: these cannot always be excluded—nor would such a course be at all desirable. Many of the great principles maintained by Seceders may be viewed in different aspects by different minds, who are equally devoted to the same cause. A manly and temperate discussion of difficult points is desirable, and has a tendency to add to the reader's stock of knowledge, although different writers may entertain views exhibiting shades of difference.

It is hoped our correspondents will continue their exertions to furnish our pages with a sufficient quantity of original matter. Without their aid, the exertions of the publisher would avail but little.

The *twelfth* volume will be commenced with a number of extra copies, under the expectation that they will be subscribed for.

Whether the Monitor is still to continue, as heretofore, to pay its monthly visits to the scattered families and congregations of the Associate church, bearing some word of instruction or comfort to the sincere inquirer after truth, depends entirely upon the exertions of its friends.—To them the question is submitted, and to them it belongs to return such an answer as the cause of Zion's king, the good of their own souls, and the souls of such as are entrusted to their care, may demand at their hands.

THE

RELIGIOUS MONITOR,

AND

EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

JULY, 1835.

ART. I. *Cause of Apostacy.*

[Continued from page 18.]

“*Without natural affection.*” Such an affection as should be in parents to their children, and in children to their parents. This charge rests on the same persons who are disobedient to their parents, for these two charges cannot be separate; and also on those parents who are “lovers of their own selves,” “proud, boasters, covetous,” &c. These dispositions are at variance with true natural affection, and consequently, where they have the ascendancy, natural affections can scarcely have any place. It is affecting to see parents carrying their authority up to the limits affixed by the laws of the land, and taking all the service and profit off their children which they may, until they are twenty-one years of age; and next, on the other side, to see the children the very next day turning round and claiming, with the same legal tone, remuneration for the least further service,—and it is a thing to be often seen. No doubt what is plead for is true—that this is just: so it would be, also, between a master and a servant or apprentice; but where is the *natural affection* of it? The *stōrk*, whose name is borrowed from this Greek word, is said *never* to leave its parents, but to feed and protect them to the last. How rarely is this the case among the present generation of human beings! It is much more common for children to avail themselves of their legal rights, like the Jewish youths of old, who took advantage of the popularity of the tradition, and said, “*it is Corban.*”

Again: on the other hand, if to be cold and careless about children’s eternal salvation, and to be all earnestness and concern about their worldly advantage, indicates a want of natural affection in parents, how many parents want it! What multitudes of parents making a profession of religion, are content—not only content, but very desirous, to procure that situation for their children, which promises fairest to make them wealthy, or to elevate them to places of honor or trust, though surrounded with temptations to become profane and wicked, and neglect and despise all those things which belong to their eternal peace. If he or she,

as the case may be, that is proposed for a new connection, have only money or property in hand or in prospect, that alone weighs down every consideration of spiritual things in the minds of parents.

“*Truce breakers.*” A truce is a treaty or an agreement, made and ratified in the most solemn manner, pledging for its fulfilment all their interest in a future world. All engagements under oath and solemn vows may be considered as coming within the meaning of the term. If a man is inducted into office by oath, it is equivalent to a truce, or solemn engagement to fulfil the duties of it. And is not the breach of such engagements come to a most appalling height? When a man or woman, at their entering on a profession of religion, promises, before a Session constituted in the name of Jesus Christ, to walk according to it, it is surely a very solemn engagement: so it is when parents, in receiving baptism for their children, promise to bring them up “in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.” Such, also, are the vows of ordination to the elder-ship or the ministry. But how are these engagements kept by the generality? or rather with how many aggravations are they broken and cast by? Are they any thing more with vast multitudes than mere ceremony, made without previous consideration or serious purpose, and forgotten and disregarded on the same day? They are *dead letters* in the history of the man. Not a few this day are, with deliberation and purpose, avowedly acting in plain contradiction to their most solemn vows; advocating measures which they were sworn to oppose; preaching doctrines which they had solemnly denounced. I appeal here to many who yet know and understand these things, if there are not whole societies of professors, yea, nations, most deeply involved in covenant violations. And this matter is of so old a date that it has long since dropped out of the mind, and so common that it is nothing thought of. If you speak seriously of it, it will be held in derision, or, to say the least, it is a dead language, which they have long since ceased to understand.

Among these truce breakers, there are no doubt many who are so from ignorance and carelessness, not understanding what they are doing, nor anxious to inquire after it. But there are others to whom this charity cannot be extended. They have knowledge sufficient to understand their solemn vows, and “speak lies in hypocrisy;” for it was never their serious, deliberate purpose at all to endeavor to walk up to them. It was only because there was no other way of obtaining the external privileges or office which, for some reason or other, they wished to enjoy. There are many that become truce breakers because (strange to tell) they think they would be uncharitable and bigotted towards those who differ from them if they would strictly adhere to their vows! Their charity bids God-speed to every one that goes by. They must hear and commune with Christians of every name, and applaud the doctrine which they do not believe. The preacher that is sprung out of this sort cautiously hides in his bosom the peculiarities of that system of truth to which he gave his solemn pledge at licensure or ordination, if the audience, or a part of it, disapprove of them, and he makes as though he would be understood to hold the opposite doctrine; and he endeavors, upon this same plan, to “become all things to all men.” These men would make you believe that they could take you into their heart for very love. They will pour encomium upon yourself and your way of faith and worship, till you are out of all countenance. The difference between them and you, if we believe them, is exceedingly small; yet it is all “lies in hypocrisy,” in the hope of proselyting you.

But, reader, can the men who trifle after this sort with their most solemn pledges to God and man—preaching one doctrine to-day, and endeavoring with all their ability to be thought friendly to its opposite to-

morrow—worshipping in one way at home, and for mere compliment's sake approving of another abroad,—*can* they seriously believe that the Bible is the word of God at all? I think they cannot; and were it not that the church stands on a rock, against which hell will never prevail, it would make me tremble to think what numbers of *Deists* are this day pretending to be her ministers, elders and people.

"*False accusers.*" Diaboli or devils, because false accusers act so much in the character of the devil, who is called "the Accuser of the brethren, which accuses them before God day and night." (Rev. xii. 10.) This vice flourishes, and has a numerous and increasing class of practicers: go to an election, and you must both see and hear them. Read the public papers, and you will frequently meet whole columns of deliberate and digested slander. Place "the way of truth" before the religious public, and by the generality of those who condescend to notice it at all, it will be "evil spoken of." It is called *cold orthodoxy*, and the few people who still adhere to it are loaded with opprobrious epithets. Bring to remembrance the martyrs and reformers by whose means we enjoy so many privileges, and it is a thousand to one if the tribute paid to their memory be not that "*they were fools.*" This is little better than to call them *heretics*, which their mortal enemy at Rome calls them, from whom neither mercy or truth is ever more to be expected. Such as yet adhere to Reformation principles are accused of being "behind the spirit of the age"—"only a few removes from barbarism"—"unfriendly to the spread of the gospel in the world"—"a hindrance in the way of harmony among the christian denominations"—"uncharitable and bigoted." These are grave accusations, and in so far as they lie against the *principles* of their profession, they are *false*.

"*Incontinent.*" It has been thought by some commentators that this whole passage was intended by the inspired apostle as a prophetic description of characters that were after to appear in the ranks of the great Popish apostacy; and that they would, among many other vices, be *incontinent*. And that there have been and still are many such among them, in all orders, from the Pope himself to the lowest of his creatures, is well known to all that are acquainted with their true history, their vows of perpetual celibacy, and higher claims to chastity notwithstanding. And I admit that that apostacy has brought, and still brings forth, all the characters in this passage by thousands, and that it has a respect to them.

But if we suppose that there are none to be found in any other connection answering this description, or if we suppose that an apostacy from the Reformation cannot bring them forth to as great maturity, we are grossly mistaken. That there are many expressions of character, in dress, language and amusements, far removed from the spirit of chastity, to be seen in Protestant communities; and that there are multitudes of lewd men and women in our cities, towns and villages, and places of public resort, is undeniable. Whence are they? and where are they baptised? and who are their parents?—Are they *all* within the Romish communion?—*all* the supporters of the theatre, masquerade and ball room, and the numerous fashionable excitements to unclean passions? It is not so. There is a large proportion of them Protestants by name, and not a few of them by profession. And it is progressive apostacy from Protestant faith and practice, that has generated and brought forth such characters.

"*Fierce.*" Those who have this as their predominant trait are easily offended, and they carry it high. Anger quickly rises to passion, and passion to rage, which vents itself in loud and clamorous speeches and threatenings, and frequently in deeds of vengeance. I know not to what

else to ascribe the numerous quarrels and outbreakings that frequently happen among us; the many law suits; the horrid cruelty of husbands to wives; the murders, duels and suicides which are continually reported in the public journals.

"*Despisers of those that are good*"—that are conscientious in their profession—observing the Sabbath in a spiritual manner—refraining from carnal conversation, and endeavoring to be spiritual in all their deportment. Those that are good are humble, self-denied, patient, forgiving, returning good for evil. They study to bring to pass in practice the whole of their profession; they study to be stronger in the word; they bewail their corruptions; they thirst after likeness to God; his declarative glory is their highest aim; gratitude and love is their strongest principle. There are few, very few of such people now among us, yet there are some; and it is not easy to know how many or where they are.—They lie hid and concealed; and the reason is, because they are any thing but popular characters: they are *despised* by the atheist, the wicked and profane—despised by the gay and fashionable, the ignorant, the unthinking: they are despised by all such as hate sound doctrine—as make light of consistency in a profession—as are full of the modern charity, and its *interminable scheming*: yea, they are despised by their near neighbors. Sometimes this despising of them may stop with simply overlooking them, or, at most, undervaluing them; but it frequently goes further, and breaks forth in terms of opprobrium, ridicule and contempt.

"*Traitors.*" The term traitor is applied to Judas, because he betrayed his master into the hands of his enemies, under the character of a disciple, and with the pretence of friendship. But the same thing may be still done. There is such a thing as crucifying Christ afresh, and so there is of betraying him afresh. Christ identifies himself with his church and his truth; and whoever betrays them, betrays him—they are *traitors*, who ever comes into a church, professing to espouse her profession, and then lays her and it open to the attack of enemies, whether in a private or public way, they are *traitors*.

When the officers of the church admit *known* enemies into her fellowship, or connive at their remaining in it; when ministers, notwithstanding their solemn vows to their profession, give help and countenance to those who are opposed to it; when ministers and people, under pretence of union or of extending the sphere of their principles, give up the peculiar truths for which they contend; and when, along with these, the property or money received in trust, to be expended in support of these peculiarities, are also given up, I would consider it as in effect betraying Christ, with more or less aggravation. And if this be betraying, surely we have enough of it. Those who will be unfaithful in these things, want nothing but a favorable opportunity and a little stronger temptation, to go farther. There is treachery in the heart, which the love of truth has not power to overawe. Such men are just as fit to betray private interest and the nation's prosperity, as to do what they do. When we look back on the conduct of ministers and people for these fifty or sixty years, and consider how general and popular this same conduct has become, we have great reason to be afraid that the great and glorious Reformation is near being given into the hands of its mortal enemies, the Roman Catholics.

"*Heady.*" This term is of the same import with rash, hasty, precipitate. When men have so strong a confidence in their own judgment as to think reflection superfluous, even before the most important steps, and without hesitation proceed upon first impressions and first views, they may be called *heady*. How many things of the greatest weight are done

in this way? and how many are there that do them? This precipitancy may be seen in every department of life.

A single thought is enough to decide on a marriage connection which is likely to affect our social, moral and religious habits, to the end of life. A first impression of a new business or a new country often times cuts a man loose from all opportunity of waiting on his religious profession, and draws him into the midst of snares and temptations to become hardened, profane and wicked. The first view of some new theory in theological metaphysics, or of some new mode of doing God service in the church, is sufficient to call all the powers of the individual into action, and by his spark, a hundred are set on fire, and by the hundred, the thousand, and by the thousand, the million, and in a few weeks or months, changes will be introduced in the religious community that would have cost our fathers many years. This is called the mighty spirit of the age, and the march of mind, leaving our fathers in the distance, when it ought to be called rashness. The rapidity and the greatness of the things done, act like showers to the roots of vanity, pride, and self-righteousness, in the growing strength of which, *children* open their mouths to despise *men of renown*.

The next thing in the verse grows out of this, viz: "*high-minded*."—It signifies here to be puffed up with pride, to be elated. The rapidity with which the people of this age are now accustomed to do great things, (after their kind,) is an excellent means to produce this effect on their minds, and answers well to the sense of the original, primitive word, which signifies *smoke*; for a great deal of what is done by the rash and heady is little else but smoke. Its first appearance looks prodigious: it overspreads and darkens the whole heavens, and we are tempted to think the world is on fire with zeal: but after a few years, it is all blown away. Still it has this effect, to elate and puff up the mind; and this has grown to such excess among us, that men will not scarcely stoop to move in the common way of doing any thing, or if they do it, it sinks in their esteem below its worth, on that account. Hence it comes to pass that plain, sober life is despised by multitudes, and has gone into disuse. They are never satisfied unless they are doing something extraordinary, and without blushing for their own vanity and ostentation, claim for it that name, to the disparagement of others.

"*Lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God*," or rather than lovers of God. If a neutral person were to inspect them, in order to find out who they were, he would perceive, indeed, that they *professed* to love God, but their life and manners would deny that, and make it manifest that they were lovers of pleasures. It is hard to say *what* pleasures, for there are many pursued, and therefore are expressed by the plural—many kinds, degrees and times of pleasures. And they are so often at them, that one looking on would say almost all the time. It is their trade, their calling—it is their meat, their drink, their element. Some pleasures are pursued more than others, and some in a more open, public manner than others. The whole world knows to what extent the *pleasures* of drinking to drunkenness have been pursued, till of late that it has been made in some degree unfashionable. The pleasures of dressing the body have been and still are pursued with unabating passion.—The pleasures of costly and splendid buildings, public and private, costly and stylish furniture, and sumptuous tables, abound. Pleasure parties have become exceedingly frequent. Night assemblings, balls, and theatres are to be met with even in remote and obscure country places. There is another pleasure which I had almost forgotten, not less generally pursued, nor less opposite to the love of God: it is *novel reading*,—and all

these by people descended of Protestant parents and professors—their selves baptised—many of them professors, and not a few pretending to rank with the foremost. What a contrast with the style of life in better times! the plainness, the simplicity, self-denial, sobriety and seriousness of our reforming ancestors! The gold has become dim; the crown has fallen from our head. Woe unto us, for we have sinned a grievous sin!

[To be continued.]

ART. II. *The Love of the Holy Spirit, displayed in our Salvation.*

(Continued from page 10.)

We now proceed to contemplate *how* the Holy Spirit displays *his* love *distinctly*, with regard to our salvation. And as we have no rule but the Scriptures, we must begin and proceed, according to the order, extent and manner, in which he himself hath revealed it. *There, we are taught that he hath done it "at sundry times,"* and in "divers manners." That we may present this delightful subject as plainly, and concisely as we can, we shall illustrate it under two general heads:

First, we shall contemplate how the Holy Spirit displayed his love to the person of the Son himself, who purchased our salvation. And,

Secondly, how he displays it to his people, by applying to them this salvation. The first makes way for the second. And the second is the completion of the former. Of each in order.

First, how did the Holy Spirit display his love to the person of Christ himself? The Scriptures reveal to us the following particulars:

1. The Spirit inspired the prophets to give warnings of him, before he came into the world. Though Christ was only manifested in these last times, yet he was "verily fore-ordained before the foundation of the world unto our glory." And, the Apostle tells the Jews, this was the main subject, of which, God had spoken by all his holy prophets since the world began;" "yea," saith he "all the prophets, from Samuel and those that follow after, as many as have spoken, have likewise spoken of these days." It was their principal business to tell mankind that "in the fulness of time, God would send forth his Son made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons." So again, "of this salvation the prophets have enquired diligently, who prophesied of the grace of God that should come unto you." Searching what, and what manner of time the Spirit of Christ, that was in them, did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow." And here, it is proper to observe, that though the revelation was not so very clear, as under the gospel, yet, it was full, and particular. Christ was made known in the early ages of the world, in the whole compass of his glorious character, and in all the branches of his wonderful undertaking. Isaiah described his person, as "the child born, the son given, the mighty God," and "Immanuel." Moses said, "a prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you, like unto me. David saith, "the Lord swear and will not repent, thou art a priest forever, after the order of Melchisedek." And, "being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath unto him, that of the fruit of his loins according to the flesh, God would raise up Christ to sit on his throne; he seeing this before, spoke of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell, nor did his flesh see corruption." Daniel told the time, and Micah

the place of his birth. Isaiah is so particular, as to describe the manner, the severity, and end of his sufferings. "He was numbered with transgressors; it pleased the Lord to bruise him. For the transgression of my people was he stricken." Zechariah speaks of "the blood of the covenant." In fine, Malachi, the last of the prophets, as it were, ushered him into the world, with his fore-runner. "BEHOLD I will send my Messenger," (i. e. John the Baptist,) "and he shall prepare the way before me: and the LORD, (i. e. Christ,) whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple, even the Messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in: behold, he shall come saith the LORD of hosts." And, it is beautiful to observe, that when the Spirit of prophecy revived, the songs that were sung about the time of his birth, struck back to the original promises. Thus saith the Virgin, "My soul doth magnify the Lord, and my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour. He hath holpen his servant Israel, in remembrance of his mercy, as he spake to our fathers, to Abraham, and to his seed for ever."

Zechariah joined in the same note, at the circumcision of his child. He "was filled with the Holy Ghost, and prophesied, saying, blessed be the Lord God of Israel; for he hath visited and redeemed his people: And hath raised up an horn of salvation for us in the house of his servant David: As he spake by the mouth of his holy prophets, which have been since the world began."

2. The Holy Spirit displayed his love and power to the Son, by forming, and purifying his human nature, which was absolutely necessary for accomplishing the work he came upon. "In all things it behooved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people." Wherefore, the angel said unto Mary, "the Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall over shadow thee; therefore, also, that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God." And in another place, we read, "Before they came together she was found with child of the Holy Ghost." And again, "that which is conceived in her, is of the Holy Ghost." Language never used before, since the creation of the world, and never to be used again, upon any like occasion. And as the doctrine contained in it can never be comprehended, so the language ought never to be changed. This is that, which God would distinguish to the wonder of all ages. "Behold, a woman shall encompass," (i. e. by conception,) "a man." And again, "Behold, a virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel." If we take an evangelist as an interpreter of a prophet, all this was fulfilled in Christ. Matt. i. 21, 22. What an amazing display of condescension, of love and power in the Holy Ghost, was this! "So the whole essence of Christ's human nature was created in the same instant. Thus far the Scriptures go before us, and herein it is necessary to assert the forming of the soul and body of Christ by the Holy Ghost. The curious enquiries of School men, and others, are to be left unto themselves, or rather condemned in them. For what was farther in this *miraculous operation* of the Holy Ghost, seems purposely to be hid from us, in that expression, "The power of the Highest shall overshadow thee." Under the secret, glorious cover thereof, we may learn to adore that *holy work* here, which we hope to rejoice in, and bless God for, unto eternity."*

3. The Holy Spirit displayed his love to Christ, very soon after his birth, by bearing testimony that he was the promised Messiah. It was revealed unto Simeon by the Holy Ghost, that he should not see death,

before he had seen the Lord's Christ." Yea, it is said, "He came by the *Spirit* into the temple: and when the parents brought the child Jesus, to do for him after the custom of the law, then took he him in his arms, and blessed God, and said, Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, according to thy word: for mine eyes have seen thy salvation," (i. e. thy Saviour.) And that, at the mouth of two witnesses every thing might be established, "Anna the prophetess coming in, that instant, gave thanks likewise unto the Lord, and spake of him to all them that looked for redemption in Jerusalem." In fine, John must have been acquainted with Jesus, in his youth, their Mother's being so near relations. He must, doubtless, have heard of the strange things that took place at his own and the birth of Jesus Christ. Though he continued in the deserts, he could not have been ignorant of these things; but he professeth that the main testimony was given by the Holy Ghost: "I knew him not," saith he; that is, not fully, not free of all scruple; "but he that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining upon him, the same is he that shall baptize with the Holy Ghost; and I saw and bare record that this is the Son of God." This leads us to observe,

4. The Holy Spirit displayed his love to the Son at his baptism by giving him qualifications for discharging all the offices to which he was appointed. "He whom God sent speaks the words of God, for God gives not the Spirit by measure unto him." Thus we read that "When Jesus was baptised, and prayed, the heaven was opened, and the Holy Ghost descended in a bodily shape, like a dove upon him, and a voice came from heaven which said, Thou art my beloved Son; in thee I am well pleased." Thus Christ speaks of his ministerial qualifications: "The Spirit of the Lord," saith he, "is upon me, because he anointed me to preach the gospel." In the same manner he performed his miracles. "God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power, who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil, for God was with him." Nay, antecedent to this, he was led by the Spirit into the wilderness, to be tempted of the devil. Lastly, he performed the whole course of his obedience under the influence of the Holy Ghost. "The Spirit of the Lord rested upon him, the Spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord." Thus he did all those things that were pleasing to his Father.

5. The Holy Spirit displayed his power and love by supporting and comforting the Son in his sufferings, and at his death. "Through the eternal Spirit, he offered himself without spot to God." This does not exclude his divine nature, but supposeth it. "By himself he purged our sins." But it seems to be meant, principally, of the Holy Spirit; for all the actings upon his human nature are represented in scripture as being by him. If Christ had fainted in the day of adversity, his strength had been small—too small for him and us. But saith the Father, "I have put my Spirit upon him; he shall not fail nor be discouraged." And again, "Mine arm shall strengthen him." And, saith the Son himself, "The Lord God will help me; therefore I shall not be confounded." His faith in, and submission to the will of the Father, his love to men, his zeal, fortitude and hope, shone with most distinguished splendor on the cross. "He, for the joy that was set before him, (over against him) endured the cross, despising the shame;" because he knew he would soon ascend to his throne and his Father. Nay, in the hour of his distress, when "it pleased the Lord to bruise him"—when crying after a departed God, he expressed his entire confidence in him: "*My God, my God!* why hast thou forsaken me?" Under all his sufferings and desertions, his faith was

victorious. Thus he drew his last breath: "Father, into thy hands I commend my Spirit, and gave up the ghost."

6. The resurrection of Christ was another period when the Holy Spirit displayed his love and power to the Son. Then he was declared to be "the Son of God, with power, by the Spirit of holiness." Thus, we read of "the Spirit of him who raised up Jesus from the dead;" that this Spirit is to quicken us. He was put to death in the flesh, but "quickened by the Spirit."

7. Lastly: all the great and distinguished blessings which Christ conferred upon the disciples, after his resurrection, before he ascended up into heaven, were bestowed through the Holy Ghost. "He opened their understanding, that they might understand the scriptures:" he gave them a commission to "teach and baptize all nations." Thus it was through the Holy Ghost he gave them commandments. And they were not only convinced of the truth of the resurrection themselves, but taught to publish it for the benefit of others, that "repentance and remission of sins should be preached among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." We proceed,

Secondly, to contemplate *how* the Holy Spirit displays his love to men, by applying to them the great salvation. Here we shall first mention some very distinguished and wonderful acts of his love, to the apostles and others, very soon after Christ ascended up into heaven: secondly, show *how* his love is displayed in all succeeding generations, till the work of salvation be completed.

First, let us contemplate some of the signal displays of the Spirit's love to the apostles and others, soon after Christ ascended up into heaven.

(1.) He gave a more *clear revelation* of the mysteries of the gospel to the apostles, which they were to preach to others, as Christ himself had declared: "I have many things to say unto you, but you cannot bear them now: howbeit, when the Spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth. He shall glorify me, for he shall receive of mine, and shall show it unto you." He did not reveal any new truths which they never heard, but he brought *old truths* to their remembrance with new illumination. He more fully cleared up the character and work of the Saviour himself, as to the divinity of his person; his mission, as the long expected Messiah, who was promised should come into the world; the perfection of his work; that "he made peace by the blood of his cross;" that he had a full title to the reward; ascended up into heaven to possess it; and lastly, that "he shall appear the second time without sin, unto salvation, to be glorified in his saints, and admired in all them that believe."

Formerly, whenever he spake of his dying and leaving them, "sorrow filled their hearts: Peter rebuked him." When the time came on that he must be delivered up, they "all forsook him and fled." They could not endure the thoughts of the cross. "All of them were offended because of him that night: the shepherd was smitten, and the sheep of the flock scattered abroad." But *now* "the offence of the cross ceased."— Thus they spake of the justice and holiness of God, and the cruelty and wickedness of men, without any difficulty; as Peter did to the Jews, who were betrayers and murderers. "Him being delivered by the determinate counsel and fore-knowledge of God, ye have taken and by wicked hands have crucified and slain: whom God hath raised up, having loosed the pains of death, because it was not possible he should be holden of it." And, having given a short account of his humiliation and exaltation, concludes thus: "Therefore, let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made (declared) that same Jesus, whom

ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ." They join the two extremes of heaven and earth in their argument. "Who being in the form of God, and thought it not robbery to be equal with God, but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: And being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself and became obedient to death, even the death of the cross. Wherefore, God hath highly exalted him," (even raised him, above all parallel) "and given him a name which is above every name, that at (i. e. by faith *in*) the name of Jesus, 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 is Lord," (Jehovah) "to the glory of God the Father." They were no longer ashamed of his cross. Nay, saith Paul, "God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of Christ."

(2.) The Holy Spirit conferred upon the Apostles and others, many spiritual and supernatural gifts. When Christ was just going to leave the disciples, and go up, for good and all to the kingdom, he said unto them, "Behold I send the promise of my father upon you: but tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high." They did so, and the Holy Ghost came upon them. "That signifies, first, their authority to go abroad. Secondly, it imparts their capacity to go upon this great expedition. For as the Holy Ghost came upon them in the shape of cloven and flaming tongues, so that was an emblem, both that they should speak all languages, and that the word of the Lord in their mouths, would shine, and search and pierce like fire." Nor was this limited to the Apostles, for we read in another place: "While Peter spake, the Holy Ghost fell on them which heard the word, (Acts x. 44.) viz: Cornelius, and his friends, whom he had called together. (ver. 24.) But how did he fall on them? Peter himself explains it. (Chap. xi. 15.) "As on us at the beginning," (i. e. in a miraculous manner.) This was an accomplishment of what Christ had said, "These signs shall follow them that believe, in my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues," &c. Nay, in another place we read: "He that believeth on me, the works which I do, shall he do also, and greater works than these shall he do, because I go to my Father." Thus, "those that were laid upon beds and couches in the streets, were healed with the shadow of Peter passing by. And special miracles were wrought by the hands of Paul, so that from his body were brought unto the sickly, handkerchiefs or aprons, and the diseases departed from them and the evil spirits went out of them." The reason of these greater works done by the Apostles, was Christ's going to the Father, which made way for such an extraordinary pouring forth of the Spirit. And it is proper to observe, that this tended not so much for the reputation of their particular persons, as for the glory of Christ; for thus they proved the truth of the gospel, and then it had a free course and was glorified.

(3.) By the conversion of great multitudes. Three thousand, who concurred in the crucifixion of Christ were converted by means of one sermon. They soon increased to five thousand. And again, we read, that "multitudes," (myriads) "believed." The word of God grew and multiplied. At Samaria, when Philip preached the gospel to them, it is said "the people with *one accord* gave heed to the words which he spake," which is more surprising, because they had all given heed to Simon the Sorcerer before, "from the least to the greatest." Even in the days of the Apostles, there were "saints in Ceasar's household," and they were in all places of the Roman empire, long before it became Christian. And how was all this accomplished? The Apostle declares,

“ My speech and my preaching was in the demonstration of the Spirit, and of power.”

(4.) The Spirit qualified the Apostles to defend the gospel against all the arguments of the adversaries. It is very surprising that a few illiterate fishermen should be commissioned to go over the world, and confront the learning of all the places they came into by the success of the gospel. Saith Christ himself, “ ye shall be brought before kings and rulers for my name’s sake, and it shall turn to you for a testimony. Settle it therefore, in your hearts, not to meditate in your hearts, not to meditate before what ye shall answer, for I will give you a mouth and wisdom which all your adversaries shall not be able to gain say or resist.” This surprised the council at Jerusalem; “ They perceived the boldness of Peter and John, and seeing they were ignorant and unlearned men, they marvelled at it, and took knowledge of them that they had been with Jesus.” Stephen lost his life in the cause, but they could not resist the wisdom and the spirit by which he spake.” They were made ministers “ according to the grace of God, given to them by the effectual working of his power.”

(5.) Lastly, the Holy Spirit supported and comforted the Apostles and others, in all their sufferings for the gospel, and especially when sealing their testimony with their blood. Christ gave the disciples such warnings about their works, as would rather have prevented than persuaded them to engage in it. “ The time will come,” saith he, “ that he that kills you, will think he doth God service; and these things will they do unto you because they have not known the Father nor me.” Saith Paul, “ I think that God hath set forth us, the Apostles, as it were appointed unto death;” he protsets for his part, that “ he died daily.” Others “ endured a great fight of afflictions.” And yet, what meekness, patience and fortitude did they display, by “ the glorious Spirit of God resting upon them.” “ They took joyfully the spoiling of their goods: rejoiced in tribulation; and always triumphed in Christ Jesus. They “ approved themselves the ministers of God, in much patience, afflictions, necessities, distresses: in stripes, in imprisonments, in tumults.” For saith Paul, “ It is God who comforteth us in all our tribulations: And as our tribulations for Christ abound, our consolations by Christ much more abound.” He threw all his afflictions into future glory. “ If so be that we suffer with him, that we may be glorified together. For I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed.” Nay, saith he, “ It is my earnest expectasion, and my hope, that in nothing I shall be ashamed but with all boldness, as always, so now also Christ shall be magnified in my body, whether it be by life, or by death.” Then you see, they were not afraid of a violent death. And indeed the most of them were called to seal their faith in the gospel with their blood; which was the highest testimony that nature could give to what grace had taught: “ They overcame, by the blood of the Lamb, and the word of their testimony: no terror could drive them from it; by their fall they conquered—their dying was voluntary—they loved not their lives unto the death. There was something they loved better: as Paul wrote to the Phillians, “ yea, if I be offered upon the sacrifice and service of your faith, I joy and rejoice with you all. These long and severe sufferings did not grieve and tire him out: But when the time of his departure is at hand, he is ready to be offered up having fought a good fight, and finished his course; and kept the faith,” without which all rest had been impossible. This is well expressed by these lines of the Poet:

“ From whence but heaven could men unskill’d in arts,
In different ages born, in several parts,

Weave such agreeing thruth? or how, or why,
Should all conspire to cheat us with a lie?
Unask'd their pains, ungrateful their advice,
Starving their gain, and martyrdom their price."*

[To be concluded.]

ART. III. Pittsburg Convention.

Proceedings of the Pittsburg Convention, called by the Signers of the Act and Testimony, May 11th, 1835.

Resolved, unanimously, That the thanks of this convention be given to the trustees of the Second Presbyterian Church, and to the people of Pittsburg and its vicinity, for their kindness and hospitality, manifested to the members of this convention during its sittings.

Unanimously resolved, That the thanks of this house be given to those editors of religious papers, who, by giving publicity to the Act and Testimony, and other documents connected with the same, have contributed to the furtherance of the views of this convention, in reference to the much desired reform in the church.

The convention having endeavored to execute the trust confided to them, in the important particulars of memorializing the General Assembly, and provided for giving to their constituents a detail of their transactions, by the publication of all their minutes, unanimously adopted the following resolutions, viz :

1. That this convention are deeply impressed with the conviction, that the Act and Testimony prepared by some of the minority of the last General Assembly, in connection with other brethren, and since that time so extensively adopted, has been, under the smiles and blessing of God, of marked and extensive benefit to our beloved church.

2. That we recognize our obligations in the most lively gratitude to God, for the care of Providence in bringing together the members of this convention in health and safety, and in an especial manner, for uniting us together in the most harmonious accord, in all measures that have been discussed and adopted.

3. That the convention declare that after prayer and thanksgiving, its proceedings will be terminated, and that of course it will be considered finally dissolved.

In accordance with the foregoing resolutions, prayer and praise to God were offered, the apostolic benediction was pronounced, and the President declared the convention finally dissolved.

MEMORIAL

(AS ADOPTED BY THE CONVENTION.)

To the Reverend Moderator and General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, the Memorial and Petition of the undersigned Ministers and ruling Elders of said Church, most affectionately sheweth :

That, in the exercise of a common right, guaranteed by the God of nature to all his rational creatures upon earth, and fully set forth in the sacred scriptures as the birthright of every child of his covenant, we come—and we desire to come with the spirit of the meek and lowly Lamb of God—into the presence of this reverend body, as possessing the only adequate power to afford the relief we desire. We come to spread before you our grievances, and to ask the interposition of your authority for their redress.

With you we recognize the unity and universality of that church of the living Redeemer which he hath purchased with his own blood. "The

* Bradbury's Sermons on the Mystery of Godliness, p. 435.

visible church, which is universal, consists of all those throughout the world that profess the true religion, together with their children." "By one Spirit are we all baptised into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free, and have all been made to drink into one spirit."

With us you will doubtless agree, that this church universal is called out of the world, and constituted and organized by her divine Head into a household and family, under general laws and regulations imposed upon her by his own supreme authority. "Now, therefore, ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow citizens with the saints, and of the household of God"—"of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named." It is not left to the corrupt volition of men, whether they will or will not come into this family. On the contrary, they are laid under eternal obligations, by the voice of the Son of Man, calling them, in the sweet promises of the gospel, to life, and peace, and joy. Others innumerable are born members of his church, and it is not optional with them—they may not, if they choose, expatriate themselves from his blessed kingdom. On the contrary, the entire weight of their heavenly Father's authority lies upon them, and binds them to a faithful improvement and everlasting possession of their invaluable birthright.

Still, though the visible church universal is thus organized and constituted, yet, as it is physically impossible that all this church can act together; as it must be collected in various parts of the world into distinct bodies for purposes of worship, and the regulation of social, and, as it were, domestic relations; as the geographical divisions of the world, and the political distinctions which the providence of God has permitted to exist, imperiously call for social organizations of smaller numbers, we think it cannot be denied that in this restricted sense the church, or, to speak more precisely, the sections of the church, must necessarily be voluntary associations; that is, Christians are left to associate as they may choose into distinct bands for mutual convenience and christian communion. These distinct communities of believers may also voluntarily connect themselves together into larger bodies, according to the principles laid down in the scriptures and in the standards of the church, which this venerable body represents. Thus is this General Assembly constituted, and in this sense the Presbyterian church is a voluntary association. No man is at liberty to separate himself from the visible church, but any man may separate from this portion of it, and attach himself to another. On this principle of common right and common freedom, is the Presbyterian church founded, and therefore she declares that "every christian church or union, or association of particular churches, is entitled to declare the terms of admission into its *communion*, and the qualifications of its ministers and members, as well as the whole system of its internal government which Christ hath appointed. They think it necessary to make effectual provision that all who are admitted as teachers be sound in the faith."—(*Form of Government*, chap. i. 2, 5.)

Agreeably to these principles, the constitution of our church makes the Presbyteries the fountains of power: they create the General Assembly. To them is reserved, according to the scriptures, the power of ordination, installation, removal, and judging of ministers. The Presbytery only can confer ministerial authority; the Presbytery only can take it away. The Presbytery can refuse to ordain or to admit into their number any person whom they judge erroneous or scandalous. If this power does not exist in the Presbytery, your memorialists can see no principle of self-preservation in the body. If every Presbytery is bound to receive all who may present themselves and claim admission on the authority of credentials from a foreign body, or from another Presbytery, it is self-

evident that the defection of one Presbytery from the truth and purity of the gospel may involve the entire body in the same corruption. There is no conservative power. The very ends of Presbyterian existence, as laid down in our constitution, are defeated, and a wide door and effectual is thrown open for the introduction of whatever errors it may please the enemies of truth to send abroad among our churches. And here, Rev. fathers and brethren, is the

FIRST grievance over which we mourn.

The last General Assembly, by an act recorded in page 26 of their printed minutes, has denied this right to the Presbyteries, and by that denial has opened the flood-gates of error, which, if not soon stopped, must sweep away the fair fabric of our church's purity, and leave us to sorrow over the melancholy wreck of our Zion, without a willow on which to hang our harps. In behalf of the Presbyteries to which we respectively belong, and of all other true Presbyteries of our beloved church, we invoke a return to the genius of the constitution; a restoration of the right and power of self-preservation; a repeal of the obnoxious act, and a distinct recognition, by this Assembly, of the inalienable right, in every Presbytery, of examining every applicant for admission into their number, be his credentials what they may, and of rejecting him, provided they think his admission would endanger their own purity and peace.

2. Intimately connected with, and nearly allied to this, is our SECOND grievance, viz: an act of the last General Assembly, recorded in their minutes, page 26, whereby the right and propriety of a Presbytery's taking up and censuring a printed publication, irrespective of its author, is denied.

This act is more offensive, because it is contrary to the practice of former General Assemblies, and inconsistent with the principles of freedom guaranteed in the word of God, and the constitution of our church. The act in question, whilst it appears to your memorialists to extend this right to errorists, denies a correspondent right in a Presbytery. The abettor of false doctrine may freely divulge his opinions. Any private citizen of the commonwealth, or member of the church or Presbytery, may freely criticise and severely censure the errors of the published book, but a Presbytery has no rights of this kind. They may not lift the voice of warning; they must not wisper a censure upon the book: they can only try the man. The pestilential volume may send forth its poisonous infection among the flock, "over which the Holy Ghost hath made them overseers," and for whose purity and peace and salvation they are held accountable by the Chief Shepherd; but their Presbyterian hands are tied up. They dare not lift a finger: they can only bring charges against the author.

But, reverend fathers and brethren, if the author thus arraigned be artful, and disposed to give trouble, as history teaches us errorists are likely to be, who can tell how long he may perplex the court and defer the issue of his trial? Meanwhile, however, the leaven of false doctrine is working its way. The uncensured and uncensurable book is poisoning the minds of the people, and the Presbytery either cannot or will not apply the remedy. Your memorialists most respectfully and earnestly entreat a reversal of the obnoxious resolution referred to.

3. The THIRD item of grievance and petition which we beg leave to present, is at the same time an aggravation of the second, viz: the erection of church courts, especially Presbyteries and Synods, upon the principle of "elective affinity," so called by its primitive advocates; that is, having regard not to geographical limits—not to convenience for attendance of the members—not to the expedition of business, but to diversities

of doctrinal views and church policy in those elected to such bodies, from their brethren and from the standards of the church; to personal animosities and antipathies growing out of such diversities; and to the consequent enlargement of this alienated interest of sentiment and feeling.—Where a Presbytery and Synod of this description exist, it is easy to see how it aggravates the grievance just presented. If, agreeably to the injunction of the last General Assembly, some person does undertake the painful and unpleasant duty of preferring charges against the author of the book, can it be supposed that a Presbytery, to whom such author is bound by the very affinities of such doctrine, will cut the bonds of their own union, by condemning either the book or its author? And if they should so far forget themselves as to commit the suicidal act of condemning the very doctrines which constitute the principle of their affinity, will their Synod do the same? Will it turn recreant to the cause for which it was created?

Thus the Assembly must perceive, that every such prosecution before such body must, if issued at all, be finally issued in the Assembly; and so long as the General Assemblies of our church consent to the existence of such bodies, just so long do they pledge themselves to protect their action. We therefore have no hope of redress, but in a change of purpose and action in the supreme judicatory of our beloved church. You, brethren, and you only, can lay the axe at the root of this evil.

Let us take another view of this subject. Our *Book of Discipline* says, (Form of Government, chap. x. 2,) "A Presbytery consists of all the ministers and one ruling elder from each congregation within a certain district." But the acts of some late General Assemblies have practically contradicted this clause. It is not true, either of "the Presbytery of Philadelphia," or of "the [Assembly's] Second Presbytery of Philadelphia," or of "the Second [Synodical] Presbytery of Philadelphia," that it "consists of all the ministers and one ruling elder from each congregation within a certain district."

Besides, the natural, and your memorialists believe the inevitable consequence of this principle is, increased alienation, strife for numbers and preponderance, division of churches, disruption of harmony in congregations, the encouragement of dissatisfied spirits, and formation of parties, and all the miseries of violent party strife. Many of us do honestly believe that the practical effects have been schism in the body—real, substantial, melancholy schism—schism more complete than if different denominations had been at once constituted. The alienation is more perfect than that which exists between either of the bodies and any other denomination covering the same territory. Hence we do most earnestly entreat this Assembly—for the purity of Zion, and the peace of the church—we pray for a reversal of the principle, and all the acts springing from it, and a restoration of the Synod created thereby to their former ecclesiastical position.

Nearly allied to this is our FOURTH item of grievance, viz: the existence and operation, within our church, of a Missionary Society in no sense amenable to her ecclesiastical jurisdiction. And here you will bear with us, first, in pointing out the connection with the preceding. If Presbyteries do exist, on the avowed principle of diversity in doctrinal opinion and feeling, and have the power of licensing and ordaining (in many instances *sine titulo*) men of their own creeds, then a missionary institution seems requisite to send such licentiates and ministers into the field. Such an institution does exist, bound by its own rules to sustain missionaries, irrespective of their adherence to, or rejection of, the doctrinal standards of our church. This institution operates largely in our congregations; first, by sweeping away from our own board the funds

which, by the laws of all social order, ought to come into the treasury of the body to which its possessors belong; and, *secondly*, by throwing into our Presbyteries brethren who, in many instances, have never adopted the standards of our church at all, and in more, who have only adopted them "for substance of doctrine;" that is, just as much of them as suits their own views. Thus a separate moneyed interest is created and kept up in the bosom of the same christian community. The Assembly's own Board of Missions, created by herself, governed by herself, and amenable to herself, finds a great and powerful rival in her own house, with whom she comes in perpetual collision. And rival agents meet on the same field, and frequently those of our own church are foiled in their efforts by the improper interference and influence of an institution which owns no allegiance to us, and feels no obligations to our courts. So violent were these contentions, that the Assembly of 1831 recommended a *convention* to be held in Cincinnati to adjust the difficulties. This convention was held: it decided in favor of the church's carrying on her own missions by her own board. Still, however, the foreign society kept the field, and continues to this hour to conflict with your board.

Now, fathers and brethren, these things afflict us exceedingly. We are pained to see such an inveterate warfare carried on so long. And we are unspeakably distressed to be constrained to view this as a part of a great system of operations whose tendency is to subvert the foundations of our Zion. The evidence of such a system forces itself upon us. We cannot shut our eyes against it if we would, and we would not if we could. Painful as the vision is, we are determined to behold it steadfastly; and we crave the attention of this venerable body to the same.—Look, we pray you, to the facts. A large moneyed institution—(for that is a large moneyed institution which has a large income, from whatever source)—a large moneyed institution, over which neither you as an Assembly, nor the Presbyteries which give you an annual existence, nor the Synods intermediate, have any control, has subsidised almost your whole western territory. "A gift blindeth the eyes." Can a minister, or an elder, whose congregation is supported in a large degree by a power foreign to your church, free himself utterly from foreign influence? Vain is the hope! Human nature is not thus constituted. Without impeaching the honesty and the honor of persons thus situated, we feel confident that an influence great and effectual must rest in the hands that dispense this bounty.

But let the church be her own almoner, and every time her hand is opened to her sons and her daughters, she binds them the more closely to her interests. Her constitution, whose legitimate operations produce these happy results, becomes the rallying point of recoiling gratitude,—and, instead of jarring and contention without end, union in the truth and peace, as its blessed effect, must fill our Zion with joy and gladness. We pray this General Assembly to sustain her own Board of Missions, by solemnly enjoining upon all the churches to contribute to its funds, and by rescinding the resolutions formerly passed, which recommended to their patronage the Home Missionary Society.

5. Your attention is now invited to another part of the same system. Before youth looking forward to the gospel ministry can be properly licensed and sent forth, they must be educated; and efforts have been already made in this cause worthy of high commendation. Nor have we any thing to object against efforts either to prepare or to send men to preach to the destitute at home or abroad. Both these causes we desire to see prospering. For both we have labored and prayed, and for both we will continue to labor and pray. But then we desire to see them prospering consistently with regard to the truth and purity and integrity

of our own church. The great burden of ministerial duty is to enlighten and save the world; and no obligation more sacred and solemn lies upon them, than that of training the heralds of the cross who are to bear the banner of her faith in triumph round the world. Let the church give good heed to this great concern, and the work of salvation will go on; let her neglect this, or do it in a careless manner, and the wheels of the gospel chariot must move heavily—stop—perhaps retrograde.

Now the question before us is, to whom shall this most sacred and solemn duty be entrusted by the church? Shall she do it herself, with her own hands? or shall she throw it into the hands of a body, self-created, and in no sense amenable to her ecclesiastical tribunals?—a body which may change in half a generation, and train her sons to her own destruction? This is the question we would press upon your consideration; and we would most respectfully suggest, that no church can be safe in her doctrinal standards—safe in her ecclesiastical polity—safe in her financial operations—safe in the independence of her ministry, if that ministry are dependent upon an independent foreign body; and especially if their houses and lands, their libraries and furniture, are under bonds. Without any impeachment of motives, or imputation of extraordinary weakness, we beg leave to repeat, “a gift blindeth the eyes,” and to refer to the course of remark under the preceding item.

Similar collisions occur here also. Your agents are met in the field by the agents of a society beyond your control. They are often beaten off the ground, and the six or seven hundred young men under the care of your Board of Education are reduced to a precarious dependence: whereas, did the church, in her highest ecclesiastical court, stand forth in her own defence, her treasury would overflow, and all these collisions and conflicts of varied interests would cease; whilst her own funds would go to her own sons, and not to their prejudice, for the maintenance of those in other churches, who are never expected to aid in building up the walls of our Zion. We pray and beseech this reverend body to sustain by all the weight of its influence, the education cause of our own church.

6. In the apprehension of your memorialists, not a small proportion of the evils which distract our Zion have grown and do still grow out of “the plan of union” adopted in 1801. We say nothing here of the wisdom of that measure at the time, nor of its constitutionality. We know it was the work of wise and good men. But we must be allowed to express the opinion, that *now* it leads to alienation, contentions and disorders. For proof of this we have only to refer to the minutes of preceding General Assemblies. It is notorious that very painful conflicts have occurred in the Assembly on this very subject. Brethren had long occupied seats in this body, who were not ruling elders, and never had been Presbyterians, and, it is believed, never intended to become Presbyterians. Nor was this evil remedied without a long and arduous and painful struggle. Under the perfect conviction that peace will never dwell with us whilst the jarring elements of this discord exist together, we beseech this Assembly to annul that act; and for the simple additional reason that the terms of compact are not complied with by our congregational brethren.

In proof of this we allege that “the plan of union” contemplates the existence of a Congregational Association and of a Presbytery on the same ground; whereas we apprehend the facts generally to be otherwise. The Association retains its essential character as such, but is called a Presbytery. Congregational ministers change simply the name, without ever adopting sincerely the Confession of Faith of this church. So far from such adoption, the Presbyteries of Grand River and Portage on May 1, 1822, adopted a confession of faith for their own churches.

And although a subsequent General Assembly ordered the formula of questions in our Book to be propounded to all the members of these Presbyteries, yet your memorialists have reason to believe that in some instances they were not answered affirmatively at all, and in others with express reservations.

Again: that plan of union provides that every mixed congregation shall appoint a standing committee; "And provided that the said standing committee of any church shall depute one of themselves to attend the Presbytery, he may have the same right to sit and act in the Presbytery as a ruling elder of the Presbyterian church." Yet we have reason to believe that members of churches often sit in Presbytery, who are neither ruling elders nor committee men; and we know such have occupied seats in the General Assembly. This is an open infraction of the "Plan of Union." Hence we can perceive no obligation binding the Assembly to adhere to a conventional agreement that is practically violated by the other party, and we pray that it may be formally annulled.

7. Our next grievance is of a similar character, viz: the plan of union and correspondence with the Congregational Associations of New England, and with other churches. It is true, that the relinquishment of the right of voting in the General Assembly has removed part of the evil.—No longer now can our constitutional order be voted down by brethren opposed to it in profession and principle. Still, however, against this union there are serious objections.

It gives weight in counsel and debate, which may command votes, to persons who belong not to our society, and who may have a sectarian purpose to answer by taking a particular side. Such things some of us have seen on the floor of the Assembly.

Besides, the whole matter is unconstitutional. The General Assembly never had the power of granting a seat in this house to any person.—(Form of Government, chap. xii. 2.) "The General Assembly shall consist of an equal delegation of bishops and elders from each Presbytery." Nor does our constitution recognize any other mode of acquiring a right to a seat here. This is a delegated—it is a representative body, and in the very nature of a delegation, unless the delegates are *expressly* empowered to delegate others, they *have* no such power. Our constitution knows no such anomaly as representatives transferring the power of representation to others.

We humbly conceive that our Book, (chap. xii. 5,) in conceding to the Assembly the power of "corresponding with foreign churches, on such terms as may be agreed upon by the Assembly and the corresponding body," does not contemplate the violation of the fundamental principle quoted in the preceding paragraph, by granting seats in this house to persons not delegated by any Presbytery; for, if the Assembly have the power of conferring a right to deliberate and vote, it may be so exercised as to bring the church under foreign dominion. Against all this the constitution presents an insuperable barrier, in the 6th section of this chapter, where the Presbyteries reserve to themselves the exclusive power of establishing any constitutional rule. Every regulation affecting constitutional principles must be referred to the Presbyteries, and be by a majority of them adopted, before they can be admitted as binding. This, in reference to the "Plan of Union," has never been done. Now, clearly, this power of granting seats in the Assembly vitally affects the constitution, which ought not to be sacrificed either to expediency or courtesy.

Hence, with all due respect and affection to the good brethren of other denominations, we pray this General Assembly to restore the constitution, by repealing the act which assumes this stretch of power.

8. Finally, as the object of all ecclesiastical order is *truth*, in the belief, love and practice of it; and as to the General Assembly also belongs the power of bearing testimony against error in doctrine, your memorialists would humbly call your attention to the present state of the church in this behalf. There is nothing worth contending for but truth; and, if we are not greatly mistaken, great and fearful inroads are made on the doctrinal standards of our church—and that too, not in reference to matters of minor consequence, but in the very fundamental principles of the gospel.

One alarming feature of the errors against which we would earnestly entreat this General Assembly to lift up a strong testimony, we beg leave to present. It is their systematic arrangement. Did a solitary individual here and there, in cases few and far between, touch upon a single insular position that is false, and maintain it even with pertinacity, it would not afford ground of serious alarm. But the case is far otherwise. The errors abroad in the church are fundamental, vital and systematic. The maintenance of one involves the whole, and must lead a logical mind to embrace the system. Now the system appears to your memorialists to lead directly towards Socinianism. This language may seem harsh and severe. Alas! dear brethren! it is the harshness of love and the severity of truth. It is not pleasant for us to entertain such an opinion, but with our eyes and our ears open, it is impossible to avoid it. The evidence rushes upon us from the pulpit and the press, and we have no power of resistance. That which the understanding clearly perceives, the mind, with its fondest desires to the contrary, must believe. It is painful for the convicted sinner to believe that his soul is exposed to the wrath divine: it is painful for us to believe that our brethren are departing from the foundations of gospel truth. But a dark hour there often is before the bright dawn of heaven's cheering light upon the soul benighted; may we hope from the action of this venerable body a return to the pure light of the scripture truth, and a strong testimony against the errors that overturn our constitutional standards?

Another alarming feature is the boldness and pertinacity with which the very existence of these errors is denied. To this general Assembly it would not be information, were we to state, that the same system of error has been characterised by the same wily policy in every age of its appearance in the church. It has ever been its course at first to deny its own existence, and when that was no longer practicable, to assume a mask, and clothe itself with zeal as a cloak. This strong feature of the modern, singularly identifies it with the ancient heresy.

It is not our purpose at present to go into a *discussion* of these doctrines, nor yet to adduce proof of their existence in our church. The evidence of this is as clear as the evidence of your existence in this house to-day. The teeming press and the groaning pulpit proclaim it. It may be proper simply to present an outline of the system. Thus:

1. *The doctrine of Adam's federal headship, or representative character, is denied.*
2. *The doctrine of original sin is denied.*
3. *The doctrine of the imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity is denied.*

The rejection of these necessarily leads to

4. *A denial of the doctrine of Christ's federal headship, or representative character.*
5. *A denial of the imputation of his righteousness to the believer, as the essential procuring cause of his justification.*
6. *A rejection of the true, proper, vicarious nature of the atonement of*

Christ; and holds up his sufferings, his tears and groans and anguish and death, as a mere exhibition—a show unmeaning, for a purpose not in accordance with revealed truth.

Thus the daughter of Zion searches in vain in the luxuriant garden of these errors for the beloved of her soul, and in the anguish of her disappointment exclaims, "They have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid him."

But these errors do not terminate in simple negation. Another system is substituted in the room of the gospel thus rejected: it is the system of human perfectibility. Thus:

1. *The doctrine of human ability is held, involving the principle, and gratuitously assuming it as true, that man's moral obligations are measured and bounded by his present ability to meet all the requirements of God's law.*

2. *Accordingly, the necessity of the agency, the omnipotent agency of the Spirit of God in the conversion of the soul, is denied, and conversion is affirmed to be the work of the creature. Man regenerates his own soul—the Spirit's agency is that of mere moral suasion. Regeneration is simply an act of the mind—the first in the series of holy acts. Faith is an act of the mind, and nothing but an act of the mind.*

Now, reverend fathers and brethren, we humbly conceive that this is another gospel, entirely and essentially different from that laid down in the Bible and our Confession of Faith. And we do most solemnly and sorrowfully believe, that unless the Spirit of the Lord raise up a standard against it, it will be followed in our church, as it has been elsewhere, by the entire system of Pelagianism, and ultimately of Socinianism. If the atonement is not essentially vicarious and penal, why demand a *divine* Redeemer? If an *exhibition* is all that is required, why not hold up Stephen, or Peter, or Paul, or John Huss, or John Rogers? This tendency towards Socinianism we think is plainly manifested in the denial of the eternal filiation of the Son of God.

Again: if the Spirit's work is merely a moral suasion, why a Divine and Almighty Spirit? Must not the mind which denies the necessity of an omnipotent influence be strongly tempted to disbelieve the existence of an omnipotent agent?

That we are not mistaken in our opinion of the tendency of these doctrines, we think is proved by the fact that the Unitarians do claim affinity with them, and express their unfeigned satisfaction at the prospect of a rapid increase of liberal principles.

And now, dear brethren, we approach the termination of this long memorial. We have, perhaps, been tedious. It is because our heart is full of sorrow; and sorrow finds a momentary relief in pouring forth even unavailing complaints. But ours is not a hopeless sorrow. We believe that Jesus died and rose again, and we know that his truth, though borne away, insulted and forlorn, into the dark shades of a vain, metaphysical philosophy, will yet break forth, and dispel the gloom by which we are surrounded, and send through our hearts and our churches the light of life and the consolations of love.

In pressing our petition for redress of all the grievances we have enumerated, and such others in regard to measures as the wisdom of this General Assembly may select, we entreat you to turn your eye upon the aspect of the world. Lo! what an inviting field for benevolent enterprise! And is there a body of believers in the whole church militant, invested with so many qualifications to enter it, and gather the rich harvest of glory to our divine Redeemer, as the Presbyterian church? The position of our country points us out—the position of our church points

us out—the position of the world points us out—the voice of unborn and unsanctified millions calls us to the conflict—the Lord of hosts himself has gone down into the plain before us, and chides our long delay. Now we ask, brethren, what causes this delay? Why, when the armies of the living God begin to consolidate, and himself gives the watch word, “*Truth and Victory*”—oh! why this delay? Ah! there is division in the camp! “There be some that trouble us.” *Innovation* distracts our councils, alienates our affections, turns the sword of brother in upon brother, and the Master’s work remains undone. Do you ask how shall the evil be remedied? We reply, let this Assembly come up to the work of reform; let them establish the ancient landmarks of truth; let them unfurl the banner of the constitution; let all who cannot fight under this, grasp the standard that suits their own views—put on their own approved armor—descend into the plain, and stand or fall to their own master. We pledge ourselves in the face of high heaven, the real Presbyterian church will not shrink from the conflict; and though our earthen pitchers may be broken, our lights shall shine, and “the sword of the Lord and of Gideon” shall turn the eye of a gazing world to that point of the field where victory perches on the banner of truth.

Venerable fathers and brethren, we are done. With you and God and Christ and his Spirit we leave our cause. That he may direct all your counsels in this behalf to his own glory and the church’s good, is the sincere prayer of your humble memorialists.

Pittsburg, May 20, 1835.

ART. IV. *Vindication of the Principles of the Church of Scotland, in relation to Questions presently agitated: An Address by the Associate Synod of Original Seceders.*

(Concluded from page 26.)

No argument, we conceive, could be more unsound—no concession more unhappy at the present juncture, than that patronage is essential to an establishment. To contend that the members of an established church must forever submit to be deprived of the privilege of electing their own pastors, a privilege which the smallest sect in the country enjoys, and would on no account abdicate, is the sorest stroke which has yet been inflicted on establishments, which indeed would justly deserve all the odium they have incurred, if they necessarily required such a dishonorable compromise of ecclesiastical freedom. But it is a fallacy to imagine that the church is bound to relinquish the power of nominating to her benefices, as an equivalent for the support and countenance which she derives from the State. No such equivalent is expected in the case of a friendly alliance between two independent powers, even although blood and treasure may have been expended in maintaining it. The proper way in which the State is remunerated for its external support, is by the benefit which society receives from the moral and religious influence of the church, and not by robbing her of her spiritual privileges, which may convert her into a political engine to serve the purposes of State empirics, but can never (and now much less than ever) render her an effective instrument in promoting the public good. Neither the ancient kings of Israel, nor the early Christians who richly endowed the church in the apostolic

age, nor some of the most munificent princes at a later period, ever claimed such a compensation from the church. Twice did the government and patrons of Scotland formally restore to the church her liberties, and as often was she despoiled of them by an arbitrary and Jacobitish administration. Our present rulers, above all that have preceded them, have the least show of reason for continuing to exact such a sacrifice on the part of the church. They have extended the political privileges of the people, in the way of abolishing, without pity or remuneration, all civic and individual monopoly of elective power, and they cannot, without the most glaring inconsistency, refuse to restore to the church those ecclesiastical privileges of which she has been violently or fraudulently denuded, even though it should be at the expense of nullifying the illicit and simoniacal contracts on which the rights of patronage were originally founded. Let them not with one hand profess to support the church, while with the other they strip her of that sacred liberty wherewith Christ has made her free; thus committing an act of greater impolicy and sacrilege than if they had alienated all the temporalities of the church and dismantled a thousand bishoprics. But whatever blame may attach to our civil rulers in this matter, it is the General Assembly which has pronounced the sentence, that the yoke of patronage shall continue to be wreathed about the neck of the christian people of Scotland; and we are sorry to be obliged to add that no small share of the responsibility of that deed lies on those ministers and elders who are usually called orthodox and popular.

But we protest against patronage, not only as inimical to the independence of the church in general, by depriving her of a right belonging to every free society, but also as opposed to the rights of the christian people, as such, to be consulted in the choice of their ecclesiastical teachers and rulers. So great respect is every where in scripture shown to the choice of the people, that under the Old Testament, their formal consent was required to establish a relation between them and those rulers who had been selected for office by God himself. The spiritual privilege of choosing their own pastors and elders, which differs entirely from the political right of the individual to choose his religious profession, belongs, by divine grant, to the christian people, as forming an integral part of the church diffusive. And it is quite compatible with the judicial powers of the church courts, whose office it is to pass both an initiative and definitive judgment on the ministerial qualifications of the persons chosen.

From the principles now laid down, and the statements made, it must be obvious, that this Synod have no prospect of an immediate return to the communion of the Established church. They still view this as a happy and desirable consummation, which, in all their contentings, they would not wish to lose sight of. Nay, we hold ourselves bound in duty, according to the terms of the Protestation and Appeal made by our fathers, to "the first free, faithful and reforming General Assembly of the Church of Scotland," to return to her fellowship, as soon as such an Assembly has taken up that appeal, and answered it in the way of removing the grounds of our secession.* Meanwhile, a sense of the obligations under which we lie, from the word of God, and the solemn engagements we have contracted, requires us to remain in a state of separation; and, by doing so, we are persuaded we shall contribute more to advance the real interests of the Church of Scotland—more to accelerate her reformation—and more to bring about such a union with her as shall be creditable to truth, than by hastily, and on the first appearance of a change of measures, rushing into her arms, and merging our present joint

* See Appendix, No. II.

and judicial testimony in any personal liberty we might enjoy, in common with those of opposite principles, within the bosom of the Establishment. Much, however, may be done within a short time, under the influences of the Spirit, for removing our present grounds of secession. To those in the national church who are honestly desirous to see this accomplished, and are using means to bring it about, we wish all success in the Lord. Whatever may be the feelings of others, they, at least, will not take offence at our endeavoring to exonerate our consciences, by performing what has been to us no pleasing task. We shall only say farther, that they cannot expect the blessing of heaven on the measures of a carnal, timid and compromising policy; and we trust that no fears of danger, from any quarter, will induce them to make a common cause with the enemies of Presbytery, or to form any coalition which will lay additional bars in the way of their prosecuting reformation, and removing from the church whatever dishonors Christ, grieves his friends, or causes scandal to the world. Never was admonition more seasonable, than that which God gave of old to the people of Judah is at the present time: "Say ye not, A confederacy! to all to whom this people shall say, A confederacy! neither fear ye their fear, nor be afraid. Sanctify the Lord of Hosts himself, and let Him be your fear, and let Him be your dread; and he will be for a sanctuary."

To the professed friends of the covenanted cause in other denominations, we would earnestly repeat the call which we formerly gave, to consider the necessity of union and co-operation in its defence at the present crisis. This assuredly is not the time when either the pride of party or the recollection of past offences ought to be allowed to defeat attempts at conciliation, and stand in the way of the pleasure, the advantage, and the duty of contending, under one banner, for the faith once delivered to the saints. Let the sad consequences of misunderstanding among the friends of this cause in former times of peril, warn us to avoid similar conduct, and excite us to repair, instead of seeking to perpetuate, the breaches which they have occasioned. United exertions are required to maintain a faithful testimony in a state of separation, and united wisdom will be useful in dealing with the judicatories of the Establishment, if Providence should at any future period prepare the way for direct intercourse with them. When the enemies of the Reformation are strengthening themselves by combination, it ill becomes its friends to weaken each other's hands by remaining separate, especially when they have in the cause which they espouse such a well defined ground, and in the solemn engagements, whose obligation they agree in owning, such a sacred pledge of union. How can the friends of "the covenanted uniformity" expect the generation to appreciate that desirable object, while they themselves set an example of disunion, and encourage a spirit of sectarian independence of each other? "Come, and let us join ourselves to the Lord in a perpetual covenant that shall not be forgotten."

APPENDIX, No. II.

What ought to be accounted "a free, faithful and reforming General Assembly?" and does the late Assembly come up to this character so far as to warrant Seceders in taking steps toward a union with the Established Church of Scotland? are questions very interesting at the present juncture. With all tenderness to such a delicate subject, it may be safely stated that the above expressions, as used by the fathers of the Secession, and as explained by their future conduct, were descriptive, not of an Assembly which would be merely willing to re-admit them to communion in the way of allowing them ministerial liberty to testify against defections and abuses, (for this was materially done by the General As-

sembly of 1734,) but such an Assembly as should evince a decided disposition to correct the evils complained of, and to return to her reformed principles and practice. There is, too, an obvious difference between making a separation from a church, and returning to her communion after it has been made. The solemn responsibility which attaches to the former, so long as it can possibly be avoided with a good conscience, might perhaps have induced the first seceding ministers to continue in the church, had they not been forced to a determination by the tyrannical procedure of the judicatories; but it by no means follows that the mere relaxation of arbitrary authority would have warranted them to return. Various improvements also may take place in a church—(witness the present state of the Irish Establishment)—and yet we would hesitate to call her a reforming church. Persons may hail, with thankfulness to God, these improvements, and yet resolve, before moving from their ground, to see such symptoms issuing in some decided measures of general reformation.

By the late enactment in regard to patronage, even though it should prove successful, no assurance has been given, even to the satisfaction of many members of the Establishment, much less to that of those who have left her pale, of a disposition to return to those principles which were once the glory of the Church of Scotland. That church, in her purer times, maintained a judicial testimony against patronage itself, as well as its attendant evils—a testimony which the Secession took up, and which it was enabled, from its separate standing, to carry out in practice by granting to the people their ancient rights, of which patronage had deprived them. This part of the church's testimony, however, has not only been dropped since the Secession, but was formally condemned by a decision of the last General Assembly.

In these circumstances, it cannot be expected by the reflecting portion of the national church, that Seceders, with their declared sentiments on this point, could regard that Assembly either as "faithful or reforming," or that they would be warranted, even in the present critical state of the Establishment, to compromise their profession, by acknowledging it in that character. By doing this, they would forfeit the pledge they have given to the people of Scotland to grant them relief, when required, from the effect of patronage, and the notorious want of evangelical preaching in many parts of the country.

The reader who wishes farther information on these questions, may consult "Reasons why they have not acceded to the Judicatories of the Established church," published in 1735, by the four seceding ministers. In that pamphlet, among other things, which, if done, "might" give them "the comfortable prospect of a pleasant and desirable unity," they require that "the the acceptance of presentations should be declared contrary to the principles of this church; and an act passed against any settlement, in time coming, without the call and consent of the majority of the congregation, who are admitted to full communion with the church in all her sealing ordinances."

ART. V. *Psalmody in New-England.*

I know not where, better than here, to insert that article of our church history, which concerns our metrical translation of the psalms now sung in our churches.

About the year 1689, the New English reformers, considering that the

churches enjoyed the other ordinances of heaven in their scriptural purity, were willing that the ordinance of the singing of psalms should be restored among them, unto a share in that purity. Though they blessed God for the religious endeavors of them who translated the Psalms into the metre usually annexed at the end of the Bible, yet they beheld in the translation so many detractions from, additions to, and variations of, not only the text, but the very *sense* of the psalmist, that it was an offence unto them. Resolving, then, upon a new translation, the chief divines in the country took each of them a portion to be translated,—among whom were Mr. Welds and Mr. Eliot, of Roxbury, and Mr. Mather, of Dorchester. These, like the rest, were of so different a genius for their poetry, that Mr. Shepard, of Cambridge, on the occasion addressed them to this purpose.

You Roxbury poets, keep clear of the crime
Of missing to give us very good rhyme :
And you of Dorchester, your verses lengthen,
And with the text's own words you will them strengthen.

The Psalms, thus turned into metre, were printed at Cambridge in the year 1640. But afterwards, it was thought that a little more of art was to be employed upon them; and for that cause they were committed unto Mr. Dunster, who revised and refined this translation, and, (with some assistance from one Mr. Richard Lyon, who, being sent over by Sir Henry Midmay, as an attendant unto his son, then a student in Harvard College, now resided in Mr. Dunster's house :) he brought it into the condition wherein our churches ever since have used it.

Now, though I heartily join with those gentlemen who wish that the *poetry* hereof were mended, yet I must confess, that the Psalms have never yet seen a translation, that I know of, nearer to the Hebrew original; and I am willing to receive the excuse that our translators themselves do offer us, when they say: If the verses are not always so elegant as some desire or expect, let them consider that God's altar needs not our polishings. We have respected rather a plain translation, than to smooth our verses with the sweetness of any paraphrase. We have attended conscience rather than elegance—fidelity rather than ingenuity; that so we may sing in Zion the Lord's songs of praise, according unto his own will, until he bid us enter into our Master's joy, to sing eternal hallelujahs.

Reader, when the Reformation in France began, Clement Marot and Theodore Beza turned the Psalms into French metre, and Lewis Gaudimel set melodious tunes unto them—the singing hereof charmed the souls of court and city, town and country. They were sung in the Louvre itself, as well as in the Protestant churches: ladies, nobles, princes—yea, king Henry himself sang them. This one thing mightily contributed unto the downfall of popery, and the progress of the gospel. All ranks of men practised it: a gentleman of the reformed religion would not eat a meal without it. The popish clergy raging hereat, the cardinal of Lorrain got the profane and obscene odes of the pagan poets to be turned into French and sang at the courts, and the divine Psalms were thus banished from that wicked court.

Behold, the reformation pursued by the churches of New-England, by the Psalms in a new metre: God grant the reformation may never be lost, while the Psalms are sung in our churches.

But in this matter, Mr. Dunster is to be acknowledged. And if, unto the Christian, while singing of Psalms on earth, Chrysostom could well

say, Μετ' ἄγγελων ἁδείς, μετ' ἀγγέλων ὑμνεῖς, *Thou art in a consort with angels!* how much more may that *now* be said of our Dunster!—*Mather's Magnalia.*

The above extract is from the Ecclesiastical History of New-England, by Cotton Mather, and exhibits the views of the first settlers of New-England respecting the psalmody of scripture. Imitations and paraphrases were not in so high repute at that time as at the present. We should esteem it a privilege to see the version of the Psalms here spoken of.

ART. VI. *The General Assembly.*

The readers of the Monitor will doubtless feel anxious to learn the fate of the Memorial, which we have published in some of the preceding pages of the present No., as the result of the late Presbyterian convention which met at Pittsburg, pursuant to a recommendation contained in the "Act and Testimony." The following are the Preamble and Resolutions which were adopted by the General Assembly in reference to said Memorial. And from these it will be clearly seen, that although the Act and Testimony, from its very beginning, has, by its enemies, (and, may we not say the enemies of the truth?) been ridiculed, caricatured, and most unjustly condemned, it has nevertheless, so far, resulted in great, and we trust lasting good to that branch of the visible church.

The Committee to whom was referred the Memorial and Petition of a number of Ministers of the Presbyterian church, and Ruling Elders, &c., report :

That they have endeavored to deliberate on the said Memorial and Petition, and the other papers committed to them, with all that respect which the character of those from whom they come could not fail to inspire, and with all the calmness, impartiality and solemnity which the deep importance of the subjects on which they have addressed the Assembly so manifestly demands.

In approaching the consideration of these weighty subjects, the committee deem it to be an obvious duty to exclude from their view all those principles which result from the wishes or plans of different parties in the church, and to take for their guide simply the word of God, which we consider the only infallible rule of faith and practice ; and those public formularies by which we have solemnly agreed and stipulated with each other, to be governed in all our proceedings. The moment we depart from these, we are not only exposed to all the evils of discord, but also run the risk of destroying those bonds of union by which we have been so long bound together as an ecclesiastical body. There is certainly no portion of the visible church, in which a harmonious accordance with the same adopted formularies, and a uniform submission to the same rules of truth and order are so essential to the maintenance of ecclesiastical peace, and to cordial co-operation in promoting those great purposes for which the church was founded by her King and Head, as among the churches of our denomination. The committee indeed by no means expect, and do not suppose that the Assembly would think of enforcing that perfect agreement in views in every minute particular, which, in a body so extended as the Presbyterian church, has perhaps never been realized ; but that an entire and cordial agreement in all the radical principles of that system of truth and order, which is taught in the holy scriptures, which is embodied in our Confession of Faith and Form of Government, and which every minister and elder of the Presbyterian church has solemnly subscribed and promised to maintain, may not only be reasonably expected, but must be as far as possible secured, if we would maintain "the unity of the Spirit," in the bonds of peace and love,—it is presumed the General Assembly will be unanimous in pronouncing. If this be not so, it is in vain that we assemble from year to year—in vain that we hope for intercourse either pleasant or edifying. Our judicatories must be scenes of discord and conflict, and the ties which bind the several parts of our extended body to each other can scarcely fail of being ties of strife and contention.

Under convictions which these general principles are adapted to impress, the committee most deeply feel the importance of some of the conclusions to which they are

constrained to come; and although some of these conclusions are at variance with several acts of the last General Assembly, yet they cannot doubt that they make an essential part of the Presbyterian system, and of course cannot be abandoned without seriously endangering both the comfort and safety of our beloved church.

The committee, therefore, as the result of their deliberations on the documents committed to them, would most respectfully recommend to the Assembly the adoption of the following resolutions, viz:

1. Resolved, That in the judgment of this General Assembly it is the right of every Presbytery to be entirely satisfied of the soundness in the faith and the good character in every respect of those ministers who apply to be admitted into the Presbytery as members, and who bring testimonials of good standing from sister Presbyteries or from foreign bodies, with whom the Presbyterian church is in correspondence. And if there be any reasonable doubt respecting the proper qualification of such candidates, notwithstanding their testimonials, it is the right, and may be the duty of such a Presbytery to examine them, or to take such other methods of being satisfied in regard to their suitable character as may be judged proper; and if such satisfaction be not obtained, to decline receiving them. In such case, it shall be the duty of the Presbytery rejecting the applicant, to make known what it has done to the Presbytery from which he came, with its reasons—it being always understood that each Presbytery is, in this concern as in all others, responsible for its acts to the higher judicatories.

2. Resolved, That in the judgment of this General Assembly, it is the right, and may be the duty of any judicatory of our church to take up, and if it see cause, to bear testimony against any printed publications which may be circulating within its bounds, and which in the judgment of that judicatory may be adapted to inculcate injurious opinions, and this, whether the author be living or dead—whether he be in the communion of our church or not—whether he be a member of the judicatory expressing the opinion, or of some other. A judicatory may be solemnly called upon to warn the churches under its care, and especially the rising generation, against an erroneous book, while the author may not be within their bounds, or immediately responsible at their bar; and while, even if he were thus responsible and within their reach, they might not think it necessary to arraign him as a heretic. To deny our judicatories, as guardians of the churches, this right, would be to deny them one of the most precious and powerful means of bearing testimony against dangerous sentiments, and guarding the children of the church against “that instruction which causeth to err.” The writer of such a book may reside at a distance from the neighborhood in which his work is circulating and supposed to be doing mischief, or he may be so situated that even if it be proper to commence process against them, it may not be possible to commence, or at any rate to issue the process within a number of months. In the mean while, if the right in question be denied, this book may be scattering poison, without the possibility of sending forth an effectual antidote. Indeed, it may be indispensably necessary, in cases which may be easily imagined, to send out such a warning, even though the author of the work were fully acquitted from the charge of heresy.

3. Resolved, that the erection of church courts, and especially of Presbyteries and Synods, on the principle of elective affinity, that is, judicatories not bounded by geographical limits, but having a chief regard in their erection to diversities of doctrinal belief and of ecclesiastical policy, is contrary both to the letter and spirit of our institution, and opens a wide door for mischief and abuses of the most serious kind. One such Presbytery, if so disposed, might in process of time fill the whole church with unsound and schismatic ministers, especially if the principle were adopted that regular testimonials must of course secure the admission of those who bore them into any other Presbytery. Such a Presbytery, moreover, being without geographical bounds, might enter the limits and disturb the repose of any church into which it might think proper to intrude, and thus divide churches, stir up strife, and promote party spirit and schism, with all their deplorable consequences. Surely a plan of procedure in the church of God, which naturally and almost unavoidably tends to produce effects such as these, ought to be frowned upon, and as soon as possible terminated by the supreme judicatory of the church. Therefore,

4. Resolved, That at and after the meeting of the Synod of Philadelphia in October next, the Synod of Delaware shall be dissolved, and the Presbyteries constituting the same shall be then and thereafter annexed to the Synod of Philadelphia; and that the Synod of Philadelphia thus constituted by the union aforesaid, shall take such order concerning the organization of its several Presbyteries as may be deemed expedient and constitutional; and that said Synod, if it shall deem it desirable, make application to the next General Assembly for such a division of the Synod as may best suit the convenience of all its Presbyteries, and promote the glory of God.

5. Resolved, That while this General Assembly fully appreciate and deeply deplore the many painful evils which result from the present division in our church, in respect to the method of conducting domestic missions, and the education of beneficiary candi-

dates for the ministry; they are persuaded that it is not expedient to attempt to prohibit within our bounds the operations of the Home Missionary Society or of the Presbyterian Education Society, or any other voluntary association not subject to our control: such an attempt would tend, it is believed, to increase rather than to diminish the existing evils. The Assembly, however, is persuaded that it is the first and binding duty of the Presbyterian church to sustain her own boards; and that voluntary associations, operating within the bosom of the Presbyterian church, and addressing themselves to her members and congregations, are bound upon every principle both of moral and ecclesiastical obligation, neither to educate, nor to send forth as Presbyterians, any individuals known to hold sentiments contrary to the word of God, and to the standards of the Presbyterian church.

6 Resolved, That the Assembly deem it no longer desirable that churches should be formed in our Presbyterian connexion agreeably to the plan adopted by this Assembly and the General Association of Connecticut, in 1801.

(2.) Resolved, That our brethren of the General Association of Connecticut be, and they hereby are respectfully requested to consent that said plan shall be from and after the next meeting of that Association, declared to be annulled.

(3.) Resolved, That the annulling of said plan shall not in any wise interfere with the existence of lawful operations of churches which have been already formed on this plan.

7. Resolved, That this General Assembly see no cause either to terminate or modify the plan of correspondence with the Associations of our Congregational brethren in New-England. That correspondence has been long established. It is believed to have been productive of mutual benefit. It is now divested of the voting power, which alone could be considered as infringing the constitution of our church, by introducing persons clothed with the character of plenary members of the Assembly. It stands at present substantially on the same footing with the visits of our brethren from the Congregational Union of England and Wales; and in the present age of enlarged counsel and of combined effort for the conversion of the world, ought by no means to be abolished. Besides, the Assembly are persuaded that amidst the increasing and growing intercourse between the Presbyterian and Congregational churches, it is desirable to introduce terms of correspondence, even if they did not already exist.

8. Resolved, That while this General Assembly has no means of ascertaining to what extent the doctrinal errors alleged in the Memorial to exist in our church, do really prevail, it cannot hesitate to express the painful conviction that the allegation is by no means unfounded; and at the same time to condemn all such opinions as not distinguishable from Pelagian or Arminian errors; and to declare their judgment that the holding of the opinions referred to, is incompatible with an honest adoption of our Confession of Faith. That this is the case will be doubted by none who impartially consider the statements of that formulary contained in chap. 7, sec. 3 and 4; chap. 7, sec. 2; chap. 8; chap. 9; chap. 10, sec. 1 and 2; chap. 9, sec. 1st,—which sentiments must of course be interpreted in their plain, obvious and hitherto acknowledged sense. Against the doctrinal opinions, therefore, above alluded to, the Assembly would solemnly lift a warning voice, and would enjoin upon all our Presbyteries and Synods to exercise the utmost vigilance in guarding against the introduction and publication of such pestiferous errors.

Each of the above resolutions gave rise to much discussion. They were all carried, however, by a large majority. The vote on the first stood, ayes 129, nays 79. The rest passed, we understand, by still greater majorities. It may be proper here to remark that we do not accede to the principle involved in the first resolution. It strikes at the unity of the church. It exhibits a church refusing to be in communion with itself! We cannot allow that a Presbytery has the right to review and set aside the decisions of a co-ordinate Presbytery. The peculiar circumstances, however, in which the orthodox in the Assembly have been placed for some years past, have led to the adoption of the said principle. But these very circumstances prove the *sin* of the orthodox. Had they been vigilant and faithful, no Presbytery could have arisen in their body that would have given clean papers to a person of avowed heterodox sentiment. And if any such Presbytery now exists, its overthrow could easily be accomplished without having recourse to an un-presbyterial principle. It may be interesting, however, to our readers, to give an extract of the argument on both sides of the question involved in the first resolution.

Mr. Leach said, "as to the constitutional question, why had it been brought before the last assembly? If the case was so very clear, why had it ever been brought up, and why was the assembly now memorialized to declare whether presbyteries might constitutionally examine persons applying to be received by them or not? This very fact showed that the thing was not so plainly to be seen in the constitution, for if it was, those gentlemen would not have failed to see it.

Mr. L. now invited attention to what the constitution did declare on the subject, and he commenced by quoting the following passage :

"The radical principles of presbyterian church government and discipline are, that the several different congregations of believers, taken collectively, constitute one Church of christ, called emphatically the church; that a larger part of the church, or a representation of it, should govern a smaller, or determine matters of controversy which arise therein; that in like manner, a representation of the whole should govern and determine in regard to every part and to all the parts united, that is, a majority shall govern.

Mr. L. expressed his hearty concurrence in these premises, and argued from them that the united church possessed an indisputable right to determine what were the qualifications for membership throughout the body. In confirmation of which he referred to the following passage in the constitution.

"Every christian church, or union or association of particular churches is entitled to declare the terms of admission into its communion and the qualifications of its ministers and members."

He also quoted the following passage :

"God alone is Lord of the conscience, and hath left it free from the doctrine and commandments of men, which are in any thing contrary to his word or beside it in matters of faith or worship."

On this latter clause he presumed the advocates of the resolution intended to hinge their argument. But he protested against giving it such a construction as should allow presbyteries to determine for themselves what should be the terms of communion within their own bounds; for that would be at once to declare that there was no uniform system of action or government in the Presbyterian church; that the church was not one; and that its government was not one. To illustrate his meaning, he supposed a case where one presbytery should require of members, not only an ordinarily good education, but that they should read German, and Sanscrit, and Chinese, and all the languages of the world. Would they not by that act put themselves, quoad hoc., out of the pale of the Presbyterian church. They would be no longer within one common bond of brotherhood, under one common constitutional principle, but would be in fact a different body altogether. The form of Government proceeded on the principle that the church as one body, had the right to determine what should be the qualifications of membership within her communion; and she had done it, by declaring that "Those who are to be admitted to sealing ordinances, shall be examined as to their knowledge and piety." This was carrying out the principle as first laid down. Here was a uniform rule applicable alike to every part of the church. Now suppose a session instead of this should admit applicants simply on the ground of a repetition of the Lord's prayer, the creed and the catechism, without requiring any evidence of a change of heart.— Would it do for that session to say that they being virtually a small presbytery had a right to judge of the qualifications of those who applied for membership? It would not; for though they were the judges, yet they were to judge according to the rule here laid down. They might examine, but they must examine on the principles of the constitution. They could make no new condition; and if they should do so, it would be a clear violation of the constitution and law of the church. And persons refused admission for such reasons would have a valid ground of appeal. Now, in like manner, the constitution said that the church as a body had the right to determine what should be the qualifications of its ministers; and it accordingly laid down in the 14th and 15th chapters of the Form of Church Government, what these qualifications should be. Mr. L. referred to these requirements and observed that they were to be uniform throughout the church and binding alike on every presbytery within her limits. The presbytery had no right to alter these terms. If it could add to them, it might also subtract from them; for the principle would work both ways. But to say that the presbytery had an inherent and independent right to say what should be the qualifications of its own members, was to throw the reins loose upon their neck, and leave them in this essential particular without government. The Assembly would censure any presbytery that should presume to change these terms; and it had done so in the case of the Cumberland Presbyterians, who for refusing to require of their candidates all that the Form of Government laid down, had been justly separated from the body. Now suppose a presbytery should go into the opposite extreme, and should very largely add to these qualifications. Suppose it to be a large and influential presbytery with a great number of young men under its care. If these young men were penned up for ten years to-

gether, studying what would be of no use to them in their ministry, would they not have a right to complain? to appeal? and would not the Assembly sanction their appeal? Surely it would. The rule of qualification in one presbytery was the rule of qualification in all other presbyteries. If it was laid down for one, it was laid down for all. If the rule was to be changed, let the constitution be changed.

But it was contended that, though this right was inherent in presbyteries, yet it need not in all cases be exercised. And when was it to be exercised? When the presbytery had good reason to suspect that the applicant ought not to be received. And what was this good reason? The minister came well accredited. He brought with him the assurance of the presbytery he had left, that he was a good and true man, and properly qualified to exercise his ministry. Still the presbytery suspect him. Well; if they had good reason to suspect, then they had good reason to inform the presbytery which dismissed the man of the ground of that suspicion; for he was still amenable to the presbytery from whence he came, and not to that presbytery into which he sought admission; and if they neglected to do this, they were recreant to their duty, both to the man and to the other presbytery. Mr. L. went entirely with the principles of the report that where there was good reason to suspect a man of unsoundness in the faith, or an immoral life he ought not to be received. But yet it was maintained that the presbytery might examine him.

Dr. MILLER here corrected Mr. L. as to the phraseology of the report; it did not speak of having "good reason to suspect," but of a case where there was "any reasonable doubt."

Mr. L. said there should be no unreasonable doubt: for if doubt was unreasonable, it was unchristian; if it was reasonable, then the presbytery ought to take the constitutional steps to have it resolved. For a judicatory who had nothing to do with a man, not a particle of power over him, to undertake to try a man who was amenable to a different tribunal! was this Presbyterianism? No: it was a new fangled thing, to which it was now sought to give currency in place of the good old well known thing called Presbyterianism, and which he rejoiced to see in the Assembly's book as he saw it in the Bible.

But suppose the man submitted to be examined; what was the language of such an act on the part of the presbytery? was it not this? "It is true that we have examined your papers, and that they declare you to be in good and regular standing and commend you to our reception; but we, have much doubt whether that presbytery, though they ordained you, and though you have been laboring for years within their bounds, have the capacity to judge of you: for we are far more orthodox, or more holy, or more refined and intellectual than they. There is some thing about us which renders it quite doubtful, though you might be worthy enough of them, whether you are worthy of us." And was this the way to draw the bonds of brotherly love? Gentlemen talked of confidence in each other: but did not this very proposal prove that there was no such thing? and that they insisted on being beyond the control of the judgment of co-ordinate presbyteries? Though the constitution had declared that the judgment of one church court was to be respected as valid in all other church courts, yet it was now for some reason—what reason he knew not, sought to set this principle wholly aside, to set ourselves up as independent presbyteries, to resolve ourselves into a congregational organization and to trample the doctrine and government of the Presbyterian church under foot. He asked whether a man was ordained to be a minister only within the bounds of one presbytery? or for the whole church? and whether if a man was qualified constitutionally for the bounds of one presbytery, he was not equally for all presbyteries? If a man brought the proof that he had been duly ordained in one presbytery, was another presbytery to re-judge its judgment? It was a farce: a solemn presbyterial farce!

Dr. HOGE now rose and observed, that when a great question of Ecclesiastical polity was under consideration, and especially if it involved constitutional principles, it was the imperious duty of the Assembly to look carefully, thoroughly and impartially, first at its nature, secondly at its direct and acknowledged tendencies, and thirdly at the evil that might grow out of it. Dr. H. had endeavored thus to examine the question now under discussion. He did not complain of the manner in which the opponents of the resolution had presented their argument nor should he waste the time of the Assembly in wandering after them in their wanderings, and in introducing a thousand irrelevant topics suggested by the fruitful imagination of men strong in mind, strong in feeling, and bent upon their purpose.

He would first inquire what was the true nature of this question? What was the character of the proposed resolution as constituting a part of an important report on which the committee had labored with no small diligence? He believed what he said when he declared that upon the manner in which the assembly should act on this resolution, would depend, in a great degree, the future destinies of the Presbyterian church. Yes, he believed it. On this very report the Assembly was to decide whether they would continue one church, or be rent in pieces and scattered to the winds of heaven.

The principle expressed in this resolution was the great conservative principle of Presbyterianism, and it was on this ground only that Dr. H. had assented to it. And why was it thus to be considered? For various reasons, but especially for this—that it left to every member of Presbytery and of the church the right of resorting to first principles, not only those of our ecclesiastical constitution, but to the principles of integrity and truth, to which the final resort must be ever made.

The gentleman who had spoken had entirely mistaken the ground which the friends of the resolution assumed, as to what these friends considered the strong point of the defence and safety of the church. The brethren seemed to take it for granted that the advocates of the resolution meant to say that the self-preserving power of the Presbytery was derived from the constitution of the church. It was not so. Dr. H. affirmed that this conservative power stood by itself; that it existed far back of any conventional agreement; that it belonged to that self-preservation which was inherent in every individual, in every corporate body of a civil kind, and in every judicatory of Jesus Christ, unless such individual or such body had parted with this power by its own act. Would any man rise in his place and say that this principle was a false one?—Would any man have the hardihood to deny that it was the right of every individual and of every collective body to exercise a conservative power over its own existence? And did not this right remain until parted with by actual compact? When a number of individuals associated together, expediency and even necessity required that they should surrender some of their rights for the common benefit, and the better to secure the residue. So far as they made this actual surrender, so far they were bound by it; but so far as they did not make such a surrender, the common sense of every man would declare that all their original rights were inherent still. They never would be parted with but by actual compact. Apply these principles to a Presbytery. A Presbytery was a corporate body, but not, as was often said of civil corporations, a body that had no soul. It had a soul, and must act as a moral and accountable agent; and if this was its character, had it not a right to preserve its own principles?—its own rules?—its own ends of action, and its own modes of ascertaining those ends? Certainly it had, unless it was bound to surrender them by a compact which either took away its original rights, or limited their exercise. And Dr. H. therefore affirmed that the declaration of the resolution proposed for adoption, was but a simple affirmation of an original and inherent right. He should not stay to prove that this was the character of the resolution, but would only strengthen the position he had assumed by one remark, in the truth of which he felt full confidence. If he understood the nature of Presbyterianism, the true fountain of all ecclesiastical power was the Presbytery.—This body acted on the one hand upon churches and congregations, exercising over them a control which was not against their own consent, and which did not bring them into bondage, but which was for their preservation and benefit. On the other hand, it reached up its power to the Synod and the General Assembly, to the Synod, by itself constituting a part of the Synod; and to the Assembly, by representation. This was the position occupied by the Presbytery in the general system; and here all the reserved and inherent powers belonging to the system were found remaining, among which surely the right of preserving its own character must be one.

2d. Whether these reasons were admitted in all their extent or not, still if it was admitted that the Presbytery had original right and might exercise, unless it was actually conceded by compact, then the inquiry presented itself, does the constitution of the Presbyterian church deprive Presbyteries of this right in any degree? Does the constitution inhibit its exercise? To this inquiry, the answer was plain. There was no express resignation of the power, nor any explicit inhibition of its exercise. It was an argument by induction, from particular clauses that constituted a whole body of artillery which had been brought to bear against the resolution. But the guns aimed too low, and did not reach the position which they were meant to assail.

To advert to the argument which had been drawn from the constitution, a brief examination would clearly show that the brethren had taken wrong positions, and had a wrong view of the whole case. The brother (Mr. Leach) had set out with a distinct reference to a clause in the constitution which laid down the radical principles of Presbyterianism. These were all true and good and wholesome principles; and if prayers and ardent wishes were sufficient to produce such a result, Dr. H. felt as though he could pray day and night to the God of influences, that these should be in fact, as they were in theory, the principles of the Presbyterian church, and might be inculcated upon every member and upon every child of that church from its infancy. But was it possible, in thus affirming the unity of the church, to slide into a dogma which went to establish a spiritual despotism, and that of the worst form—the uncontrollable despotism of the many over the rights of a part? Because the Presbyteries had conceded some of their natural rights, was it therefore true that they had parted with all?—that their rights and powers were clean gone?—that the rights of minorities were no more to be regarded? Was the Presbyterian body so completely consolidated that the voice

of one of its parts must be, de facto, the voice of all other parts?—so that if one part of the body should perform an act or speak a word, that all other parts must be concluded by this one, and must be liable to the action of that wrong, if wrong were done? Was the union of church to be converted into a bond of slavery?—so that if one Presbytery should send forth ten or twenty or a hundred men, inimical to Presbyterianism, and even to Christianity, with a certificate under its hand, every other Presbytery throughout the body must receive these as good men and true? If this was the essential principle of Presbyterianism, he should wash his hands of it, and declare himself an Independent on principle.

Report on Popery.

Mr. Breckenridge, of the committee to whom was re-committed the Report on Overture No. 10, from the Presbytery of Baltimore, on the subject of Popery, reported as follows:

The committee to whom was referred the Overture (No. 10) from the Presbytery of Baltimore, on the subject of Popery, beg leave respectfully to recommend to this body the adoption of the following resolutions, viz:

1. Resolved, That in the judgment of this Assembly, according to the declaration of our excellent standards, chap. xxv. sec. 6, "the pope of Rome is that Anti-Christ, that man of sin and son of perdition, that exalteth himself in the church against Christ, and all that is called God," as predicted and defined in the word of God, (2 Thess. 2d chap. and elsewhere.) That the communion self-styled "The Holy Catholic church," is not *the* church of Christ, or *a* church of Christ, but is apostate from God, fallen by unbelief, and cast off from the church of Christ; and therefore that her ordinances, acts and administrations are not to be recognized as valid, and that this is more especially true in regard to her professed sacraments, of baptism and the eucharist—inasmuch as by various profane exorcisms, idolatrous incantations, and unauthorised additions, mutilations and ceremonies, these simple sacraments have wholly lost their original character and true design; and moreover, that the prevalence of popery is esteemed by this Assembly destructive of the souls of men.

2. Resolved, That while the prophecies of God's word, the history of popery, and the spirit of the age give cheering and abundant evidence that this enormous organization is speedily to be dissolved, its power to be broken, and its influence to cease, yet owing to the peculiar position of our beloved country, in regard to papal Europe, and to the immense emigration of Roman Catholic population, and especially of Jesuit priests from foreign lands, it is believed that our religious institutions are exposed to imminent peril, without the united efforts of the people of God; and therefore we are loudly called on, as American citizens and Protestant Christians, to use all wise and Christian means consistent with the religious rights of our fellow men, to arrest so insidious, alarming and ever-growing an evil: especially do we recommend the withdrawal of all youth from under the care of Jesuit priests and papal nuns—to provide schools adequate to the education of our youth, especially of our female children—to diffuse light in the spirit of love by the press and the pulpit, and to seek, by intercession with God, and by all moral influences within our reach, alike to save our country from the destructive influence of popery, and to rescue the unhappy votaries of the pope from the delusion by which they are misled and destroyed.

3. Resolved, That it be earnestly recommended to all our Theological Seminaries, to train candidates for the sacred office with adequate instructions on the great questions involved in the papal controversy—so that they may be fully qualified to meet and discomfit the priesthood of Rome.

Report of the Board of Managers of the Theological Seminary.

The following Report should have appeared at an earlier date, but was inadvertently omitted:

At a meeting of the Board of Managers of the Theological Seminary, on the 25th March, 1835, at the Hall, the following students were appointed to be taken on trials for license, viz: Mr. James Dixon, by the Presbytery of Muskingum; Messrs. Wm. Galbraith, George M. Hall and David Strang, by the Presbytery of Chartiers. In the event of their licensure, the following scale of appointments was adopted, viz: Mr. Dixon, in the Presbytery of Muskingum, August and September; Mr. Galbraith, Allegheny, August—Philadelphia, September; Mr. Hall, Philadelphia, August, September; Mr. Strang, Chartiers, August, September. By order of the Board.

THOS. HANNA, Sec'y.

THE
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,

AND
EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

AUGUST, 1835.

ART. I. *Death and Burial of Sarah.*

Mr. Editor—I transmit to you, for insertion in the Religious Monitor, a few thoughts upon the 23d chapter of Genesis, which occurred to me in reading this chapter lately, in my ordinary course of reading, and at a leisure moment I enlarged upon—hoping that they may be of use to some of your readers, if not to inform them of things they know not, yet in the way of turning their attention to things that need to be remembered, and showing them that this passage, like many others, has more in it than the mere history of the facts as here related. The subject it treats of is the death of Sarah, and Abraham's care to have her buried; his buying a field of the children of Heth for that purpose, and the manner in which the affair of the purchase was transacted between him and them. There is room for serious reflection from it, concerning death. It contains excellent moral instruction in reference to some of the particular duties of the christian life, and it contains much gospel in it. And in laying these thoughts before them, I will consider these things in their order. To show that there is room for serious reflection from them, I shall give the following observations as they occur, without any respect had to the order of connection which is in the chapter from which they are taken.

1. All have to die, good and bad. "It is appointed for all men once to die, and after death the judgment." A solemn decree has passed, which, surer than the laws of the Medes and Persians, altereth not—cannot be reversed, that this is not our rest, for it is polluted. Sin has opened a channel for death to make its inroads upon the human family, so that as with an overflowing flood it carries them away in their successive generations, and each one in his own appointed time and way, without any possibility of evading its attacks.

The words *his dead* and *thy dead* serve, while reading this passage, to remind us of this; because they suppose that others have their dead, as well as Abraham; and the children of Heth here seemed to have a common understanding of what was meant by the words. They had their dead, and they sympathised with Abraham, knowing that his case, or the case of his deceased partner in life, would in due time and might shortly be theirs. The grave is the place where the rich and the poor meet; the

master and the servant; the great worldly potentate and the meanest of his subjects; the righteous and the wicked; the infidel, who dares to deny, if not the being of a God, at least of an all-governing Providence, or a divine revelation given from heaven to men as a rule of christian faith and practice,—and the believer. (Job iii. 13—20.) There is no discharge in this war. A few, indeed, have escaped the beaten path, as Enoch and Elias, but they have undergone what is equivalent. They had to leave the world in their appointed time, as well as others, though with a peculiarity in their case that displayed the Lord's favor towards them, for their zeal and faithfulness in the evil times they lived in, and was designed to answer other wise purposes of Jehovah, not particularly made known to us. And so plain is the fact, that it needs not to be proven. Every man carries about with him the proof, in the mortality that cleaves to him. He dies while he lives, and is going down to the grave while he is growing up to his best estate of manhood in this world.—While he is busy about the affairs of the world, he is a candidate for eternity, and does not know how near he is to it. And the only necessity of referring to the fact that all must die, is that we may have it in our daily remembrance, and be improving it, with a view to that eternity which is before us.

2. That mourning for departed friends and relatives is allowed to us. There is a day, when the Lord God of Hosts calls to weeping and mourning, not only in respect of sins prevailing, but also in respect of sorrows that come upon us, or a time to mourn. When friends and relatives are taken away from us by death, so as we lose their society, especially if they are godly persons, we have reason to mourn, though our loss is their gain; and we find that mourning for deceased relatives has in every age been practised by the saints of God, as well as others. Abraham here mourned for Sarah, verse 2d. Jacob mourned for his son Joseph, supposed to be dead; Joseph and his brethren mourned for Jacob, their father; the people of Israel mourned for good Josiah; and at the grave of Lazarus, Jesus wept or mourned for him. Religion does not destroy the common feelings and sympathies of our nature, but rather refines them, and gives them a proper direction; keeps them in proper bounds, and even shews itself in some degree through them. It teaches to "mourn for those that mourn, and weep for those that weep;" and tells us "not to despise the chastening of the Lord," but allows us, and even makes it our duty to feel under it, so as that if a friend or relation is taken away from us by death, we shall feel it sensibly as a dispensation of Providence that to us is afflictive and makes us sorrow for them: yet if they are true believers, not as those of whom we have no hope, to be without these feelings and sympathies, betokens often a heart careless under the rebukes of God in his providence, and hardened in sin. The Lord complains of the people of Israel, as an evidence of the hardness of their hearts, (Jer. ii. 30.) "In vain have I smitten your children, and ye received no correction." They received not God's hand laid upon them in providence as a correction. They were unfeeling under it, so that it did not answer to them its proper end, as a chastisement from him.

3. That the death of those we are conversant with taking place, one after another, relatives, friends, acquaintances, neighbors, &c., should remind us of our situation in the world, as sojourners. Abraham was reminded of this by the death of Sarah. He was so in fact, but her death served particularly to put him in remembrance of the fact. So the Lord, by the removals of others around us in death, and especially by deaths which occur in our own families and among our connexions, teaches us that we should be remembering our real condition here as strangers and sojourners. One makes the remark, (to very good purpose) that as we

come nearer the grave, and to prepare us the better for bidding an adieu to the world, when the time comes that we must leave it, and to loosen our attachments from it, the Lord in his providence, in infinite wisdom, takes away our earlier acquaintances and friends and our relations, one after another, until in a manner we have few to associate with, and we become as strangers to the world before we leave it, if we are spared to the period of an old age; so as we have the less, as it were, to engage us to stay, and may the reader be disposed to turn our eye to that better country to which we profess that we are journeying. "I shall go to him" David was brought to say, upon the death of his child, "but he shall not return unto me." It would be a right improvement of God's ways in providence to us, were deaths in our families and among our connexions and neighbors to serve this end to us, to lead the more our affections away from the world, and dispose us to be looking out for death, and endeavoring after an actual preparation for it. Such dispensations are calls to us to be also ready, as the Lord Christ may come at an hour when we think not.

Man in his best estate here is but a stranger and a sojourner,—believers are so particularly, verse 4th. Men of the world are so by necessity, but believers by profession, and even of choice. They declare that they seek a country that is heavenly. Abraham was a great man in his day, but he was a sojourner in the world, like others, and having fulfilled the duty of his generation, like those who were before him, he had to leave it, and endeavored to keep this in remembrance. The children of Heth were sojourners in the world, properly, as well as Abraham, but they seemed to forget it. Abraham keeps it distinctly in view; "I am a stranger and a sojourner with you." We, too, have to go our way at last, while others will take our place—all this serving to remind us that here we have no continuing city of abode; that we are pilgrims and sojourners, like our fathers. We begin our journey as soon as we come into the world, and it ends in death. We are sojourners; all sojourn while we are in it, and death will bring believers to their home. It will carry wicked men, though not to their home, in the same sweet sense of the word in which heaven is to be considered as a home to the believer, yet to their eternal abode in the mansions of woe.

4. Death makes a mighty change in the bodies of men. "Thou changest their countenance, and sendest them away." The most lovely countenance death disfigures. Though Sarah was to Abraham the desire of his eyes in his lifetime, he seeks after her death to have her buried out of his sight. Death will make an amazing change to pass upon the most beautiful countenance. In the hour of death, if wasting disease does it not sooner, its beauty departs greatly from it. A few days after it has done its work, and we could not look upon it with any feeling of satisfaction. When it has begun to be a prey to the worms, the sight would be so horrid that few could behold it: we would turn away our eyes with pain from the scene, were it before us. How should this tend to suppress the risings of pride in young persons, in consequence of the beauty of their countenance, manly form and handsome figure, if they possess these, and such qualities or accomplishments of the body as are calculated to attract the gaze of their fellow mortals, and dispose them to pursue after more solid properties! And should it not dispose mankind to value one another not so much for these things as for true mental excellence—the grace of God in persons—the image of God shewing itself forth through them—the love of God in them, and fear of God they seem to be possessed of. These are the things that justly commend those who are possessed of them to the esteem and regard of fellow mortals.

These are substantial recommendations : all others are like the flower that may make a show for a little time, but soon withers and falls off.

5. Among our possessions which we have in the world, are the sepulchres which we have for our use, not in our lifetime as it respects ourselves, but at our death. We have them in our lifetime for the benefit of our families, our friends and ourselves, that they may be ready when we need them, and the poorest must have them as well as the rich. Some are rich in this world in lands and possessions, having large estates, while others, like our Lord, who had not where to lay his head, have none in their lifetime ; but at death they must have a burying place equally with the rich, and are not left behind them in this respect. Alexander, who conquered the world, had no more than six feet to contain his body at last, and this was all that was necessary. Those who could never call a foot of land their own in their lifetime, will after their death possess as much.

In all parts of the world inhabited by civilized man, we find that places of interment make a portion of that property they endeavor to be possessed of ; and no sooner do they become civilized, than they begin to shew a respect to these things, if before they were neglected. It is mentioned by one of the earlier missionaries which went out to Caffraria, (I think) that the custom there was to expose the dead to vultures and other beasts of prey ; but some of the mission family dying, and being interred in the manner most common in the civilized world, the mode of disposing of them by burying began to be adopted as the more decent and proper. Societies may not have their churches and temples, but they must have their burying grounds, their sepulchres. Do we travel through most inhabited countries, we find every where in them, throughout, places appropriated for the dead, and it becomes necessary, from the common mortality of man. As certainly as man lives, so certainly he must some time die ; and while he has to make provision for his maintenance and comfort while living, so he, or others for him, have to make provision in reference to his death. Abraham obtained this field of Machpelah, and had it made sure to him for a possession—the field and the cave, and all the trees that were in the field and in all the borders round about ; and the fact is as particularly described as if he had been buying a large inheritance, which he and his family after him were to live on, and were to possess forever.

6. A decent respect to the dead in general, and a sympathy with those who suffer the loss by their removal, is to be expected of all those who are endowed with principles of common civility. There are many reasons for it. Death is the common lot of men, and by the death of others we are warned that our own time may soon come, when we must go the way of all the earth, and that it is at any rate before us,—while it would be grating to our own feelings to know that our own bodies, after death, would be treated otherwise ; and as we naturally desire with respect to ourselves, so should we be inclined to do toward others. Some, indeed, have been so monstrously wicked, and so little entitled to the common feelings of mankind, in their sympathies with one another, that their dead bodies have been treated with contempt, as some have been buried, according to the language of holy writ, with the burial of an ass. But the common relation which those who possess human nature have to one another, requires it in general cases. The body, as once the receptacle of a soul endowed with reason and intellect, and which is in its nature immortal, and as in itself, by its peculiar form and the upright countenance of man, in a certain degree the image of God in the remains of it, even in fallen nature, serves to show that this is proper.* He is the lord of this

* We think it unwarrantable to ascribe any "degree" of the image of God, either to the "form" of body or "upright countenance of man."—*Edii. Rel. Mon.*

lower world, though fallen from his primeval dignity, and it is decent that he be distinguished from the brutes, in this.

The children of Heth, though heathens, and a portion of those Canaanish nations which were devoted to destruction for their wickedness, yet were not so lost to all sense of decency and humanity as not to sympathise with Abraham concerning his dead, and show a respectful attention to his deceased partner, Sarah. And it is owing to more than a heathenish cruelty in the votaries of the Roman Catholic church, in some parts of the vast domain of the man of sin, that they will not allow Protestants to be decently interred, but treat their dead bodies with every measure of contempt. It shows that Romanism, in its very nature, tends to blunt the common feelings of humanity in those who are given to this error.

7. To have our dead decently disposed of belongs not only to the principles of common civility, but of Christianity; and there is something in Christianity that calls particularly for a decent disposal of the dead, who have been creditable professors of it. The hope of a resurrection, and the consideration that believers are all members of the mystical body of Christ, seem to teach that a due respect to the bodies of dead saints should be shown in this way. Though they have to die, and their dust goes back to kindred dust, and mingles with it, yet it is not so as that it shall never again assume its wonted form and connexion with the soul, which once inhabited it. A decent interment of the dead bodies of believers, is a practical declaration of the belief of those who are the instruments in conveying them to their long home, in that truth which is, and will be verified concerning all true believers, as to their bodily part—"It is sown in corruption—it is raised in glory;" and to express the hope of the living concerning them, and our hope of a resurrection in general, it seems to be proper—as their bodies are members of Christ, and sleep in Jesus in the grave itself, so as that he and they are not separated in death any more than in life. To the honor of Christ, of whose mystical bodies they form a part in their bodies as well as in their souls, a due respect belongs to them, that Christ may be honored in them, by this means.

There is a respect due to the dead bodies of saints, (though it is not to be carried to that excess in which the mother of harlots teaches her votaries to carry it, namely, so as to worship at their shrine—to adore their relics, and to place a virtue in the tomb that contains them, which, were they even what they are pretended to be, is to carry a common respect that belongs to them to the length of a superstitious veneration, putting them in some measure of equality with Christ himself, and even giving to them honors beyond what they are warranted to give Christ himself; for even as to his human body, the cross he suffered on, and the tomb which enclosed his dead body after his crucifixion—no worship was due nor virtue to be expected from them.) And the Spirit of God, through the Psalmist, as an inspired penman, complains of the great injustice done to them, in the way of insults given to their dead bodies, and maltreatment of them after death, in Psalm lxxix. 2d verse: "The dead bodies of thy servants have they given to be meat unto the fowls of the heaven, the flesh of thy saints unto the beasts of the earth;" and that there was none to bury them—to do this honor to them after their death. Believers, according to that Psalm, do not all get their bodies decently buried. Some have been torn by wild beasts; some have been burnt to ashes, and have had their ashes scattered to the four winds, or thrown into rivers, if possible to render the reunion of the respective particles of which they were composed more improbable. Some have been buried in the ocean, by the hand of violence or otherwise; and some have been

lost, so as it is not known where they are, nor what disposal Providence has made of them. And in the event, it is to themselves no loss, however little honor was put upon them in their death, or after it; and, however widely scattered their ashes may be, they will have all a certain and a glorious resurrection at last, dust being united together to its dust, and that which was sown in corruption being raised in glory. But this does not make the decent disposal of them after death any less a duty, when persons have it in their power to do so, and to the honor of Christ too. A cup of cold water the disciples of Christ often cannot get, when they need it: but, given to a disciple in the name of a disciple, and to the honor of Christ, it shall not want its reward; and a decent respect shown to the dead bodies of the saints for Christ's name's sake, will have this sentence of approbation passed upon it at last, by Christ himself: "Inasmuch as ye did it to these, ye did it to me."

Abraham here shows a respectful attention to the dead body of his beloved Sarah, and doubtless he was influenced the more to do this from the consideration that she was a true believer, as in the 11th chapter of Hebrews she is represented to be. The promise that God would be his God and the God of his seed, was seen through her particularly: she gave evidence of a dutiful respect to Abraham in his lifetime, in a fulfillment of the relative duties which it belonged to her to discharge, to the glory of God; as it is recorded of her that she obeyed Abraham, calling him lord, whose daughters all godly women are, &c. And the Holy Ghost records this case about her when dead, by Abraham, doubtless for our example to those to whom the ends of the earth are come. The believer, as he is a member of the mystical body of Christ, like Christ his mystical head, he is to rest his flesh in the grave in hope: and others are to place it there in hope of a blessed resurrection it will obtain in due time.

8. Rightly exercised, believers mingle religion with all their dealings in the world, and especially with more important concerns which befall them on their way through it. Abraham, here, amidst all his care about the disposal of the body of his beloved Sarah, shows himself to be a true believer. He talks religiously: he shows himself to be honest and upright in his dealings. He has a respect to the covenant promise in all his anxiety. He shows the hope he possessed of a blessed resurrection—as, why so much care about a burying place for Sarah, if her body was to become dust, and remain so, without any hope of a resurrection? If a connexion did not yet subsist between it and the soul already glorified, and they were not to be re-united, that they might together everlastingly enjoy the fellowship of Christ in heaven, her body was not much more worthy of so much attention being paid to it, than an old cast-off garment which she wore in her lifetime. So the saints of God, religion shines out through them in their daily walk and conversation, and particularly when so remarkable events in providence occur as bereavements by death in their families of a beloved parent, a beloved husband or wife, or a beloved child. Jacob, when the king of Egypt, Pharaoh, asks him, (in a carnal way to be sure) "How old art thou?" he answers, "The days of the years of my pilgrimage are an hundred and thirty years; few and evil have the days of the years of my life been, and have not attained unto the days of the years of the life of my fathers, in the days of their pilgrimage. Isaac on his death bed "blessed Jacob and Esau concerning things to come;" and Jacob on his death bed blessed his children.—They lived in faith and died in faith. So it is with all the saints. Others sometimes appear very serious about the time of a death in their families or among their connexions or neighbors, but they do not mingle religion so much with their general concerns. The children of Heth went about the matter of a contract with Abraham here, with some seeming serious-

ness. They talk about the matter of Sarah's death with decency; but Abraham is religious in the whole affair.

9. There is something noble and dignified in the manner in which a true believer is exercised, about the time of a death in his family, or among his connexions, when he carries himself suitably to his professed character, compared with what at such times is often found in others.— Abraham, endeavoring to obtain a burying a place for his Sarah, goes about the matter seriously, yet with composure. Providence had made a very great change to take place in his family: the desire of his eyes was now taken away from him, and he was to have her assistance no more in the business of his household, or the pleasure of her company and conversing with her, as in times past, about their common concerns, and more especially about what God had done for them both, in calling them out from among their heathen relatives, and making his covenant promise that he would be their God and the God of their seed after them, and fulfilling it already in part, in the birth of Jacob, the child of the promise. And he meets the dispensation, trying as it was, with resignation. There is a command given, that "we despise not the chastening of the Lord, nor faint when we are rebuked by him." Abraham endeavored to practise according to it, even before as a command it had its existence in holy writ, in so many words, as an example to us in similar circumstances to encourage us to be obedient in the ways of the Lord, and to practise according to it, as we have it very plainly as a command set before us. He neither despised this chastening of the Lord, nor fainted under it. He endeavors to improve the circumstance of Sarah's death to the best advantage.

When the Lord deals in similar providences with ungodly persons, they give themselves up often to excess in sorrow, or they make light of the Lord's dealings with them, in those adverse dispensations he brings upon them. Their mourning is so as that they will not be comforted, or they are light and trifling in their carriage, about a time when they are called upon by the rebukes and warnings of God, given to them in providence to be serious. Around the death bed of a godly person, when godly connexions and godly neighbors are in attendance, there is a vast difference, generally, from what is to be seen around the death bed of the ungodly and the careless. Around the one is to be seen a serious composure; hope is mingled with grief and sorrow. Acquiescence in the holy pleasures of Jehovah, who does all things well, appears on the very countenances of those who are witnesses of the solemn scene, and there is a ready justification of God, in such dispensations of his. Around the other is to be seen, in the reverse, excessive sorrow or the vacant stare. If there is sorrow, it is sorrow as if there were no hope—or if there is a hope, it is in an unmeaning and presumptive way in which it is shown—not in the way in which Abraham shows his hope here, who goes to God's word of promise for it. God had promised him the land of Canaan, to be a possession to his seed after him, and through this promise, he had a promise of heaven given to him, to which he was himself to be brought in due time, of which the land of Canaan was to be a type and figure. He looked forward to the accomplishment of this promise in hope, and endeavors to take possession by this burying place as an earnest of his seed's enjoying it, and also as an earnest in respect to the accomplishment of the promise to himself and Sarah spiritually.

[To be concluded.]

ART. II. Cause of Apostasy.

Concluded from page 38.

"*Having a form of Godliness.*"—Sometimes a very sound creed and a very strict and punctual form of duties, private and public, but more generally they are unscriptural in some part of their profession, and loose and irregular in their duties. More generally still they are content to belong to any church, and believe there is little difference, they are a church going people, they receive both sacraments and give a little to support the ordinances. And besides all these there is great multitudes content with going to church on Sabbath forenoon, without any more.—I cannot here describe all the variety in their forms of godliness, but surely there can be none lower than the name christian, neither Pagans, Turks, Jews, nor Catholics, but christians. They are christians.

But whatever be their form their sins have many peculiar aggravations. First, this form of godliness, itself is a sin of a heinous nature, for it is but a form, as the next words inform us "they deny the power of it" not by way of inference or necessary consequence, but directly and formally.—They renounce it and disown it. There is the authority, which the truths of godliness claim over the heart and affections and thoughts within, and over the words and actions without, they renounce; and that life of godliness, that holy, humble, loving reverence and submission to God in Christ, and receiving by faith the truths and promises of the Gospel in which lies the christians chief enjoyment, they deny. They do not deny godliness or religion, but deny these things to be belonging to it. This being the case their godliness is nothing better than an empty dead form. But it is something far worse, in very many of them. They are few indeed whose intellectual powers are so small as not to enable them to understand the general import of their professions of godliness when they profess to observe the sabbath, hear the gospel, read the inspired words of scripture, sing praise—pray—fast—and it is not possible in most cases for them not to perceive that in these religious acts they are professing not only to admit of but to submit to the power of godliness which they at the same time deny. What can this be but hypocrisy? God is mocked in their worship, fellow men are deceived by their professions. Hypocrisy under any circumstances is so very base a thing that few men have been found so lost to moral sense as not to despise it—but consider what it must be here. It is done on the sabbath, a day set apart exclusively for pure and spiritual and sacred acts; therefore they on the matter say that this hypocrisy of theirs is of this character. It is done in the assembly of the saints, who in heart as well as expression, do abhor hypocrisy; and these are in effect saying that they abhor it too, while they are in the very act. In so far as their form of godliness consists with truth they are practising their hypocrisy in opposing and betraying that truth. It is done in acts of solemn worship to God, in which they are acknowledging the omniscient to be looking on and witnessing their inmost heart movings. Yea, and approving of what they are doing, and calling upon him to accept them and it! Again how solemn are some of the acts in their "*Form*" in which there is nothing but this hypocrisy! it is in their most solemn vows, in their engagements at baptism—at the Lord's table, at ordinations to office, &c. Then lastly it is repeated. It were a sin of dreadful aggravation to do it once. What mind then can conceive, or tongue can utter the enormity of going on with it for twenty or thirty years?

Second, let us consider, their "*denying the power of it.*" This is another sin of dreadful aggravation. I do not say but that in some it is done in a degree of ignorance, which yet is not to be excused, especially if their ignorance be in consequence of their neglect of both means and opportunity of knowledge which lie within their reach every day. I leave it to

conscience whether the plea of ignorance will avail that man who can read—has the Bible in his possession, and knows where he can every sabbath hear it explained. Still less force will this plea have to exculpate where ignorance is the result of a set purpose, when people keep away from the gates and posts of wisdom's doors for fear their ignorance should forsake them and leave them without excuse before the bar of conscience. They will not buy or read such a book for fear it might force the light into their mind, and they might be compelled to know the truth to a greater extent, and particular truths which they do not wish to know to be truths, such as particular unconditional election, the imputation of Adam's first sin, particular atonement, &c. They will not go to hear such a preacher, nor consider the exemplary life of such christians, lest they should be obliged to find out their sins or be found out of their own conscience. These will find out at last, if not before, that their ignorance is but another name for "*hated-light*," which will turn states-evidence and make proof that they "*resisted the truth*" all their days, while it constantly sought entrance into their minds. This will aggravate their denying the power of godliness. They might and could often have discovered that it hath a commanding authority and a vital power belonging to it, but they chose not to discover it and *diligently* kept out of its way. But there are others, and there are many it is to be feared, who commit this sin *against* their knowledge. They understand clearly that godliness has this power, and yet they go on to deny it. They have perceived the sense and import of scripture sufficiently to know this. Their "denying the power of it" must, therefore, be exceedingly aggravated under any circumstances. Although their knowledge be not quite so extensive as that of others, yet if they know this much, and although they did it but once and under strong temptations, yet it would be a great sin. What then must it be when they do it without any strong temptations—when they do it deliberately—with extensive knowledge of the scriptures—and with a knowledge of the judgments which God has poured upon those who have in times past followed their line of conduct! They have before them many examples of the life and power of godliness, and can easily understand how excellent and desirable a thing it is, and what good and desirable fruit it yields to man through the periods, relations and conditions of life; and farther, they know what bitter things have come out of this "denying" it, what vice, what crime and misery, what torments of conscience, what ruin and destruction to individuals and to states, have sprung from it, and will spring from it again—and their own conscience as yet condemning their conduct, and yet they go on to do it year after year, carrying it out more openly, more boldly, and into further acts which they had not done before. I find no terms to express the measure of their guilt.

But great as it is, many of them are left to greater still, viz. "*to resist the truth*."—First, this is to be charged upon their "denying the power of godliness." I will not say that many, I hope they are but few, do this expressly with the design of "*resisting the truth*," but they design to make this denial while the truth is all the time fighting against them, and trying to dissuade them, and they against it. Their conscience enlightened—their early education—the example of the Godly—the scripture which they have committed to memory, and which they read, and the sermons they hear—the reproofs of friends, the testimony of the church (through God's mercy there is still a testimony,) all join in opposing their denial of the power of godliness. Often is the case argued before the mind. Often do these advocates plead and reason with the man to stop, but it is all to no purpose. They are determined on their course. Their course of conduct, too in which they make this denial, is

itself an aggravation. viz. that which is described in the preceding verses. "For men shall be lovers of their own selves, boasters, proud, &c." It is in these vicious propensities and the actions thence proceeding that they "resist the truth." Farther, it is frequently to be charged on their "form of godliness." They are not ignorant of the errors in doctrine and corruption in worship, which their form embraces. They knew very well where was a form more agreeable to scripture, but this was less disagreeable to their carnal mind than that, more convenient and more fashionable, and so they made choice of it, while truth was staring them in the face and remonstrating and protesting against their deed, and conscience witnessing and signing the same.

This same charge lies against much that is preached from the pulpit and published from the press; it is done in resistance to the truth, such have been the instructions, the conviction, the knowledge and the solemn vows of many individuals, that if they preach or publish such things at all, they must do it in the way of fighting against the truth present to their thoughts. And it is to such characters as these that the text obviously refers; they are extremely anxious to make proselytes, their zeal carries them far beyond the line of all sober men, they take most unjustifiable measures, they use craft and deceit, "they creep into houses and lead captive silly women;" surely by the time that men will resort to such measures to increase their party, they must have tried every other. Perhaps there is nothing in all this passage, that comes closer home to the spirit of the times, than this *proselyting*, it is only one way that is mentioned, but it is an extreme measure, and implies all the rest. It implies that they are compassing sea and land to make proselytes. Every plan they try that promises to move and excite the multitude to "GET religion" and to add their names to the communicant's roll.

The next aggravation, is *continuance* in this sin, "they do always resist the truth"—truth attested by the clearest and most forcible evidence; on this account they are compared to Jannes and Jambres, who withstood Moses. To continue at this rate, is to sin with a high hand. To go on from year to year in this course can be nothing else than heaping up wrath against the day of wrath.

Then what truths they are which they resist! Truths expressive of the highest glory of the triune Jehovah, and embracing the eternal happiness of man! Nothing less than the great mystery of godliness, God manifest in the flesh! his vicarious obedience and death, the sovereignty of grace in electing, calling, justifying and saving sinners!

At the same time the Almighty has in many ways testified his displeasure with these things. He has both spoken with his mouth and touched with his hand. The light in which he has viewed the conduct of professors of this description in time past, and the punishment which he has inflicted on them, stands on record, witnessing against us. The issue of such a course, the whole world has already witnessed, and severely felt in the great Roman Catholic apostacy. God has through all these times of decline still raised up a few, and stirred up their spirit by his spirit to testify openly and with point against all these things. And besides all this, he has sent and is still sending one judgment after another to call us to repentance. But we have not repented.

Such is the awful state to which things have come amongst us, and such are the effects and consequences of not "*remembering the way in which the Lord has led.*"

And now what shall we look for to be the end of these things? If there is any point which ought to arrest the attention of every serious man, at this time, it is this. A true answer must embrace events that will deeply

touch every interest in community. There is not a church nor a state that shall stand neutral to it.

Let us for a moment return to the 8th ch. of Deut. from the 2nd verse of which, these papers were suggested, and we shall find it stated ver. 19—if thou do at all forget the Lord thy God, and walk after other gods, and serve them and worship them, I testify against you this day, that *ye shall surely perish*, as the nations which the Lord destroyed before your face, so shall ye perish." They did forget the Lord their God, and they have perished. And if, as I have proved, this "*remembering of the way in which the Lord leads,*" be a general rule, we have just reason to apprehend the same punishment as the due reward of our apostacy. On this point I shall only state the several things that occur to me and leave them to the serious reflection of the reader, and pass on to the last topic which I have in view at this time, viz. *what ought we to do?* First, then, it is scarcely possible to conclude any thing else from the preceding view of the sins of professors, than that God has given multitudes over to themselves. The very length which they have gone seems proof enough of this. There is no instance since the christian era of those who have gone so far ever returning again: neither does the passage just considered leave any ground to expect it—their backsliding courses have brought on a degree of insensibility and hardness of heart, that is without any parallel. It has generated a spirit of Deism, or I should say Atheism, which has out stripped its predecessors in subtlety, boldness and contempt, and is in many of its features entirely peculiar to this age of improvement—under its shade and nourishing, the depravity of the human heart hath arisen to a degree of daring and boldness in crime, which mocks at all restraint. These things will of themselves bring forth anarchy and ruin—and now already with what difficulty is it that churches and states are able to keep from falling to pieces. Either this is likely to be our doom, or which is still more probable, we shall again fall under the despotic and cruel bondage of the Roman Pontiff. "Perilous times are come," what ought we to do?

ART. III. *Abraham commanded to sacrifice Isaac.*

Gen. xxii. 14. "And Abraham called the name of that place, Jehovah-Jireh: as it is said to this day. In the mount of the Lord it shall be seen."

When a revelation is made by the God of heaven, a truth declared in his blessed word, or a command given, however mysterious that revelation, however trifling one may deem that truth, however painful that command, it is our duty to receive, believe and obey. The command given to Abraham to sacrifice his son, was indeed extraordinary and mysterious: still we are bound to acknowledge with the patriarch, that Jehovah, as the Lord of life, has an undoubted right to recall the life he has given—to fix the time, and to employ, either the sword, or disease, or the hand of a father, for the execution of his will. When reading too, this affecting history, and beholding the wise and merciful designs of Jehovah in all, can we but admire the power of that grace, which supported Abraham, and be convinced, that he, who in the face of every difficulty, submits to, and obeyed all the commands of the Lord, will never be a loser. How common is it for man—ignorant, and erring man—to reject those duties and injunctions, which cross their vain notions, or sinful desires and brand as unnecessary and non-essential, truths stamped with the authority of the God of heaven! Every command, every truth, whether

plain or mysterious, whether essential or non-essential, in our estimation, rests on the authority of Almighty God; its revelation is ordered by infinite wisdom, and to reject the least truth, to disobey the smallest command, is to scorn the wisdom, and trample on the authority which enjoined it. If there are mysteries in this book of heaven—if there are truths, the full reason of the revelation of which, we may not be able to explain, still resting on the unerring declaration, that "*all scripture is profitable,*" it is our duty to receive all with humility and reverence. That there are mysteries and difficulties in the bible, we freely grant; but this is only an additional proof that its author is Jehovah, that its origin is divine, as it contains revelations that far surpass the conception of finite minds. And be it observed, that though the bible requires us to believe, and contend earnestly for truths that are far above our reason, far beyond our comprehension, it never requires us to believe what contradicts right reason; while our belief of these mysterious rests on the unerring testimony of that God who cannot lie. The proud and conceited infidel, who professes to "reject every thing he cannot comprehend," on this principle can believe nothing, not even his own existence. The puny understanding of the wisest of mortals cannot comprehend one of the ten thousand mysteries, which in the works of creation and providence, are to be seen around us. "The grass grows for the cattle, and herbs for the use of man," but what man can tell us *how* it grows. Not a flower that blooms, not a leaf of the forest, not the minutest insect that sports in the sun-beams, but baffles the wisdom of the proudest and wisest of the sons of men. Not one of these proud rationalists can tell, why the same soil should produce a poisonous plant, and one necessary for the support of life: they can no more explain the mysterious union of soul and body, than any of the profound mysteries of the book of God. If the powers of the human mind cannot grasp these least of the works of God, if they can no more penetrate into the nature of the meanest reptile that crawls on the earth, than they can grasp the ocean in their hand, or tell an angel's form, or the nature of an angel's existence, how much less can they fully comprehend the nature and mysteries of an incomprehensible God? "It is as 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." As beings of yesterday, ignorant and perishing, let us bow with submission to all the truths of the bible: with a "thus saith the Lord," to warrant our belief, let us lay our limited reason, when it fails, at the foot of God's word, and esteeming all his commandments concerning all things to be right, humbly bend and adore before the infallible wisdom of the Most High. It was thus that Abraham acted. He is here seen, through faith in a covenant-God, triumphing in a trial more awful than perhaps ever wrung the heart; and exhibiting a spirit of submission to the will, and unreserved obedience to the commands of God, which has never been exceeded by man.

I propose then, to consider—

1. The circumstances of the event with which the text is connected, in the order in which they are recorded by the inspired penman.

2. The plain and necessary lesson we should draw from this portion of sacred history.

"And it came to pass, after these things, that God did tempt Abraham," after these things—after he had left at the command of heaven, his country, his kindred, and his father's house, for a land of strangers:—after many sufferings in that strange land—after the trials with which the quarrels of Sarah and Hagar, distracted his life, and poisoned his comfort: after being forced to drive from his house his first born, an outcast and a wanderer: after all these sorrows, a heavier storm is approaching; a

sharper trial must yet be encountered. All this was intended to teach Abraham, and to teach us that this is not our rest ; that our whole life is but a warfare ; that our dearest earthly comforts are but lent us for a season ; and that our brightest earthly hopes may be blighted in a moment.

After these things God did tempt Abraham—not by inciting to sin ; in this way God cannot tempt any :—but by placing Abraham in such a situation, and so ordering events, that the sincerity of his profession might be fully tested ; and his entire devotedness to God, be clearly displayed. The word here translated “tempt,” literally signifies “to try.” “After these things, God did try Abraham, and said unto him, Abraham : and he said Behold here I am. And he said, take now thy son, thine only son Isaac, whom thou lovest, and get thee into the land of Moriah ; and offer him there for a burnt offering upon one of the mountains which I will tell thee of.” Here was a plain and express command from the God of heaven to Abraham, to sacrifice his son. No reason is given, by a sovereign God, for this. The sacrifice was terrible, and the command of such a nature, that the heart where faith and love reigned not, would have been ready to rebel—to “curse God and die.” Look at the difficulties accompanying the command. The father must destroy his own son, must slay him with his own hands—must kill him, whose death would bring his gray hairs with sorrow to the grave—must thus at once, stab his reputation and his son to death—open the mouths of enemies to blaspheme his religion, and his God, and make himself through life, a mark for the finger of hatred and scorn to point at, as the savage and bloody father, who bound and butchered his only son. He must thus, also, apparently bury forever with the ashes of his Isaac, the precious promises of a merciful God that Isaac should be the support and comfort of his declining years, the head of many nations, the seed, in whom all the nations of the earth should be blessed.

Insurmountable as these difficulties at first might seem, the tried Abraham, strong in faith, and trusting confidently in the mercy of him who can bring light out of darkness, and good out of apparent evil, hesitated not. Though the natural feelings might rebel, and the world might censure, he knew he might confidently leave the explanation of this mysterious providence to him, who sees “the end from the beginning,” and will one day wither the arm and silence the tongue of every reviler ; while at the same time, he felt and knew that obedience was his duty. We know not in what way the will of heaven was revealed to Abraham.—But in whatever manner the command was given, Abraham was *assured* that it really proceeded from God. He was assured, beyond the possibility of a doubt that it was the voice of the Lord addressing him. We are not indeed required to believe contradictions. But Abraham, by the eye of faith, saw that the present command, did not contradict former promises. The death of Isaac, might indeed seem to destroy the promises made to him as the father of many nations : but Abraham knew that the Almighty God could raise his slaughtered Isaac to life again, could restore his dissolved body, again re-unite it to his soul, and even from the grasp of death, rescue the heir of the promises. Indeed, it was the belief of this that supported Abraham, and it was thus his faith reasoned, “accounting that God was able to raise him up even from the dead.” It was in the night, when deep sleep falleth on men, that Abraham heard the voice of God ; a voice dear to his heart ; a voice which he well knew, and which he had often heard with rapture. “Take now thy son,” the voice is heard commanding, “thine only son Isaac whom thou lovest”—how must this tender mention of his son, have awakened the attention, excited the hopes and caused the heart of the affectionate father to leap for joy. Take now thy son—that only one of thine—that Isaac whom thou

lovest; and go to Moriah: and what? Behold heaven opened, and the marks of Jehovah's favor descending there, on the head of thy beloved son? Take now that son, whom thou lovest, "and get thee into the land of Moriah, and offer him there for a burnt offering upon one of the mountains which I will tell thee of." How must this command, like a thunderbolt from heaven, have smitten and withered his very heart, crushed his hopes, and filled his soul, at first, with horror and amazement. To take his son, *his only one*; to slay his innocent Isaac; to witness his dying agonies, to listen to his dying groans; and then kindle the wood and burn the body of his Isaac to ashes:—all this he must do, all this he must witness; and O, what a faith was this! he faltered not. Had he listened to the suggestion of unbelievers, he might have been ready to wish, that if his Isaac must die, he might be spared the sight of his last agonies, that some other hand might slay the sacrifice.

He might be ready to feel and say, that his own life would be valueless, when his beloved son was gone. He might be ready and willing to say with David, "would to God my son I might die for thee"—willing to be driven a beggard outcast, from country and from home; willing to bar his own breast to the fatal blow: (ah! this would be easy,) but Abraham knew that God required obedience, not murmuring and lamentation.—Hiding from Sarah, and from Isaac, the anguish of his soul; stifling every doubt, every repining thought; bowing with resignation to the command of heaven, believing, that the God of infinite wisdom, would soon scatter the dark cloud, which hung over him, and his; and, that there was a gracious, though hidden design in all; he delays not, disputes not, "and Abraham rose up early in the morning, and saddled his ass, and took two of his young men with him, and Isaac, his son, and clave the wood for the burnt offering; and rose up, and went unto the place of which God had told him." What amazing faith, that could triumph, in a trial like this! Abraham, with a love to God which all the pleadings of natural affection could not quench; a faith stronger than death, and a firm reliance on that wisdom which can make darkness light, and difficulties plain, thus instantly prepares to obey. The place of sacrifice was three days journey distant. Abraham, though supported by divine grace, and submissive to the divine will, could not but feel such a fearful trial. He was not crushed by the blow, yet unless he had been more than mortal, he could not be insensible, nay, it would have been sinful to have been indifferent under it.* On the third day of this mournful journey, Abraham saw the place; pointed out probably, by a pillar of fire, or some appearance of gloom, as the spot where his son must die. Having left his servants at the foot of the mountain, "he took the wood of the burnt offering, and laid it upon Isaac, his son; and he took the fire in his hand, and a knife: and they went both of them together." For three mournful days the patriarch had struggled with his feelings. For three mournful days as he looked on his beloved son, and thought of the death to which he was doomed, thought of what he himself must do, and see, and suffer, the anguish of his heart must have been terrible, though his faith failed not. And now, as they

*I know not that it is correct to say, that faith "banished all fear and sorrow" from Abraham's breast; nor is it necessary to suppose that he was thus utterly dead to the feelings of natural affection. Jesus the great antitype offered himself willingly; though the human nature cried out on the cross, when the floods of wrath were rolling over his soul. Abraham did offer up his Isaac freely, and it was necessary that he should do so; as the Eternal Father freely gave up to a bloody and agonizing death, His co-equal, and co-eternal Son, for the ransom of our souls. Still, we have no scripture authority for saying, that the one was a "proper type" of the other, though the analogy is striking and instructive. It is not necessary then to suppose with Hervey, that Abraham's faith banished entirely sorrow from his soul; nor that without a pang or a "parting tear," he obeyed the divine injunction; neither does the gospel of the type require this supposition. See Hervey's *Theron and Aspasio*, Letter 11.

drew near the appointed place, "Isaac spake unto Abraham, his father, and said, My father: and he said here am I my son, and he said, Behold the fire and the wood, but where is the lamb for a burnt offering?" "My father"—how must this tender appellation, and how must the affecting question "where is the lamb for the burnt offering?" have touched the soul and thrilled through the heart of the parent, pleading for the life of the victim, with a force which nature, unsupported by grace, never could have resisted. There is a touching simplicity and beauty in the sacred narration here, which the heart feels, but the tongue cannot utter. "My father—behold the fire and the wood, but where is the lamb? and Abraham said, my son, God will provide himself a lamb for a burnt offering: so they went both of them together." Having built the altar and laid the wood in order, Abraham "bound Isaac his son and laid him on the altar upon the wood." Now let it be remembered here, that Isaac was in the very vigor of life, and according to the best computation, and the opinion of almost all the Jewish writers, was above thirty years of age. It is evident therefore, that his aged and infirm father never could have *forced* him to become a sacrifice. He must have been a willing victim. Still, it was necessary that he should be bound; bound as the sacrifices were all commanded to be, when offered to God; bound as a type of Jesus, who by wicked hands, was nailed to the cross, when he made his soul a sacrifice for our sins. And now hear the father revealing to his son the command of the Lord, and telling him that he was the "lamb" that must be slain and offered up, and for whose destruction the fire and the wood had been provided. Think of the father urging the son to bow to the orders of the Eternal, and behold the son willingly consenting to be bound, and laid on the altar to die. Without a murmur, it would seem, he bows to the will of Him, who is his own and his father's friend. Abraham binds his son and lays the victim on the altar at the command of God. The father embraces his dying son, the last farewell has been uttered, the last charge sent to the childless mother, and the last look raised to heaven, where soon there would be a blissful reunion; and now, Abraham takes the knife and stretches forth his hand to slay his son. The heart is fixed, the arm is raised, the fatal blow is descending, and in another moment the life-blood of the son will be running at the father's feet. At that awful moment the voice of the God of mercy is heard: "Abraham, Abraham—lay not thine hand upon the lad, neither do thou any thing unto him; for now I know that thou fearest God, seeing thou hast not withheld thy son, thine only son, from me." With what unutterable transport would this voice from heaven fill the soul of the patriarch; and O, how would the feelings of his heart gush forth, as he looked on his rescued son. Abraham's obedience was accepted, another victim providentially provided in the place of Isaac; and promises of blessings great beyond all conception, and lasting as eternity, confirmed by the oath of the living God, to this father of the faithful. Well might Abraham, to proclaim the glory of his God, and to encourage the hearts of believers under the severest trials, name the place of deliverance "*Jehovah-Jireh*," the Lord will see, the Lord will provide. And thus through all ages will he appear for the help of his chosen. In the darkest hour, rest with Abraham on the promises of a covenant God. Under the heaviest trials, lean on his arm, in the face of danger and death, obey his will, and though the eye of nature may see nothing before you but blasted hopes, a life of sorrow and reproach; clouds and calamities darkening every step of your earthly pilgrimage, till death comes and lays you in the grave: yet let the eye of faith look through the dark cloud, and read the name and see the hand of him, who is guiding and governing all. The Lord is on your side, and as thy day is thy strength shall be. Follow the Lord whithersoever he goeth. In

sickness and sorrow, when the heart is broken and filled with bitterness, trust in his word; amid all the dangers of the christian warfare, desert not his banner, but cleave to his testimonies, and stand fast in the faith. Thus shall you be safe in life, triumphant in death, and through eternity, rejoice and rest with Abraham and Isaac in the kingdom of heaven.

"And Abraham called the name of that place Jehovah-Jireh, as it is said to this day. In the mount of the Lord it shall be seen." *As it is said to this day*; that is from the days of Abraham to the time of Moses, the inspired penman of this history; it is said," it is used as a proverbial expression, "in the mount of the Lord it shall be seen," or rather, *in the mount, the Lord will be seen.* That is, as the Almighty God rescued Abraham and his son in the mount, in the very moment of extremity; so will he always appear for the deliverance of his people. In the day of danger, in the hour of trial, in the very moment, when even hope is extinguished, and nothing left but darkness and despair, "the Lord will be seen," a present help in the time of need; "the Lord will provide," and display his power, in supplying their every want.

II. The practical instructions we should draw from this narrative.—In "looking unto Abraham our father," we are taught many useful and impressive lessons. May the God of Abraham and of Isaac inspire us with that spirit, and fill us with that faith which will enable us, like them, to bow with submission to his holy will.

1. Christians are taught from this history the necessity of a ready and willing obedience to all the commands of God. We must be willing to give up every earthly comfort at his command, and brave every danger, rather than disobey his will. Father and mother, wife and children, and life may be dear; yet, if Christ is not in our estimation dearer than all, we are not his disciples. "He that loveth father or mother more than me, is not worthy of me; and he that loveth son or daughter more than me, is not worthy of me." (Matth. x. 37.) You love your relatives, your children, your friends, and it is your duty to love them; but what if God should command you, as he commanded Abraham, to part with your beloved child? Behold your son. Make the supposition. What if the Lord should commission death to cut him down, and your nearest and dearest be seen withering in the grasp of the king of terrors to-morrow? You might weep bitterly over your blasted hopes, yet would thy soul bow without a murmur to the will of the Eternal? True, we are not now called, like Abraham, to sacrifice the child of our hopes, yet unless like him we are willing to part with every thing for Christ, we deserve not to bear his name. If Abraham had refused to obey the divine command, terrible to nature as that command was, his disobedience would just have proved that he loved his Isaac more than his God; that his child was his idol, and his professed love of and obedience to Jehovah, as the Lord of him and his, a mere mockery.

If, when we know the will of God, though that will should cross our dearest desires, and require the sacrifice of our most beloved hopes, yet, if we refuse to obey, we are not Christians. The world may call us Christians,—our own deluded hearts may hope that we are Christians; yet, if we deliberately disobey one command,—if we deliberately reject one truth in the hand-writing of the Eternal, we break every command, and receive *no truth* from right motives. The seal of Heaven is upon all the words of the book of God, and "*if any man love me, he will keep my words.*"

Here, then, is the grand test to which we should bring our professions and our hopes. Does God, for instance, command us to observe family worship, and has he threatened to pour out his fury on the families that

call not on his name? He who lives in the wilful neglect of this duty, disobeys God, is not Christ's disciple, and shall not inherit the kingdom of heaven. Is it fashionable to omit imploring the blessing of heaven on the food we eat, and giving God thanks for his unmerited bounty? He who is conformed to the world in this respect, who neglects this duty, is worse than the heathen, who never neglected pouring out an offering to their idol deities before eating; yea, he is unworthy to herd even with the brutes, for the very ox "knows his owner," and the hand that feeds him, "and the ass his master's crib," where his wants are supplied; but the neglecter of this duty knows not and owns not his Lord and preserver, and shall not inherit the kingdom of heaven.

Is there, then, *no duty* which we dare to neglect, no sin upon which we are not making war, and from which are not praying to be delivered—no truth which is not dear to our souls, no ordinance which we do not love? Is it again a duty to contend earnestly for the faith delivered unto the saints? He who neglects this—he who instead of boldly stemming the torrent of impiety and error, is courting popularity, willingly swimming with the stream, and refusing, at the command of God, to sacrifice his wordly interest or reputation for the sake of the truth, has his reward, and shall not inherit the kingdom of heaven. Such time-servers dread the scorn of dying worms for a day, and yet risk becoming the sport and the prey of tormenting fiends forever. They dread the laugh and scoff of those whose mockery, this night, may be changed into hopeless wailing, and yet can expose the guilty soul to the terrible wrath of an insulted God. Awful delusion! Alas! such manifest not the spirit of an Abraham. Christ has not the throne of the heart: it bows to another master and other laws. They are not willing to slay their pride, their unholy passions, their love of the world, at the command of heaven; and how can they hope to enter the new Jerusalem? They are not willing to expose error, because the world loves it; and rather than encounter the "world's dread laugh," they will drink the fatal poison, brave the danger, and expose the soul a laughing stock to devils through eternity. They can neglect family worship and secret prayer, because they dislike it, or because it is fashionable to do so; while they dare not oppose innovations on God's institutions, because the world says it is bigotry, forgetting that it is better to be branded bigots here than burn forever with the "*fearful* and unbelieving." (Rev. ii. 18.) They can forget that God has forbidden all to add to or take from his word and institutions, and they can join in the laugh against those who faithfully and fearlessly cleave to the truth. Alas! instead of the spirit of an Abraham, theirs is a spirit that would have joined with pagan and popish Rome, in the attempt to drown the truth in the blood of its friends. Theirs is a spirit that would have helped to kindle the fires, and sharpen the axe that drank the blood of the martyrs,—blood shed in defence of the truths they are now trampling on—the blood, perhaps, of *their forefathers*, and which, if they repent not, will one day fall on the heads of their degenerate sons, in judgments that will waste the soul with agony, and make the conscience an eternal hell.

O be faithful, then, like Abraham, and obedient to the word of the Lord. Let it be a light to your feet, the pillar of fire to guide you through the wilderness; and when enticed to forsake it, remember that we are going into eternity where that word, and not the opinions of men will decide our destiny. Follow Jesus, though you should meet the frown of the world: strive to please and obey him, though you should displease the whole world. Compared with acceptance in his sight, it is a very small matter to be judged unjustly of men, or blamed for what the Lord will one day own and bless.

Let our obedience, too, be *willing* and *ready*. Abraham, when commanded to sacrifice his son, "rose up early in the morning, and went unto the place of which God had told him." Let us not grudge to give or suffer for the cause of Christ. Let the dead bury their dead; and even when the last sand in the hour glass of their time is sinking, let them court the praise of men, and meanly grovel for what is worthless as dust, and will benefit them as little at a judgment seat as the wind which sweeps over their graves. Let the men of the world pant after the dust of the earth, and when they have heaped up their thousands, still unsatisfied, grasp for more; let them, for the sake of popularity, desert the standard of heaven, or careless slumber while the enemy is breaking in upon the churches like a flood; but let us remember that our great business upon earth is to promote God's glory, our first and chief concern to be faithful to king Jesus, and to live as those who hope to be forever with the Lord.

2. We are taught from this history, that God, for the instruction and trial of his people, is pleased in mercy and wisdom to call them to pass through much tribulation on their way to heaven. Christian, is some beloved gourd withered? Is the reed on which you were leaning broken? Does death strike down a husband, a wife, a brother, or a friend? Are you called, like Abraham, to part with a beloved Isaac—to see the child in whom all your earthly hopes centre, and around whom the fond affections of the soul are wrapped, struggling with disease, sinking in death, and buried in the grave? Yet refrain from weeping. Trust in Abraham's God, and Abraham's promise is yours. (Gen. xvi. 1.) Your friend, your beloved child, if clothed with the righteousness of Emmanuel, is in heaven—is an angel, and his voice is now mingling with angels, in the song of praise before the throne. And could you wish him back again? Can you be so selfish as to wish him to come from where he shall weep no more, and for your sake struggle again with the sorrows of a world like this? O no! The conflict is ended forever. The battle is fought, the victory is won; the Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away: blessed be the name of the Lord.

Like Israel in Egypt, we are thus made to feel by the hand of affliction that this polluted earth is a house of bondage; that the pleasures of time are but vanity and vexation of spirit, and that there is not throughout this miserable world, a resting place for the soul. It is a valley of tears.—Our Father's house is the only place where the wicked cease from troubling, and the weary are at rest. And shall we not bless God, for even driving us to that ark of safety, where the devouring waves cannot reach us; to that foundation which no tempest can shake; to that strong hold which no arrow of wrath can ever enter!

Friend of Jesus, fear not your trials, sink not under your bereavements, but let them lead you for comfort to God, and long to be at home. Though disease should be wasting your frame; though called, like Abraham, to part with a beloved Isaac; though your whole life should be one continued scene of trial, deep calling unto deep—desolation advancing upon desolation—cloud darkening and condensing on cloud, and not a ray break through on the troubled soul, till the light of eternity scatters the gloom, and death has placed you in the promised land; yet fear not, neither be dismayed, ye servants of the living God. The sickness which drives the bloom from the cheek, the trials which fill our houses with sorrow, and dig the graves of the nearest and dearest, are all intended to lead us to seek and prepare for that better world, where the blessed inhabitants shall never more say, I am sick, and they that dwell therein shall be forgiven their iniquity. Besides, we must look by the eye of faith to the end of these trials. We must not only look at Abraham ascending

he mountain, and lifting the knife; at Job, sitting a sick and wretched eper [!] in the ashes; at Joseph in the dungeon; at Paul and Silas in chains,—see them experiencing, even in this world, that the end of the Lord is very piteous; and above all, see them on their thrones of glory, adoring the mercy of him who preserved them in the fiery trial, and led them through the waters of affliction and death to his holy habitation.—Like them, be faithful, and with them you shall soon triumph on the heights of Zion, and together bow before the throne, and proclaim the praise of him, who is still *Jehovah Jireh*.

[To be continued.]

ART. IV. *The Love of the Holy Spirit, displayed in our Salvation.*

(Concluded from page 44.)

¶ About two pages of this, which should have come in here, have been lost.

7. Complete victory over all enemies, is another valuable blessing of salvation, which is ascribed to the Holy Ghost. "If ye through the Spirit mortify the deeds of the body ye shall live." Again, "this is the victory by which we overcome the world, even our faith," of which the Spirit is the author. But, for this it acts upon Christ. When faith is bathed in the blood of the lamb, it receives a celestial edge, and cuts down every enemy. Thus we can conquer devils, "above all, taking the shield of faith wherewith ye shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked," "they overcame by the blood of the lamb." "We are more than conquerors through him that loved us." In fine, victory over death and the grave, is ascribed to the Holy Spirit! "If the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead, dwell in you, he will also quicken your mortal body, by his Spirit that dwelleth in you;" But this is not to the exclusion of the other persons; for saith Christ, "as the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them" directly and immediately, "so the son quickeneth whom he will," directly and immediately. Nay, "the hour cometh and now is, when all that are in their graves, shall hear his voice, and shall come forth."

8. Lastly, the Holy Spirit completes the application of salvation, "by leading believers to the land of uprightness," there to inherit eternal life. But this is not to the exclusion of the Father and the Son. "This gift of God," i. e. the Father, "is eternal life." And yet, saith Christ himself, "I give unto them eternal life." Both persons are joined together in the last and kindest 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."

Thus, we have contemplated *how* and *when* the Holy Spirit displays his love in our salvation, not to the *exclusion*, but with the *concurrence* of the other persons. The reader will easily observe a repetition frequently, of thought and argument. This is not only unavoidable, but useful, when proving that the Son and the Holy Ghost, equally as the Father, act as scripture agents, in displaying the love in our salvation.

Some readers know the reason why we have discussed the subject in *this manner*, others need not. What we proposed was, to give plain and distinct account, from the holy scriptures, of all the persons in the Godhead in our salvation; how far we have succeeded, the intelligent, candid reader may judge. If you find any thing contrary to the holy scriptures, trample it under your feet. But if what we have presented unto you, be contained *there*, receive it; not because it is published by a creature like

yourself, but, because it is the revelation of a God, who "is light," and cannot be deceived, and just, and will not impose upon you. "All the words of his mouth are righteousness; there is nothing froward or perverse in them."

A great many very important inferences, both doctrinal and practical, might be mentioned, as flowing from this extensive and delightful subject. But, as this, and the preceding contemplations, have swelled far beyond what was intended, we shall conclude by mentioning the observations, in relation to the display of divine love, in our salvation in general. If divine love be displayed, distinctly and jointly, by all the persons in the God-head, then we may infer the matchless excellency of the work of salvation itself—the absolute certainty of its being completely accomplished—and that the glory arising from it, ought to be equally ascribed to them all. The work of our salvation, itself, is without a parallel, there is none like or second unto it, there is more divinity expressed in our redemption, than in the creation of the universe. God made and established universal nature, by the breath of his mouth. "He spake, and it was done, he commanded, and it stood fast," but to accomplish our salvation, there must be a counsel of peace! The incarnation of the Son of God, and all that followed. The Lord of glory must be crucified, and "God purchase the church with his own blood." The holy Spirit must be sent down to inspire the prophets, qualify the Saviour, furnish the Apostles, and apply the great salvation, as hath been repeatedly observed; "the gospel is the wisdom of God, in a mystery." It is in its astonishing contrivance—in its exalted privileges—and in its glorious effects; the admiration of angels; and will be the holy wonder of the redeemed from among men, to all eternity. Angels desired to look into the mysteries of it, and were the heralds to proclaim its glory." Luke, ii. 14. Tucker, on predestination, p. 169.

In opposition to this, a distinguished author boldly asserts, "there are a great many untenable notions, which are entertained and reiterated, by commentators and divines, as indisputable maxims, which it would be of importance to the cause of religion to discard: Among these he mentions the following; "that there never was, nor never will be, through all the ages of eternity, so wonderful a display of the divine glory, as in the cross of Christ, that the wisdom of God, is no where, so illustriously displayed, throughout the universe, as in the scheme of redemption—that the chief employment of the future state, will be to pry into the *mysteries* of redemption."—Dick's Christian Philosopher, p. p. 532—53.

One would think, from the preceding sentences, that the title of the book ought to be understood, "per antiphrasin" i. e. to mean the very contrary, when the works of nature are represented as equal, if not superior to the works of grace; and mentioned as a drawback upon the principal glory of the gospel, and the most powerful motive to holiness, viz. the cross of Christ. But here observe, first, we are plainly told, in the scriptures of truth, "that God hath magnified his word above his name," &c. above all that he hath done in the whole creation. The formation of the human nature, and the constitution of the person of Christ, is presented to the eternal wonder and admiration of angels and men. "Behold, I create a *new thing* on the earth, a woman shall encompass," i. e. by conception, "a man." "Behold a virgin shall conceive, and shall bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel." Well may his name be called wonderful, when we consider the way he was born, the manner in which he was given. He is called "the beginning of the creation of God," not because he was first made, but because he is the best of any thing. "The noblest work of God." Secondly, what God hath done, or will do, in all the works of nature, he cannot tell, but he hath given us a sure record of his Son: "Without controversy, great is the mystery of godliness, God was

manifest in the flesh"—here you have the history of a God, his journey from a throne to the cross, and back to a crown. Thirdly, for the author to affirm that these doctrines which we believe and maintain, "set limits to the divine perfections and operations," is absurdity in the extreme. When Christ crucified, is by way of eminence, called "the power and the wisdom of God." Nay, here we have a display of "the manifold wisdom of God." Lastly, the works of nature will not be forgot in heaven, thus they sing, "thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory, and honor, and power, for thou hast created all things, and for thy glory they are, and were created." But a glorified Saviour will be the principal object of the adoration of angels and saints, to all eternity. They sing a new song, one that never had a precedent, and never will have a parallel; nay there is an eternal newness in it, "saying with a loud voice, worthy is the Lamb that was slain," and again, "blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, forever." Thus, you see the propriety of the warning given by an apostle, "beware, lest any man spoil you through philosophy." "The grand scheme of the gospel exhibits the divine excellencies, far beyond the whole creation besides, yet the acute astronomer, who measures the distances and magnitudes, and traces the motions of the heavenly bodies, and the sagacious philosopher, who prys with such intensness into the arcanum of nature, for the most part content themselves with viewing its beauties, and contemplate with more pleasure, the position of the planets, the bloom of a plumb, or the plumage of a butterfly, than that astonishing work, for which the whole frame of nature was formed, and is still upheld and preserved." Tucker, on predestination, p. p. 169—170.

Saith, Dr. Owen, "the wisdom of God displayed in the works of nature, bears not the proportion of the smallest star, to the sun in his meridian splendor, to that wisdom which is displayed in the person and works of Christ. And though this, now, be with many nothing, yet in eternity it will be all." It is hoped the length of this illustration, will not tire the pious reader, who bewails how much Deism prevails in this age.

2. We may be sure that the work of our salvation, will in due time, be completely accomplished. For this purpose, the church will be preserved on earth, i. e. "till the mystery of God be finished." Thus saith Christ himself, "upon this rock will I build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."—though *Hades* signifies the place of the dead, our Saviour does not mean here, the *resurrection*. Because, first, there is no proportion in the similitude, between the resurrection, and the rock upon which the church is built. The gradual death of believers does not tend to extirpate the church, but rather to build it up in glory. Secondly, the period in which the church is in danger of being razed, is before the resurrection. Thirdly, as all public business among the Jews, was transacted at the gates of the city, so "the gates of hell," i. e. all the combined policy and power of hell and earth, wicked men and the powers of darkness, shall not be able, by persecutions and heresies, totally, and finally, to prevail against the church. If this had been possible, the doctrines of the church would have been lost in the death of her martyrs, and her members would have swimm'd away in rivers of blood. But, the blood of the martyrs was the seed of the church. Christ shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand." "His name shall be continued as long as the sun," i. e. he shall have sons born in Zion. His glory in the church runs parallel with his glory in the creation; he will have a church, whilst he has a world.

What the Father hath purposed, shall be accomplished: "His counsel shall stand, and he will do all his pleasure." The election shall obtain. "The foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal, the Lord knoweth them that are his." The son himself will present to his Father all

the redeemed. "Of all thou hast given me, I have lost nothing." Lastly, the good Spirit will lead all the saints to the land of uprightness.

The glory arising from our salvation ought to be ascribed *equally* to all the persons in the Godhead. As they are equal in power, i. e. in influence and operation, so they are equal in glory. To the Father, Son and Holy Spirit we shall give eternal praises in heaven, as appears by all the accounts of what they do in that world. The throne of God and the Lamb is in it, and his servants serve him. There is but one throne for both persons, and the honors of salvation and power, glory and strength, are equally ascribed to him that sits upon the throne, and to the Lamb forever. It is from them that the Spirit speaks unto the churches, and there he will be adored when he has fetched us all up. I shall therefore now conclude, as I hope to be in the work of heaven, with glory to the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, as three distinct persons, and one living and true God, forever and ever. Amen and amen."*

Thus, reader, the writer hath finished these contemplations on divine love. They were composed for the consolation of his own soul. For the same purpose they are presented to you. We conclude, in the grateful language of an apostle, "Blessed be God, even the father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of mercies and God of all comfort, who comforteth us in all our tribulations, that we may be able to comfort them which are in any trouble, by the comfort wherewith we ourselves are comforted of God."

QUISLIBET.

ART. VI. Case of Mr. Barnes.

The Assembly's Second Presbytery met agreeably to adjournment in the session room of the First Presbyterian Church, on Tuesday morning, the 30th ult. The Presbytery dissolved the pastoral relation between the Rev. Dr. Ely and the Third Presbyterian Church of this city, and dismissed the Rev. Alfred H. Dashiell to join the Presbytery of Illinois; they also recognized the validity of the act of the last Assembly, by which their proceedings in relation to the Fifth Presbyterian Church were reversed.

The subject of Mr. Barnes' trial was then brought up for consideration. The minutes of the preceding meetings relative to the matter were read, together with the charges preferred against Mr. Barnes, by Dr. George Junkin, of the Presbytery of Newton. The following is a copy of the letter and charges:

Letter from the Rev. George Junkin, D. D., to the Rev. the Second Presbytery of Philadelphia, containing his charges against Rev. Albert Barnes.

Brethren—To you belongs the solemn and responsible duty of "condemning erroneous opinions which injure the purity and peace of the church—of removing and judging ministers—of watching over the personal and professional conduct of all your members."

Now one of your members has, as appears to me, published in a recent work certain erroneous opinions, of a dangerous tendency to the peace and purity of the church, and to the souls of its members. In that publication, he has observed, "he who holds an opinion on the subject of religion, will not be ashamed to avow it." As, therefore, he appears willing to let his opinions be known, and to abide their consequences, and as to me they appear dangerous, (in the absence of a more suitable advocate of the opposite truths) I ask of your reverend body the privilege of preferring charges against the Rev. Albert Barnes.

* Bradbury's Sermons on Baptism, pp. 194, 195.

As I have stated in a letter to that brother, "the object is peace, through union in the truth; and I hope the God of truth and peace will direct us to a happy issue.—Most conscientiously do I believe that you have fallen into dangerous error: I feel that *your* doctrine shakes the foundation of my hope for eternity. If it be true, then I cannot 'read my title clear to mansions in the skies.'"

Around the discussion of a subject so solemn, I cannot doubt the Son of God will throw a hallowed influence, which will call up feelings very different from those that too often agitate ecclesiastical bodies, when principles of minor consequence acquire exciting power from adventitious circumstances. I have also stated in that letter, the opinion that peace and union in evangelical efforts cannot take place, so long as these important doctrinal points remain unsettled. Hence this measure. It is designed to produce a legal decision, and put an end to the distractions consequent upon present fluctuations. I do therefore pray and beseech the Presbytery to take order in the premises, and to facilitate the issue with the least possible delay. I have no witnesses to cite but brother Barnes himself, and shall be confined to his testimony contained in his Notes on Romans. These are referred to in part in connexion with the charges, and other portions will be read on the trial for further proof and illustration.

THE CHARGES.

The Rev. Albert Barnes is hereby charged with maintaining the following doctrines, contrary to the standards of the Presbyterian church, viz :

1. That all sin consists in voluntary action. Witness his notes on the epistle to the Romans, pp. 249, 123, 192, 124, 116.

2. That Adam (before and after his fall) was ignorant of his moral relations to such a degree that he did not know the consequences of his sin would or should reach any farther than to natural death. *Idem*, p. 115.

3. That unregenerate men are able to keep the commandments, and convert themselves unto God, pp. 164, 165, 108.

4. That faith is an act of the mind, and not a principle, and is itself imputed for righteousness, pp. 94, 95.

Mr. Barnes is also charged with denying the following doctrines, which are taught in the standards of the church, viz :

5. That God entered into covenant with Adam, constituting him a federal or covenant head, and representative to all his natural descendants, pp. 114, 123, 118, 115, 120, 121, 123.

6. That the first sin of Adam is imputed to his posterity, pp. 10, 117, 119, 121, 127, 123.

7. That mankind are guilty, i. e. liable to punishment, on account of the sin of Adam, pp. 123, 123.

8. That Christ suffered the proper penalty of the law, as the vicarious substitute of his people, and thus took away legally their sins, and purchased pardon. Same as on the 6th and 7th charges, also pp. 39, 90.

9. That the righteousness, i. e. the active obedience of Christ to the law, is imputed to his people for their justification, so that they are righteous in the eye of the law, and therefore justified, pp. 28, 34, 35, 94, 95, 127, 212.

10. Mr. Barnes also teaches, in opposition to the standards, that justification is simply pardon, pp. 28, 29, 110, 124, 127, 123, 182, 217.

I further charge Mr. Barnes with teaching, as referred to the 1st, 2d, 3d, 4th, and 10th of the above doctrines, in *opposition to the holy scriptures*, and with denying the 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th and 9th of the above specifications, *contrary to the word of God*.

The moderator then called upon the accused for his plea to the indictment, guilty or not guilty. Mr. Barnes arose and stated that he had no desire to throw embarrassment and difficulty in the way of trial; but that he felt a difficulty in giving a plea to an indictment which consisted of so many particulars. He acknowledged that he held some of the points alleged in the libel to be errors, and he denied that he held others. He would feel no difficulty in pleading, if there had been some specific charge, as of heresy; but under the present circumstances, he could not reply by a simple affirmative or negative to the general indictment. He then presented in writing the following, as his special plea :

"In reply to the inquiry whether I am guilty or not guilty, I allege that the Book of Discipline, chap. v. sec. 10 and 13, supposes that the accusations which can be brought against a minister of the gospel must be either of crime, or heresy, or schism; that until I am apprised whether these charges be of crime, heresy or schism, I cannot answer in general to the inquiry whether I am guilty or not guilty; that some of the

doctrines which are charged on me I hold, and some of them I do not ; but that I neither have taught, nor do I teach any thing, according to my best judgment, contrary to the word of God, nor do I deny any truths taught in the word of God, as it is alleged that I do in the indictment now before the Presbytery."

Messrs. Duffield and Patterson insisted that Mr. Barnes could not be tried on the indictment, as it now stood ; that he must be charged with some crime or offence, to the establishment of which the prosecutor should direct his proof ; that he could not be tried for mere matters of opinion, which did not involve heresy, and that it would be unconstitutional, as well as a great waste of time, to consider the charges as they now stood.

Dr. Junkin remarked that the charges did relate to a specific offence, inasmuch as they declared that the accused held and taught doctrines which were contrary to the scriptures and to the standards of the church, and that he had not comprehended these charges under the general head of heresy, not from any fear of consequences, but because the term heresy was equivocal, and subject to a diversity of interpretation. The first morning was spent in desultory remarks on this point, by which an attempt was made to induce the prosecutor to charge the accused generally with heresy.

After the cause was referred to the court, the roll was called : Mr. Patterson gave it as his opinion that no error had been proved against the accused. Dr. Ely read a paper which he wished to be adopted by Presbytery as its final judgment, and which declared the acquittal of the accused ; and supported it by one of his peculiar speeches, in which he reconciled Mr. Barnes' views to the strictest orthodoxy, as far as *substance of doctrine* was concerned. Rev. Messrs. Scott, Judson and Davis concurred in opinion with Dr. Ely, without further remark.

The Rev. Mr. Barber then arose in order, and *undesignedly* gave a strong argument in favor of the prosecution. He stated that he had lately come into the Presbyterian church, and was compelled to express his surprise and regret that in the impeachment of Mr. Barnes, the Confession of Faith as well as the Bible was introduced to support the indictment. This was hoisting the Confession of Faith into a wrong place.— For his part, he would not like to be tried on the ground of the Confession of Faith. Mr. Barnes might be proved to be against the Confession, and yet not against the Bible. The Bible, as he could prove, was the only infallible rule of faith and practice, and must therefore be the only standard in trials for errors in doctrine, and there was no possible authority for proceeding against a minister of the gospel for going against the standards. He was glad to hear Mr. Barnes declare that when he wrote his commentary he had no Confession or Catechisms lying beside him, and that he had not inquired whether his views squared with any system.— For his own part, he had received the Confession as containing a *system*, and not in all its parts, and none but a good Catholic could believe all that the church believed. Now if he should depart from this Confession, he should not be charged with heresy, but merely with hypocrisy, as Dr. Wilson had charged Dr. Beecher. For his part, he believed that the Confession taught that all sin was voluntary, for what else could it be, when it was a transgression of the law ? He believed, too, that men could do all that God required, and he was glad that he did not hold the opposite doctrine, to paralyze him when preaching to sinners. If Mr. Barnes' views were against the Confession, what of that ? The professors in Princeton had jostled out of the Confession the old view of imputation, and put in another view of their own, and Mr. Barnes had just as good a right to change the doctrines as they had. He believed that Mr. Barnes had taught views on the subject of imputation and the cove-

nants which were contrary to the Confession of Faith, but denied that they were contrary to the Bible.

This was the general strain of the remarks of one who professed to have adopted the standards of our church; and the whole speech might be considered as one of the best possible arguments for the necessity of the right of examination maintained by the last Assembly.

Mr. Barnes was ultimately acquitted by the Presbytery; but from this decision Dr. Junkin appealed.

ART. VII. *Dr. Junkin's Appeal.*

LAFAYETTE COLLEGE, July 16th, 1835.

To Rev. John L. Grant, Moderator, and to the
Rev. Second Presbytery of Philadelphia.

Rev. and dear Brethren: You are hereby officially informed that I intend to appeal to the Synod of Philadelphia, at its next meeting, to be held in the borough of York, on the last Wednesday of October next, against your recent decision in the case of the Rev. Albert Barnes. This appeal is from the "definitive sentence." Its general ground is "a manifestation of prejudice in the case, and mistake," and consequent injustice in the decision.

Allow me, before proceeding to specify the reasons which shut me up to the belief that the court was prejudiced and did err in judgment, to say that I impeach no motives—I charge no *corrupt* prejudice, no *intentional* mistake or error upon any man. Men do often err under the purest motives, and are often powerfully prejudiced whilst perfectly unconscious of it. With this single remark, I proceed to detail the reasons why I appeal on the above named general grounds, viz:

1. Because the Presbytery, nearly three months after the charges had been received, and the day fixed for trial, attempted to constrain the prosecutor to change them, by prefixing the general charge of *heresy*, and did actually pass a resolution refusing to hear the parties, merely because this term was absent; and upon the prosecutor saying, in answer to a question put to him, that *in his opinion* the errors charged amounted to heresy, the Presbytery made a record which amounted virtually to a change of the indictment to a general charge of heresy. The prosecutor, now appellant, had stated his objections to the use of this term. First, it is a vague term, not defined in our books: no two, perhaps, of the Presbytery themselves, would agree in what constitutes heresy. Its use, therefore, could only create confusion, and throw a character of indefiniteness around charges of error, which he had labored to make definite and precise. Secondly, this term is a bugbear, and is often used to excite popular commotion of an unpleasant character, and may therefore greatly prejudice the mind against the one who accuses another of error, and in favor of the accused.

Thus the Presbytery manifested favor toward Mr. Barnes, in giving him and his friends the opportunity of exciting odium against the accused by allusions and references to persecution, and to the "inquisitorial toils" of the prosecutor. Accordingly this phraseology was actually used by one of the judges, (Rev. John Smith) and not without effect.

Thus also, the Presbytery changed substantially the ground and nature of the prosecution, and led themselves into error. In their final verdict,

they assume heresy as the general charge; and in giving their opinions, some members had their eye constantly on that fearful term, the meaning of which the court did not define. So the Rev. Mr. Barbour opened his remarks: "I never can give my verdict," said he, "that brother Barnes has been guilty of *heresy*." And again, "the Confession was not made for a trap to catch heretics;" and more of the same kind. So the Rev. John Smith and the Rev. N. S. Smith rung the changes on the word heresy, and evidently were engrossed with that undefined idea. So Elder Hinckle said, "the prosecutor has failed in establishing the charge of *heresy* against the defendant." So Elder Darrach, "I would not say Mr. Barnes was guilty of *heresy*." And thus the court was carried off the ground of the charges, and decided on a case not before them. Heresy, with many, is some horrible thing, for which a man must be burnt: thus lost in a term undefined and undefinable, the court, as appears to me, erred in judgment. They shuddered at the idea of burning Mr. Barnes.

2. Because the accused was not called upon by the court to put in a plea to each charge specifically. Dis. v. 10: "The charges shall be read to him, and he shall be called upon to say whether he is guilty or not." Now cases may occur wherein an accused person may plead guilty to one and not to another of the charges, and unless the question be distinctly put, "do you admit the truth of this first charge or not?" And so of the rest, it cannot be known what the plea is; and if no special plea be put to each count of the indictment, the prosecutor and the court are put to unnecessary trouble, and kept in ignorance of what they are called upon to do, whether to prove the truth, or only the relevancy of the charge.—This violation of rule is the more censurable, because a Presbytery is a court of conscience, and every person arraigned ought to have it put to his conscience to say whether the things charged are true or not. But the 12th section settles this question. "If the minister, when he appears, will not confess, but denies the facts alleged against him," &c. Clearly this contemplates an explicit acknowledgment or denial of the things charged. Now Mr. B., in the plea he put in, admitted some of the charges, and denied others; but the Presbytery did not require him to specify which he admitted and which he denied—so that the plea amounted to nothing. He says, "I neither have taught nor do I teach any thing, according to my best judgment, contrary to the word of God; nor do I deny any truths taught in the word of God, as it is alleged that I do in the indictment now before the Presbytery." Can any candid man read this plea against charges of holding doctrines contrary to the word of God and the Confession of Faith, without feeling that the accused admits teaching doctrines contrary to the Confession of Faith? And is this plea any thing more than any errorist in every age has put in? Who does not know that all errorists that have troubled the church and do trouble her, always profess to found their doctrines on the Bible? In reference to the Confession of Faith, there is absolutely no plea at all. The prosecutor has always been of opinion, and by the admissions of Mr. B. now more than ever, that had he been put to a special plea, he would have acknowledged the truth of at least a majority of the charges, as he has done of the principal ones, so far as the standards are concerned, and would have justified himself on the ground of scripture. Thus, it is believed, prejudice was manifested in favor of the accused; for by this course he was left to all the benefit of a denial, where he could do it with a clear conscience—whilst he had all the advantage of silence, where he could not have denied. By this, too, the trial was greatly protracted.

Thus, also, the appellant and the court are left still in doubt whether Mr. B. admits or denies certain points. Dr. Ely in his paper said Mr. B.

included Christ's active obedience in the matter of the believer's justification, and did not teach that justification is simply pardon. On the contrary, Rev. Mr. Patterson said he believed Mr. B. held the common doctrine of the New-England divines, and the doctrine of Dr. Dwight; which is, that justification is simply and only pardon. Thus, justice, in this state of the case, could not be expected. This incipient error led on to others.

3. Another reason for thinking that there was some little bias in the court, is the high estimate in which, deservedly, some at least of the members held Mr. B., as to talents, and his congregation as to respectability and influence. It will be remembered that the Presbytery held its meetings in the lecture room where the accused had usually met his people, and many of them were present during the trial. It is hardly conceivable that the good brethren should not be insensibly influenced. Accordingly, one, in closing his remarks, said, "Never let me be found condemning a man to whom God has given such mighty powers of mind, and a congregation so dignified and influential."

4. My fourth reason for appealing on the ground of prejudice leading to error, is, that the Presbytery have, in their decision, endorsed some of Mr. B.'s alleged errors, and having made them their own, could not be presumed altogether impartial in their judgment. Ex. gr., "This exercise of mind and heart," (Abraham's) say they, "the apostle says was imputed to Abraham for righteousness." See 4th reason. And again, under 5th reason, "It (the Confession of Faith) does not intimate that independent of, and subsequent to the enactment of the moral law, God entered into a special compact with man, about his obedience; but that he was pleased to promise eternal life, not only for himself but for his posterity, on condition of Adam's obedience to that law, to be proved by his observance of the prohibition from the fruit of the tree of knowledge."

Now, on the contrary, the very doctrine of the Confession and Catechisms, is, that man was created "having the law of God written in his heart," and "when God created man, he entered into a covenant of life with him." The covenant was subsequent to the enactment of the law. Thus the Presbytery sanctions the error charged, and therefore may well be supposed favorable to the accused.

5. Because, on the 5th, 6th and 7th charges, it is very difficult to say whether the Presbytery admit, as Mr. B. did, that he denied the doctrine of the standards. It is painfully difficult to know what their decision is under these heads; and particularly on the 7th, they certainly do not tell us whether Mr. B. denied or acknowledged the doctrine that Adam's posterity are guilty, i. e. liable to punishment on account of Adam's sin. Why did not the Presbytery give an unequivocal sentence here? On these three charges, where every attentive hearer of his defence must know that Mr. B. admitted his denial and rejection of the doctrine of our standards, and where he set up his defence on the ground of scripture and his own metaphysics, in opposition to them, I am constrained to think the main efforts of the Presbytery have been expended in throwing darkness and obscurity around the subject, and "so they wrap it up." This reason I may extend to each one of the charges, and the Presbytery's action on them.

Three questions naturally arose on each. 1. Is the thing charged proved by the testimony? 2. Is it contrary to the standards? 3. Is it contrary to the Bible? Now the prosecutor humbly conceives he had a right to a decision on each of them. This he respectfully requested, in a letter addressed to the Presbytery, but was refused.

6. Because an inaccurate statement in the 8th reason of the decision,

was perhaps partly the ground of said decision, viz: "Because the prosecutor did not attempt to show in what the proper penalty of the law consisted." Now the prosecutor did show, from the Confession and the Bible, that the proper penalty of the law consisted in death. "Thou shalt surely die"—that it consisted in the curse—the wrath of God—which things include sorrows, anguish and woes unutterable, inflicted upon the Saviour by the righteous judgment of God the Father, because his own Son bare the sins of his people, (by legal imputation) in his own body on the tree.

Because of a similar inaccuracy in the 10th reason, viz: that "the evidence submitted on the part of the prosecution—was that of inferences drawn from Mr. B's language." Now the appellant humbly conceives that he submitted the language itself of Mr. B., as the testimony and the evidence in the case. He submitted all the passages read, and their adjoining contexts respectively. These were the evidence, and it is believed they contain proof.

8. Because one member of the church, at least, distinctly rejected the Standards of the Church, as a rule of judgment in the case. He said the confession had been twisted into a wrong place. It was not a trap to catch heretics. He had as good a right to bring charges against a man for holding doctrines contrary to Ridgley's Body of Divinity, and the Bible, or contrary to the Christian Almanac and the Bible, as the present prosecutor had to charge Mr. B. with holding doctrines contrary to the Confession of Faith and the Bible. It is true, he next day apologised, by saying he did not mean to disparage the Confession of Faith. But then his speech was at least, partly written. It was deliberately and strongly expressed; whereas the apology was obviously a lame effort, for popular effect. Now, how many more of the judges were of this sentiment, I cannot say. I believe, however, there be some even *newer* Presbyterians, than this anti-confession brother. But one thing is obvious, viz: that such doctrine effectually precludes a fair and impartial trial.

9. Because the Presbytery took Mr. B's present declarations as expository of the meaning of his language adduced in proof. I think this will be evident upon a simple reading of the passages of his book quoted as testimony, and the decision of the court. During the whole trial, it appeared, plain to me, that he was by the court viewed as the legitimate, and the only legitimate expounder of his own printed words; and in support of this, it was alleged, that he knew best what was his own meaning.

Now the appellant believes that the court itself was the only authorised expositor. They had no right to take the *present views* of the party at the bar; nor his present gloss upon his own words, formerly uttered, as their correct meaning. They were bound simply to weigh the words according to their obvious meaning in their connection, and according to the usages of the language. The question before them was not (or ought to have been) what does Mr. B. *now* teach or deny? Not, what does he *now* say he taught *then*? But simply, what has he taught here in this book?

Every candid mind must perceive, that if a man shall be permitted to give his own explanation to his own words, no man can ever be convicted of holding error, unless he be so stupid as to be unable to distinguish between truth and error, and to fritter down and explain away his own terms. A very small portion of talent for mystification can gloss over the most obnoxious terms. For example: An action of slander is brought against me, for uttering the words—"I saw O. P. Q. in a state of intoxication, at a public dinner on the 4th of July." It is proved that I pronounced these words, and that I am not on friendly terms with O. P. Q. I put in a plea of justification, and claim the privilege of explaining. I show both from my habits of speaking and writing, that I have used the term intoxication,

in application to high mental excitement. The man was intoxicated with joy. This is all I meant. It was a compliment. I was simply representing the strong patriotic feeling of O. P. Q.; he was intoxicated with joy upon a reminiscence of the glorious transactions this day commemorates. Or, I show that I have been in the habit of abusing Pennsylvania as a drunken state—the whiskey insurrection state—the state of intoxication, I meant nothing more than that I saw O. P. Q. in Pennsylvania that day. Will the court and jury take my explanation, and find me a verdict? or will they judge for themselves, what my language means? Will they receive as authority, my present testimony, in my own favour; or will they ascertain by other scales, the weight of the words proved!

This, I take it, is the grand error of the Presbytery as to the ground of their decision. They made Mr. B. both witness and judge in his own case, by a gratuitous assumption of his present views, and his present exposition of his language formerly uttered, and now adduced in proof, as being undoubtedly the true and proper sense of that language; and of his doctrines there published. Accordingly, notwithstanding he had said in his defence, "the doctrine of all sining in Adam, and falling with him, I mean to reject," the Presbytery acquitted him on the ground of his oft-repeated declaration, that he agreed with his accuser in the substantial facts of the case.

All these considerations, and some others, conspire to sustain me in the conviction, that my tenth and last, and principal reason of appeal is just and true, viz:

10. Because the decision of the Presbytery is not in accordance with the facts of the case, as exhibited in the charges, and the Testimony and the law. It is not a righteous decision.

All which is respectfully submitted, by

Your unworthy brother in the Lord,

GEO. JUNKIN.

ART. VIII. Trial of Dr. Beecher.

We have delayed giving a statement of the recent trial of the Rev. Dr. Beecher, because the information we have hitherto possessed was not of that definite character which would induce us to place full confidence in its truth. For the same reason, we have not even published the charges which were presented by Dr. Wilson, although a brief paragraph appeared, months ago, in almost every religious newspaper in the Union.

The New-York Observer is now engaged in publishing a very full report of the trial, and we may have occasion hereafter to refer to its report; but we now copy the following from the Standard, published at South Hamover, Indiana, because it presents a good condensed statement as to the charges preferred by Dr. Wilson, which were very long, and also furnishes the views of the minority of the Presbytery on some points.—*Christian Intelligencer*.

On Tuesday, the 9th ult., the Presbytery met in the Second Church, at 2 o'clock, P. M., and after a sermon by Prof. Stowe, the moderator, they proceeded to take up the charges brought by Dr. Wilson against Dr. Beecher. A summary of the charges follows:

1. Dr. Beecher was charged with "propagating doctrines contrary to the word of God and the standards of the Presbyterian church, on the subject of the *depraved nature of man*." Under this charge it was specified, that in a sermon by Dr. B., published in the National Preacher, vol. 2, on pages 11, 12, it is taught that "the depravity of man is voluntary; that neither a depraved nor holy nature are *possible*, without understanding, conscience and choice; that a depraved nature cannot exist without voluntary agency; that whatever may be the early constitution of man, there is nothing in it, and nothing withheld from it, which renders disobedience unavoidable; that the first sin in every man is *free*, and might have been and ought to have been avoided; that if man is *depraved* by nature, it is a voluntary nature that is depraved, and that this is accord-

ing to the Bible: "They go astray as soon as they be born"—that is, in early life—how early, so as to deserve punishment, God only knows." The doctrines of our church, referred to as impugned by these sentiments, may be found in the Conf. F. ch. vi. sec. 3, 4, 6; Larg. Cat. 26, 57; Sh. Cat. 18.

2. Dr. B. was charged with propagating doctrines contrary to the scriptures and our church standards, "on the subjects of total depravity and the work of the Holy Spirit in effectual calling." The doctrines of our church, referred to under this charge, are contained in Con. F. ch. vi., sec. 2, 4; ch. ix. sec. 3; Larg. Cat. 25, 149, 190. These teach the doctrine of total depravity. On the subjects of total depravity and effectual calling, and the work of the Spirit in the production of saving faith, further reference was made to Con. F. ch. vi., sec. 1, 2, 4; chap. x., sec. 2; ch. xiii., sec. 1; ch. xiv., sec. 1; Large Cat. 72. In all these references, the scripture proofs were included.

The first specification under this charge refers to Dr. B.'s sermon on native character, p. 12, and on dependence and free agency, p. 11, 12, 19, 23, as teaching that "man is rendered capable by his Maker of obedience; that ability to obey is indispensable to moral obligation; that where there is a want of ability to love God, obligation to love ceases, whatever be the cause; that the sinner is able to do what God commands, and which being done would save the soul; that to be able and unwilling to obey God, is the only possible way in which a free agent can become deserving of condemnation and punishment; that there is no position which unites more universally and entirely the suffrages of the whole human race than the necessity of a capacity for obedience to the existence of obligation and desert of punishment; that no obligation can be created without a capacity commensurate with the demand; that ability commensurate with requirement is the equitable foundation of the moral government of God, and that this has been the received doctrine of the orthodox church in all ages."

The second specification under this charge, referred to Dr. B.'s sermon on dependence and free agency, p. 11, 19, 29, alleging that it was therein taught that "man in his present state is able and *only unwilling* to do what God commands, and which being done would save the soul; that the more clearly the light of conviction shines, the more distinct is a sinner's perception that he is not destitute of capacity, (i. e. ability, compare p. 27, 31,) to obey God; that when the Holy Ghost comes to search out what is amiss, and put in order that which is out of the way, he finds no impediment to obedience to be removed, except only a perverted will; and all he accomplishes in the day of his power is to make the sinner willing to submit to God; that good men have supposed that they augment the evil of sin, and the justice, mercy and power of God, in exact proportion as they throw down the sinner into a condition of absolute impotency; that he (Dr. B.) cannot perceive the wisdom of their views; that a subject of God's government, who can but will not obey, might appear to himself much more guilty than one whose capacity of obedience had been wholly annihilated by the sin of Adam."

3. The third charge was that Dr. B. propagated a doctrine of perfection. This charge was supported by a comparison of p. 11 and 19, of the sermon on dependence and free agency, where it is taught that "the sinner is able to do what God commands; that the Holy Spirit, in the day of his power, makes him willing; and so long as he is able and willing, there can be no sin." It was also corroborated by an argument of the Perfectionists of New Haven, in which they claim the "renovated and redeemed" theology of "Beecher, Taylor, and their associates," as furnishing the foundation and proof of their peculiar faith.

4. The fourth charge accuses Dr. B. of slander against the whole church of God, and attempting to bring odium upon all who sincerely receive the standards of the Presbyterian church. This charge was supported by quotations from the sermon on dependence and free agency, pp. 12, 23, 28, 31, 33, 34, 37, in which the doctrine of fallen man's impotency or natural inability, and those who hold or who have held it, are exhibited in such a manner as is calculated to excite odium against them.

5. Dr. B. was charged lastly with hypocrisy or dissimulation in religious matters.—This charge was predicated upon hypothetical grounds. If Dr. B. *has not* adopted our standards, as some circumstances indicate, then he is insincere in his professed attachment to them. If he *has* adopted them, he is still insincere, because he impugns them on subjects of great importance. I give the sense, not the words of the first two specifications; to which a third was added, that Dr. B., before Synod, apparently for the purpose of popular effect, declared that the "Confession of Faith contained the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth." Another thing was alleged in corroboration of the relevancy of the charge, viz: that Dr. B. having preached the sermon on dependence and free agency just about the time that he contemplated entering the Presbyterian church, with the expectation of being pastor of the Second Presbyterian church, Cincinnati, and professor of theology in Lane Seminary; "either did not know the doctrines of our church, or if he knew them, designed to impugn them in that sermon, and to vilify those who honestly adopt them."

The Cincinnati Journal says, that "at the commencement of the trial, Dr. Wilson, according to the rules of our church, was duly warned that if he failed to make out his charges, he himself should be censured as a slanderer of the gospel ministry." Now, although I was not present when this warning was said to be given, yet I am convinced, from the circumstances of the case, that this is a misrepresentation. The moderator, Professor Stowe, who, notwithstanding the relation he sustains to Dr. B., conducted himself throughout the whole sessions with a dignity, propriety and impartiality highly creditable to him, would, as a matter of course, read the rule adopted on such occasions; but such a rule as that given by the Journal, our Book of Discipline does not contain. The rule is this: "The prosecutor of a minister shall be previously warned that if he fail to prove the charges, he must himself be censured as a slanderer of the gospel ministry, *in proportion to the malignity or rashness that shall appear in the prosecution.*" The Journal omits the material clause, which I have italicised, from which it appears, that if no malignity or rashness appear in the prosecution, no censure is incurred, even if the charges should not be proved to the conviction of the accused. Every candid and intelligent mind will acquit Dr. Wilson of manifesting either malignity or rashness on this occasion. A sincere desire of adhering to the path of duty, and discharging the obligations imposed on him in his ordination vows, is obviously, and as I firmly believe, the leading motive for entering upon the arduous and painful task of prosecutor.

The remaining part of Tuesday afternoon and Wednesday morning was consumed in hearing testimony. The charges were then read, in connection with the passages referred to in the Confession of Faith and Catechisms, and the *whole* sermons of Dr. B. on native character, and on dependence and free agency. The whole sermons were read, and the plea that the court could not understand the import of the passages cited in Dr. W.'s specifications, unless in their connexion with all that went before and all that followed. These preliminaries, with some short interludes devoted to miscellaneous business, occupied the Presbytery till Thursday noon. In the afternoon, Dr. Wilson commenced his speech, and concluded it at noon on Friday. It was plain, pointed, argumentative and convincing. In the afternoon the court allowed Dr. B., contrary to all usage, to produce additional testimony to meet information given by Dr. W. in his speech, on the degree of reputation which Dr. B. enjoyed in New-England at the period of his removal to the west—a point of no consequence at all to the business before the court. After the hearing of the testimony, Dr. B. commenced his defence, which he continued on Saturday morning, and closed on Monday afternoon. It appeared to me that the whole of this long speech was rather calculated to make a favorable impression upon the spectators than to enlighten the court. The simple object should have been to shew that the specifications on which the charges were grounded were irrelevant, misstated, or misrepresented, and that therefore the charges could not be sustained. But instead of this, an indirect and inferential method was pursued—declamations about "capital" in well earned reputation—laws of interpretation to be applied to the Confession of Faith—citations from the fathers, reformers, and some modern divines, to shew that they held the doctrine of the sinner's natural ability and moral inability—and in general, an endeavor to impress every one with the belief, that as certain divines, who were reckoned orthodox, held the opinions which were charged on him as errors, therefore he too must be regarded orthodox, and as teaching nothing inconsistent with the Confession of Faith. He strongly contended for the natural ability of the sinner to obey God, and denied that, ordinarily, there is an *immediate* operation of the Spirit in regeneration; or, in other words, he asserted that in regeneration, the instrumentality of the word in the hands of the Spirit, implied the absence of direct agency.

On the other doctrinal points brought forward in the first two charges, it was evident to a careful hearer, that however softened down this appeared in Dr. B.'s defence, they were nevertheless there, and that he still held them. On Tuesday Dr. Wilson replied, and by the allowance of the court, Dr. Beecher rejoined on Wednesday evening, and Dr. W. very briefly made his closing reply. The spirit which actuated the parties during all this time, appeared to be good, and honorable to both, as gentlemen, and as christians. The patience manifested in the constant and placid attention of the members of the court, (with but two or three exceptions on the New School side of the house) was highly creditable to them. The parties being heard, the roll was called, and an opportunity offered for remarks. But few were made, and they were brief. In the afternoon, as soon as the Presbytery came together, the vote was taken on the charges separately. On the first and second charges, 12 voted that they were sustained, and 23 that they were not sustained. On the third charge, while some of the minority viewed the language specified as censurable, and involving a doctrine of perfection; yet, as it did not appear in evidence that Dr. B. designed to teach such a doctrine, they declined voting. On the fourth charge, a similar discrepancy of judgment appeared in the votes of the minority; for some thought, that although the language and rep-

representations of Dr. B. were censurable and unjust, yet these were rather the effects of prejudice and infirmity than the result of any malicious intention to defame, and accordingly they did not consider the charge sustained. In relation to the fifth charge, some of the minority, while they viewed Dr. B. as exhibiting inconsistencies; yet because there was not sufficient evidence in their opinion, to show that he was insincere in his inconsistencies, they voted against sustaining the charge. While the minority thus exhibited evidence of thinking and judging independently, the majority voted in unwavering uniformity; a phenomenon which any one can readily explain, who is at all acquainted with the operations of the mind in its present imperfect state.

Dr. Beecher is acquitted on all the charges, by a vote of about two to one; but from this decision, Dr. Wilson has appealed to the Synod of Cincinnati.

INCREASE OF POPERY.—At the anniversary of the British Reformation Society, I. E. Gordon, Esq. presented the following startling facts:

"He had simply to direct their attention to the contrast presented by the number of popish chapels and colleges which existed in England, Wales, and Scotland, in 1796, and the number to be found within the same boundary line in 1833. In London, there were, according to information derived from Roman Catholic documents, only two chapels in 1796; and in 1833, there were, according to the same information, no fewer than twenty-five; leaving out in both cases, the embassy chapels. In 1796, there were ten licensed Roman Catholic places of worship in other parts of England; and according to the map which he held in his hand, there were now four hundred and twenty-three. In 1796, there were no Roman Catholic colleges in England; but in 1833, they had no fewer than nine colleges, *overflowing* with students. In 1796, there were only two seminaries of education noticed in the Roman Catholic official publications; but these had increased in 1833, to upwards of fifty, most of which were connected with colleges and monastic institutions. To these chapels were to be added ten, which had been built in the course of the last year, and no fewer than seventy-eight for Scotland, most of which had been erected within the period described."

He also stated what is true *mutatis mutandis* of the increase of Popish establishments in America:

"It is a fact, that a considerable part of the funds raised by public subscription, for the erection of Roman Catholic places of worship in this country, is contributed by persons glorying in the title of liberal Protestants. Yes, on that list might be found the names of presidents of the India board, secretaries of state, lords-lieutenants and secretaries of Ireland,—men who, with the profession of Protestantism on their lips, appeared to be utterly destitute of a particle of Protestant truth in their hearts. The same cause would account for the frequenting of such exhibitions as oratorios, given by Roman Catholics for religious purposes, and crowded by applauding Protestants, who could sit and listen, with delight, to such performances as the following: "Hail, Mary, full of grace, the Lord is with thee! Blessed art thou among women, and blessed is Jesus, the fruit of thy womb! Holy Mary, mother of God, pray for us sinners, both now and at the hour of our death. Amen!" And would the meeting believe, that men in Scotland, where the noblest and most decisive struggle for the reformed faith, had taken place, Scotland whose very name had been rendered synonymous with Protestantism—would Englishmen and English women believe, that, even in Scotland, Protestant provosts and Protestant elders, were to be found among the patrons of such exhibitions? Yes: with Popery increasing around them, would Scottish provosts and Scottish elders be found contributing to the multiplication of popish chapels, to augment the victims of delusion, and to immolate another and another portion of their country men at the shrine of a hateful superstition.

Something New.

We copy the following *morceau* from the New-York Evangelist. The three hundred feet tent is designed, we presume, for Mr. Finney's campaign in the west, and we may expect, unless a kind Providence interposes, that his march westward will be traced, as it has been in New-York, by the desolation of the church.

"**TENT FOR MR. FINNEY.**—This tent has been completed, and was yesterday forwarded from this city to Mr. Finney, at Oberlin. It covers three hundred feet of ground, and will hold three thousand people, and cost \$700. The expense is defrayed by a number of gentlemen in this city."

TO CORRESPONDENTS.—Y. in answer to "*Aspasio*," is received. The great length of his article, has prevented us as yet from giving it that attention which is necessary before coming to a decision respecting its insertion. The writer is informed that his manuscript will either be inserted in the pages of the Monitor, in due time, or carefully preserved, subject to his order.

THE

RELIGIOUS MONITOR,

AND

EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

SEPTEMBER, 1835.

ART. I. *Review of Sommerville, on the use of the Psalms.*

"The Psalms of David, designed for standing use in the Church. By the Rev. William Sommerville, A. M. Halifax, N. S. 1834." 76 pages, octavo.

The above is the title of a work inscribed to the Presbyterians of Horton, a township of Kings county, Nova Scotia. It appears from the statements of the author, to have been designed to confirm the minds of his congregation in a change effected by his instrumentality, from the use of songs of human composure, to the use of the inspired Psalms, in divine worship. The only book which he had seen on this subject, was Doctor McMaster's Apology. And his chief inducement to publish any thing of his own, in preference to the circulation of that excellent book, was, that it embraced much relating to the controversy in the U. States, which was not necessary to meet the difficulties in the way of his people.

The main arguments of Mr. Sommerville, appear to be novel, ingenious and weighty. And as his book may not have an extensive circulation in the U. States, a summary view of its contents will probably be found interesting to the readers of the Monitor. The whole book is worthy of being read. The style is accurate, dignified, and sometimes elevated. The spirit moderate but firm. He speaks strongly in behalf of truth, yet treats his opponents with tenderness and respect. The sentiments indicate good judgment, and the arguments are stated in a clear and forcible manner. The chief fault is, that the illustrations, though just and striking, are sometimes more numerous than necessary. If the particular arguments used had been somewhat abridged, and if others which have been employed, had been briefly stated, the power of the whole book in carrying conviction to the mind, would have been greater. The nature and proof of the inspiration of the scriptures, which are insisted on at considerable length, are an example of this kind. Though it is painful to reflect that there is too much reason for bringing in these topics in answer to the reasonings of opponents. There is justice in what the author states, that these reasonings usually proceed on the supposition that the Psalms at least are not inspired either in the original or in any faithful translation. And he would have found still more evidence of this, if he had seen a late comment on the epistle to the Romans, in which the

Psalms and the Spirit of the gospel, are reconciled on the ground that David is to be regarded in many places as writing under the influence of his own evil passions: a reflection excessively severe when made against an uninspired author; but when made against the words of the Spirit of God, who spoke by David, it is absolutely deistical, to use the most moderate language which truth will admit of our using.

In the introduction, Mr. S. gives a general statement of the question at issue. He advocates the exclusive use of the book of Psalms, and rests his proof on the four following facts:

I. The Psalms are given by inspiration.

II. They were given to be sung by the members of the Church—the worshippers of God.

III. No subsequent book or books have been written by inspiration for the same purpose.

IV. The book of Psalms is no less adapted to the present state of the Church, than to her state when they were originally written.”

The body of the book contains six chapters, a conclusion and an appendix, in confirmation of these four facts.

Chapt. I. is on the question, “Are the Psalms given by Inspiration?”

The author proves, by many pertinent citations, the plenary inspiration of this part of the scriptures, and that it is placed by Christ and his Apostles on equal footing with any other portion of the word of God. He states, also, with great propriety, that this fact being once admitted, one of the most daring objections against the use of the Psalms is removed. This is, that they breathe cruelty and revenge, and contain language hardly fit for a Christian to utter. He also contrasts here, as has been frequently done, the sayings of Christ and his Apostles, with the language of the Psalms, to show that if the spirit of the Psalms be improper, the spirit of the New Testament cannot be vindicated.

Chapt. II. is on the question, “Were the Psalms given to the Church that they might be sung to the Praise of him by whom they were dictated?”

“The truth of this proposition,” says the author, “appears from the titles given to them, and the manner in which they were used in the Jewish Church by divine appointment.”

He here states that Josephus mentions their being written in metre, that some of them were Hexameters, some, trimeters, some, pentameters, some, other kinds of metre. Their being called Psalms and Songs, Songs of the Lord, and Songs of Zion, proves that they were designed to be sung in divine worship. It is also evident that they were so used by the Israelites, who speak as being interrupted in this pleasing work at Babylon, “How shall we sing the Lord’s Song in a strange land!” Various other cases are adduced, where mention is made of the Psalms, as given for the public praises of the Church, and employed by her accordingly. It is also noticed as deserving particular attention, that psalms found in other parts of the word, are sometimes repeated in the Book of Psalms, sometimes not. Their being repeated, could not have been for preservation, as they are preserved elsewhere; nor could it have been to make a full collection of these songs, as some are omitted. It appears, therefore, that the Spirit designed this as a collection of all that was for regular and standing use in the public and social services of the church. He has not left even the selecting of these songs to weak, erring men, but has by this divine collection of them into one book, intimated to us what was designed for general and constant use, and what was private and temporary. We think with the author, it would be very difficult to find any other satisfactory reason for such a selection being made by the Spirit.

In discussing the general question in this chapter, an argument is intro-

duced which we do not remember to have seen applied to this subject before. The spirit of it is found in the words of the heathen Poet,

"Nec Deus interait, nisi dignus vindice nodus
Inciderit."——

"Let not a God be introduced, unless a crisis shall have arrived which is worthy of his interference." "In other words," says Mr. S., "A God should never be brought forward when there is not something to be performed which man is unable to accomplish." He shows that in the works of creation and providence, and in miracles, God accomplishes by himself, only that which requires infinite power, and employs finite means for every thing to which they are adequate. To select only one example out of a number mentioned. The Son of God put forth his infinite power to restore Lazarus to life, because no finite power was adequate to this work; but he proceeded not a step beyond this, to effect by miracle what could be done by finite agents. He bid those standing by to remove the stone from the grave, and to free Lazarus from his grave clothes. The same principle will apply to the revelation of God's will. He has not interposed to teach us by inspiration common sciences, or things which could have been known without it, but only to teach the great things of his law, and the mystery of our redemption by Christ Jesus, which could not have been understood without his teaching. "For what man knoweth the things of a man save the spirit of man which is in him? even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God." (1 Cor. ii. 2.) This principle will also apply to the particular parts of the word, as well as to the word in general. And to quote the author's own language:

"God never immediately appears when the agency of the creature is adequate. But God has given to his Church by the immediate influence of his Spirit the book of Psalms to be used in the celebration of his praise. Therefore man, not immediately directed by the Spirit, was inadequate to the composition of such a book for such a purpose."

This argument is corroborated by a notice of the qualities essential to a book of praise; such as its perfection, its adaptation for general use in all ages and nations, and for meeting all the diversified cases of individuals; qualities which man is no more able to give to this part of the Bible, than to the whole book. The argument is farther corroborated by a notice of the easy and almost inevitable introduction of things improper, such as party spirit, national prejudices, and errors into works composed by men. This is an argument which is gathering strength in proportion as this corruption of the divine ordinance of praise continues and extends.

"Let us, therefore," says the author, "with one heart resolve, and with one voice proclaim our determination, to have no other songs than those which sustain the character of the Songs of the Lord, and in which, being the very word of God, we are sure there can be no error."

Chapt. III. is on the question, "Has a second collection of Songs for the use of the Church been given by inspiration?"

We are sorry that the limits of a review forbid our quoting the whole of this chapter. It begins with some interesting observations respecting the Providence of God in so ordering it that though other things were written by the inspired penmen, besides those written by inspiration, yet nothing of this kind has been preserved. We have accounts of books written by Nathan, Solomon, and others which were probably no more inspired, than the book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Media and Persia, of which we read in the book of Esther. The design of God in so ordering it that no uninspired book of an inspired penman has been preserved, appears to be to prevent an undue reverence to such writings, and so a confusion of mind in respect to that wide difference which ought always to be made between the word of God and the word of men. The

author proceeds to show that no songs made by Christ or his Apostles have been preserved, and that there is no evidence that any were composed by them. They always refer to "The Psalms" as the only book of the kind; it is evident that this book was employed by them in praise, and we have no evidence of any other compositions being used. The author treats with merited contempt, the capacity or integrity of the man who would infer authority for human compositions from the mention made in the New Testament of "hymns," and of "psalms, hymns and spiritual songs." He repeats without disapprobation the usual explanation of these terms, and the supposed reference to the titles in the original Hebrew and in the Septuagint. It is his opinion, however, that these terms do not apply to different portions of this book exclusively, but any of these divine songs may be considered as a "psalm or song," a psalm, a hymn, or spiritual song, according as there is reference to the manner in which it was sung, the matter of it, or its divine origin. He illustrates this by various similar cases, such as the names of ministers, stewards, &c., given not to different officers, but to denote different things in the same officer; the names of laws, testimonies, precepts, judgments, statutes, word, &c. given to the Scriptures, not to denote different parts of these to the exclusion of the rest, but the various characters of the same parts.

The author proceeds to notice, that though the inspiration of the Book of Psalms is not directly called in question, or the inspiration of such men as Newton, Doddridge, Watts and Wesley, expressly maintained, yet the introduction and defence of human compositures in preference to the Psalms, has produced great indistinctness on this subject. He shows that while the apostles were content that their writings should be on equal footing with those of the prophets of the Old Testament, Dr. Watts has put himself far above them, by confounding spiritual illumination with infallible inspiration, so that he considered himself, though least in the kingdom of heaven, better qualified to compose songs of praise for the church, than those who, under the Old Testament, were infallibly inspired. But passing over what is said in the Preface of Dr. Watts, which has been so often and justly exposed, we shall quote entire the remarks made on the preface of another man to a book of hymns partly *his own* and partly selected. We were not before aware that John Wesley had written any thing so out of all measure arrogant.

"Another (John Wesley) says in his preface, 'It is large enough to contain all the important truths of our holy religion, whether speculative or practical; yea to illustrate them all and to prove them all both by Scripture and reason. *And this is done* in regular order.' Again he adds, 'May I be permitted to add a few words with respect to the poetry?—Then I will speak to them who are judges thereof with all freedom and unreserve. To these I may say without offence: 1. In those hymns there is no doggerel; no botches; nothing put in to patch up the rhyme; no feeble expletives: 2. There is nothing turgid or bombast on the one hand, or low and creeping on the other: 3. There are no cant expressions; no words without meaning. Those who impute this to us know not what they say. We talk common sense both in prose and verse, and use no words but in a fixed and determinate meaning: 4. Here are (allow me to say) both the purity, the strength, and the elegance of the English language.' Again, speaking of some who had reprinted some of the hymns: 'I desire they would not attempt to mend them, for they really are not able.—None of them is able to mend the sense or the verse.' Nothing more can be claimed [than is claimed in these remarks of Wesley] for the writings of the Holy Spirit. There is neither error nor defect in the matter, and there is no defect in the form. The author of some

of the hymns, and the selector of the rest, has pronounced the book perfect, admitting of no improvement:—*more perfect than the Bible*. Be patient, Reader. I have not made a statement without thought. If I have thought incorrectly, point out the error. This collection contains not only the important, but ‘all the important truths of our most holy religion, whether speculative or practical.’ Where are the unimportant truths of our holy religion to be found? Doctrines not taught in scripture, are not doctrines of our holy religion at all, but unholy traditions of vain man. The unimportant truths of *our holy religion* must be in the Bible. If the character which the compiler has given of his ‘Hymns’ be just, in possession of them we would have no cause to regret the loss of the Scriptures. They would form an excellent and adequate substitute, while the minds of the weak would be freed from the difficult exercise of separating between the important and the unimportant truths, and furnished with the proofs which reason supplies of the doctrines of religion, and which are wanting to him who has nothing but the word of God. Let it pass: There is neither error, nor defect, nor redundancy in the hymns of John Wesley!”

Chap. IV. treats of the characteristics of inspiration. The following points are clearly stated, and proved at some length by forcible arguments: “1. The word of inspiration claims *God* for its *author*. 2. The word of inspiration claims absolute *freedom from error*. 3. The word of inspiration is free from *defect*. 4. The word of inspiration contains nothing *superfluous*. 5. The word of inspiration is *authoritative*.” These remarks are concluded by showing that in all controversies on the doctrinal or practical subjects of religion, our final and only appeal is to the Scriptures. Of this the Scriptures themselves furnish us with copious examples. “Whenever Christ or his Apostles appeal to the Scripture, they do it with the most implicit deference and submission, and teach us to consider its decision final.” The bearing of these remarks on the question in dispute is unhappily too evident.

Chapt. V. discusses the following question: “Have Psalms and Hymns of modern date been given by inspiration? or, Does the superior light of the last days supercede the necessity of inspiration in their composition?”

In examining this question, the pretensions of Dr. Watts and others are clearly exposed. The author, among other things, notices, notwithstanding the superior *privileges* of the latter dispensation, that those who enjoy them may be so ignorant as to need to be taught *the first principles of the oracles of God*. He mentions the errors, contradictions and weaknesses of the *writers of hymns* as a bad argument of their ability to go beyond prophets, and others, inspired to furnish us with a book of praises. A master, he observes, is above a servant, as a master, and yet the servant as to learning, piety and other things, may be far above the master. So we may be in some respects above those who were inspired under the Old Testament, and yet as persons inspired, they were far above us.

Chap. VI. consists of a number of sections in which the following question is examined: “Are the Psalms of David adapted to the state of the church under this dispensation as under the former?”

The author of course defends the affirmative. In section 1st, he shows that there is no part of Scripture which brings the *Saviour* more fully to view, than the *Book of Psalms*. He notices the many citations from this book in the New Testament which are applied to Christ. For instance, out of seven such citations in the first chapter of the epistle to the Hebrews, six are from the Psalms, and some suppose the seventh also. All the chief things related by the Evangelists, respecting the incarnation, works, sufferings, death, resurrection, ascension and reign of Christ, the rejection of him by the Jews, the combination of princes and rulers, Jews

and Gentiles against him, the reviling words spoken by his enemies, the manner of his death with all its circumstances, the success of his gospel among the nations, and a multitude of such things are very clearly exhibited to our view in this book, so that it is difficult to understand how men can think any thing of Christ lacking in it, and much more how they can call it "a Christless book."

In section 2d, it is proved that "In the Psalms more especially, there is a most happy adaptation of the language to the state of the Church.— Here the author shows that the Psalms teach the inefficacy of legal sacrifices, and speak of them not only as to pass away, but as if already abolished, referring for proof to Ps. 40, 50, 51 and 69, besides many other particular expressions occurring in others. And though there is a use of ceremonial language in a few instances, a contrast is made between these passages and corresponding ones in the New Testament, which are set down in parallel columns. From this it is made evident that the language of the Psalms is no more exceptionable on this account than the language of Christ and the Apostles. It is next observed as to the predictions, against which it is often objected that we sing of things past as yet to come, that these are generally found in the historical form, as things already accomplished, and this is considered as designed by the Spirit to adapt them to every age. Predictions of things admitting a definite fulfilment, such as the incarnation, death, and triumphant ascension of Christ, are spoken of as already fulfilled. Whereas it is chiefly or only where events are predicted, which are to be progressively fulfilled, that the future tense is employed. The 2d Psalm furnishes examples of both kinds. We do not read, "I will set," but "I have set my King upon my holy hill." This has been accomplished, and is so spoken of in the prediction. But the extension of the gospel to the heathens and their subjection to Christ, are works past, passing, and to pass, therefore the tense is changed, and we are taught to look forward to these works to the end of time. It is not "I have," but "I will declare the decree,—ask and I shall give—and thou shall break them with a rod of iron, &c." This point is also illustrated in a clear manner, by a reference to many other Psalms, such as the 21st, 22d, 50th, 31st, 40th, 16th, &c. The great propriety of the use of the present tense, when the sufferings and joys of Christ are mentioned, is also noticed. His people have fellowship with him in these, and he has a present sympathy with them, so that the Psalms may be said to set forth Christ as crucified and glorified among us. Examples of this kind may be found in the 2d Psalm and most of those already cited. The 2d Psalm, for instance, brings Christ to us at once in the midst of his sufferings, "Why do the heathen rage? &c." Can any fail to see how much more this is calculated to affect the heart, and promote the faith, and comfort of God's people, than the cold, historical narrative into which Watts has thrown it for the sake of improvement? But we are forgetting our author.

In his 3d section, he shows that the Psalms contain nothing but the language of unwavering faith. The language of doubt and unbelief is recorded, but not while the penman was under their influence. Such unhappy experiences are related after deliverance, and are not for our imitation, but for warning.

In the conclusion, the author notices the regard paid to the Psalms by the Reformers. These were Luther's "Little book of all saints, in which every man, in whatever situation he may be placed, shall find Psalms and sentiments which shall apply to his case, and be the same to him, as if they were for his own sake alone, so expressed, that he could not express them himself, nor find, nor even wish them better than they are." It is also observed that "The use of the Psalms of David is not confined to a

few inconsiderable and illiterate individuals even now. I rejoice," says the author, "that the cause for which I am an humble advocate is above the stigma that it is the cause either of a party, or of the ignorant and superstitious. It is the cause of Presbyterians in every part of the British empire with a very few exceptions, and these not likely to give a tone to public sentiment, or to exert a very extensive influence in directing public practice. It is the cause of the Church of England. Upon the subject of the Psalms, Episcopalians and Presbyterians are, in principle, perfectly agreed. They differ merely in this, that they use different versions. And it will be seen in the appendix, that one of her greatest ornaments [Bishop Horsey] did not highly esteem the version used in the church of England. Romaine likewise, whose praises are deservedly beyond the limits of Episcopacy, tells us that he occasionally used the Scotch version, 'when it appeared to him better expressed than the English, that he considered it nearer to the original than any other, and that in it, is every thing great, and noble and divine, although not in Dr. Watt's way or style.'

"Many seem to think the subject of the Psalms to be used by the assemblies of Mount Zion, of little moment; that it is a matter of indifference whether, for instance, we use Rouse's *version* or Watt's imitation, and therefore put aside the question as unprofitable and vain. One thing they shall find vain indeed; to attempt to evade the inquiry into the claims of Zion's Songs. It may be postponed, but it cannot be evaded. Ultimately it must come forward, it will press itself with resistless force into notice; and God is never without the means of directing universal attention to one point. The world has frequently been surprised to find the minds of Christians in the most widely divided countries called almost simultaneously into exercise, respecting subjects that had very partial notice before. It is unnecessary to enumerate instances with which all are familiar."

The above extract is all for which I have room.

T. B.

ART. II. *Death and Burial of Sarah.*

(Continued from page 71.)

This narrative contains excellent moral instruction in reference to some of the particular duties of the christian life.

1. It teaches that we are to endeavor, in our converse with our fellow men, to maintain good manners. Religion does not destroy good manners, but refines and corrects them. It takes out of the civilities of mankind what is not conformable to the gospel. But on the other hand, it requires that we behave ourselves seemly in our converse with others, whether Christian or Heathen, believers or unbelievers, giving honor to whom honor is due. David, though chosen to the Kingdom in Saul's room, gave due honor to Saul as his superior, while he remained his subject. Paul calls Felix, the Roman Governor, "Most noble Felix," and concludes his Epistles generally with salutations to noted persons in the several churches to whom he wrote them: and here Abraham bowed before the children of Heth. A man may be no less a gentleman that he is a Christian. On the contrary, christianity rightly exemplified, constitutes the gentleman in the right use of the word in its most extended sense, as it disposes those who are under its influence, to all that is kind and beneficent and praise-worthy; It disposes them to conduct themselves in every way as becomes them towards their fellow men and towards their God. We find Jeremiah, in his Lamentations, bringing in this as a

special instance of the great depravity of the people of the Jews in his time, and an evidence of the justness of God's judgements come upon them in the destruction of their city and temple, that the faces of Elders were not honored, which shewed that this and such instances of good conduct, toward those who were in superior stations in life, was not only required of them as a duty, but the neglect of it was a sin as it is still; for the fifth precept of the moral law requires of all that they preserve the honor and perform the duty, which belongeth to every one in their several places, relations, as superiors, inferiors or equals, and forbids the neglect of doing so, or a contrary conduct.

2. In contracts we are to be open and particular. This contract between Abraham and Ephron was made in the gate of the city and in the presence of the children of Heth. The place agreed upon was particularly described in the making of the contract and well understood by both parties: an example in respect to public contracts which should be very specific and open. Those of a more private nature and which respect lesser matters, are to be also open and particular. The parties entering into contract should be made to understand one another; no reserve being had by any of the parties by means of which they may have the opportunity of taking advantage of the other afterwards. If there is a defect of title or a deficiency in the article contracted for, it should not be concealed. Persons in offering lands for sale sometimes take the intended purchaser, a stranger, through them in a way that shows the best, but leaves the worst unscen. A merchant sometimes buys a bad article, and cheap of price on this account, and sells it for a good article and at the usual price of a good article of the kind: or he mixes a good article with a bad, and takes for the article mixed the price of the good article: This is not to be open and fairly correct in dealing.

3. Persons are to endeavor to walk conformably to strict justice in contracts, both in making and fulfilling them. In the contract between Abraham and Ephron, the worth of the field is determined and paid for with strict punctuality, verses 15. 16, and it is very particularly recorded for our imitation. So ought both the buyer and the seller: or persons in contracts both in the making and fulfilling of them to be scrupulously just. We find punctuality in this respect very particularly enjoined in the word of God; as in Leviticus, 19. 13, respecting hired servants, "Thou shalt not defraud thy neighbour, neither rob him: the wages of him that is hired shall not abide with thee all night until the morning;" namely, without his consent and to his sustaining an injury thereby; and in Deut. 24. 14, 15, "Thou shalt not oppress an hired servant that is poor and needy whether he be of thy brethren or of thy strangers that are in thy land within thy gates: At his day thou shalt give him his hire, neither shall the sun go down upon it for he is poor and setteth his heart upon it: lest he cry against thee to God and it be sin unto thee." And the Apostle James complains, "Behold the hire of the labourers who hath reaped down your fields, which is of you kept back by fraud, crieth: and the cries of them which have reaped have entered into the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth." Where there is a hire, there is a contract made or supposed, and this is with great punctuality to be fulfilled, as a failure is an act of injustice done to the suffering party, and often more than the offending party is aware of. And in all other things, justice in this way is to be studied: and both the eighth and ninth precepts of the moral law, which teach the obligations we are under to honesty in our dealings, and to pay a strict regard to truth in all things, serve to shew the absolute necessity of this.

4. Persons should endeavour to live above the charity of others, when not standing in need of it, and especially when in circumstances by which

they might be brought under temptations by means of it. Abraham here, though offered the field of Machpelah without a price, would not accept of it in this way, as he had in plenty wherewith to purchase it. He knew it would, by accepting it as a free gift, bring him more under obligation to this heathen, and he did not know what advantage he might take from it afterwards. Besides, it had made his claim to this place as a possession for a burying place less certain, and therefore he will pay down for it, what it was adjudged to be worth. David, too, when offered the thrashing floor of Araunah, that he might build an altar there unto the Lord, would not take it but at a price. Charity belongs to persons in needy circumstances, and such should be the objects only on whom it is bestowed. They may not be ashamed of it who are in the need, and who as needy, have those in more able circumstances ready to bestow it upon them. For, in such a case, the Lord himself is providing for them by this means, through those he disposes to it, as instruments in his hand in Providence, for their supply. But where it is not necessary, it is neither honorable nor proper to give it, nor receive it. Persons out of love and respect, and in token of friendship, may sometimes shew favours, and though for the present, they are to be considered as evidences of particular regard had to those who received them; yet they often turn out to be bribes, or are considered as tokens of friendship, that bind persons to things which, often conscience and the word of God will not allow them to do, in which case they should be despised. Professors of religion sometimes need them and obtain them: and ministers of the gospel have often friendship shown to them, and respect in this way. But they should always remember that they are not to consider themselves as obligated in one iota by these things, to swerve from what is right to please those who have bestowed their kindnesses upon them: and it is exceedingly ungenerous in those who have shewn their goodness in this way to them, to expect it. It would be far better if ministers who are more exposed to temptations in this way, than others are, and whose particular callings bind them to be particularly exemplary in respecting men, not for their wealth, or for their friendships, in this manner shewn to them; but for what of Christ appears in them, were always placed in such circumstances, as they would not stand in need of such favours, and would be contented with a smaller competence, rather than to be much dependant on the charities of their hearers or others, and were to be shy in receiving them. It would take many temptations out of their way, and be a means of putting their hearers more upon an equality in their regards and in the attention which they are to pay to them. A gift blindeth the eyes often, when persons themselves know it not. "A gift," Solomon tells us, "destroyeth the heart;" and "he that receiveth gifts overthroweth judgement."

5. Difference in religious profession does not loose men from the common duties which they owe toward each other. Abraham bowed before the children of Heth. They were Heathens, yet he did not refuse to shew that common respect to them to which they were entitled as fellow men, possessing the same common humanity with himself: and more especially as they were the lords of the land, having in God's providence at the time, a rightful possession of it, as the proper and principal owners, and he but a sojourner among them. Again, on the other hand, the children of Heth sympathize with Abraham respecting the death of a principal member of his family: and thus they behaved toward each other with decency, in their existing circumstances, whereof a record seems to be made in Holy Writ for our imitation. Men have common duties which they owe towards one another as men, which as Christians

they are not liberated from in respect to those who are not professors of the Christian religion: or in respect to those who differ from them in their profession of it. To neglect these duties towards others, or to observe them wholly or mostly to fellow professors, would shew that persons are actuated more by a love of party, than a sense of duty, in the case. It is to practically disobey, in this instance, that injunction given by Christ to his disciples, and to his professed followers, to the end of time. "Let your light shine before men, that others seeing your good works, may give glory to your heavenly Father."

6. In our dealings with our fellow men, not what a thing will bring to us, but the real value of it, is what we are to sell it for. This is a dictate of nature's light, as well as agreeable to the law of God, as given to us in the Scriptures, by which, as professing Christians, we are to be regulated in these matters. This child of Heth, guided by the dictates of the light of nature, in selling his field, puts no more price upon it than he concluded it is worth: and this Heathen might put to the blush, many who name the name of Christ in this respect. There is a saying in use with many: "A thing is worth what it will fetch." But a thing, in many circumstances which the buyer may be in, might bring far beyond its true value; and persons are not to judge of the value of a thing so much from the necessity of the buyer, as this is to take the advantage of a brother in case of necessity, as from scarcity of the article and difficulty to come at possession of it, general demands for it, and current price it is held at, together with the use it might be of to the seller, if he retained it. He is to be regulated a good deal in this way. It is worth so much to him if he keeps it: and if he sells it without any necessity to supply another's want, he is in justice entitled to that amount: whereas, on the other hand, if he sells it of necessity, he is to be regulated in great measure by the consideration of what it will be worth, to the person he sells it to. The rule given by our Lord himself, which we are to be guided by in our dealings with one another, is a very plain direction in this case. *Math. vii. 12.* "Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so them: for this is the law and the prophets." In selling, we should, in imagination, put ourselves in place of the buyer, considering what we would be willing to give for the article we are to dispose of, and in buying, put ourselves in place of the seller, taking into view circumstances, and we will not be far wrong in our dealings generally, if we endeavor to practice accordingly.

There is even much gospel in this chapter, which treats of what Abraham did, relative to the disposal of the dead body of Sarah. For,

1st. It teaches that the earthly Canaan was, to the Israelites, when they possessed it, and to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and their posterity, before they got the actual possession of it, a type and figure of heaven, and of that which goes before in the true spiritual enjoyment of believers even in this world. It was to be, and proved to be, a rest to them after their sojourning from the calling of Abraham, until their actual settlement in due time: Whereby was figured out that true rest which believers have in Christ, and is begun to be enjoyed by them in the very moment of believing; and also heaven, as that rest which yet remaineth for them. And Abraham buying a burying place in it and making use of it in the case of Sarah; and afterward in himself: and Isaac and Jacob being buried there even before the children of Israel obtained possession of it: and Joseph's bones being carried by the children of Israel into it, agreeable to the request of Joseph: all this has particular instruction in it to us, and appears to be intended for our instruction, as there is so full a record of these things given in the Scriptures. So particular a record of these things had been made to very little purpose as concerns us, otherwise than as

through these things God's covenant promise is seen to have been accomplished in their day, and as there is instruction variously given besides, by the relation of them as facts which took place. The instruction they give is this, namely : That as God made special promise to Abraham and afterwards to Isaac and Jacob, concerning the land of Canaan, so they lived and died in the faith that he would give their posterity in due time possession of it. And that as it was a type of heaven, so they lived and died in the faith of being brought to it, when God had his work done with them here, which he had appointed for them; God himself being faithful that had promised: In all which they were exemplary to us. We read in Gal. iii. 8, of the gospel which was preached before gospel times unto Abraham. It was preached unto Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and others, through these and such things as types and figures of things spiritual, and is preached unto us in the record of them given in the Scriptures, which we are to be endeavoring through grace to profit by. But more particularly.

2d. It teaches that the promise is not fully accomplished to the people of God in this world, and in many parts of it not at all. Abraham was an heir of the promise through faith; yet he obtained it not in the literal accomplishment of it in himself; nor in the full accomplishment of it, and spiritual accomplishment of it here, even in his posterity. Heaven was this promise to Abraham: And it was in it also to all the believing Israelites. That same covenant promise which was made to Abraham is made to us through him: but it is a promise which will not be fully accomplished to us, until we get to heaven. And as respects the literal accomplishment of it, it is not a promise which at all applies to us.

3d. The covenant as a new covenant promise only properly respects spiritual things. If to Abraham the land of Canaan and a literal seed which was to be given to him, was embraced in it, this was a promise of means, which were to lead to the end, according to the Lord's usual way of exhibiting himself through promises to his people. The promise of a literal seed, embraced under it the promise of Christ, the promised seed by way of eminence, as appears from Gal. iii. 16. "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds as of many but as of one, And to thy seed which is Christ." And it had its special fulfilment in this to which the other was to make way. And the promise of Canaan as a literal rest, had the promise of heaven as an eternal rest, embraced in it to which the former made way as a type and figure; and as it was to be a place where ordinances were to be enjoyed and plentiful means of grace. Believing Israelites were prepared thereby for heaven, and believers to this very day enjoy the benefit of the instruction which, through Canaan as a type of heaven, is given unto them as the history of the Israelites possessing of it, with its being divided out to them by lot. Its being the land of promise, and God's taking his abode among that people, who inhabited it by these ordinances of his grace, which of old were enjoyed in it; his making himself known to them as their covenant God, and owning himself as standing to them in this character, &c. are all instructive to believers to the end of the world.

4th. When the Lord makes a promise, his people should be, as it were, taking enfeoffment of it. Abraham did so in respect to the covenant promise the Lord made to him by this field, in the purchase of it, and burying Sarah here, and being buried here afterwards himself, by Isaac and Ishmael, his sons, Gen. xxv. 9—Isaac did so in being buried there herself, together with Rebekah, by his sons, Jacob and Esau.—Jacob did so by the charge he gave to his children, that they should bury him there, Gen. xlix. 29, 30, 31: and in burying Sarah there.—And Joseph did so by a similar charge, which he gave to his brethren, namely, that they should

carry up his bones from Egypt and bury them there, Gen. i. 24, 25, 26; which in Heb. xi. chapter and 22 verse, is reckoned to his faith, because it was in the faith that God would fulfil his promise, made to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, in all its extent, that he gave this commandment, not only in bringing the children of Israel into Canaan, but the coming of Christ, the promised seed, and bringing his chosen people all to the heavenly Canaan in due time.*

5th. Heaven is to the believer but a land of promise. It is in death, and through it, he comes to have possession. The promise of the land of Canaan was given to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, including them, as well as their seed after them, or posterity, Gen. xvii. 8. and xxvi. 3, and xxviii. 4. This being the tenor of that promise as given to all these Patriarchs: "To thee and to thy seed after thee will I give this land." Yet they had no actual possession in it but a burying place. And even those who came after them, and did obtain actual possession, it is said of them in Heb. xi. 39, that they received not the promises, namely, as Christ was in it; and it might be added, as heaven was in it. They had in respect to this as yet but the type and figure. Yet as a land of promise, it is sure to the promised seed, as Canaan the promised land, was to the posterity of Abraham, through the promise which God had made to him. There was little apparent likelihood when Abraham, Isaac and Jacob were travelling through the land of Canaan, as strangers and sojourners and when they had so little possession in it, that they had to purchase for themselves, a burying place, that their posterity after should be the occupants. But so it was. God's promise was sure. The promise of heaven is equally sure to all the spiritual seed.

6th. Persons may receive the promises as to the comfort and benefit of them, when they do not actually receive the things promised. Abraham here found comfort in the promise and benefit from it. His faith led him to expect the accomplishment of it in due time. Sarah's death, though it was to him a trying event, yet through his faith he was the more able to bear it. And he lays her dead body in the grave in the hope, not only of a blessed resurrection, but also of the accomplishment of all promises which respected him and his posterity, and the coming of Christ in due time, with the eternal enjoyment of him in heaven, he was himself to have, and in fellowship too with his beloved Sarah, the partner of his joys and sorrows in this world, and of his hopes through the covenant promise, now taken away from him by death.

Various other important gospel truths are exhibited to us in this passage, which time will not now permit to mention. These are a specimen of the many that might be adduced from it besides; and they shew that

* This so full account of the purchase of this field, with the burial of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and Joseph there, with Sarah, Rebekah and Leah, as it is interspersed throughout the Scriptures, and referred to by the Apostle, is not related merely as an historical fact, to be handed down to us as such, but for important ends; as, "whatsoever was written aforetime, was written for our learning, that we, through patience and comfort of the Scriptures, might have hope." What end does it serve us to know where Sarah and Abraham, or any of these Patriarchs, with their wives, were buried, whether in Canaan or any where else, were it not from some instruction to be had from it, that would in some way be useful to us. Were it not for such an end, the place of their burial had been concealed from us perhaps, as was that of Moses from the children of Israel, lest they should have paid a superstitious respect to it. But as from the burying place of Moses, there was not that instruction to be obtained: at least the same in kind, as from this common burying place of these Patriarchs, there is no record made of it. It was kept concealed from the children of Israel. This is a special part of the instruction given by this piece of history, namely, that "These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, they were persuaded of them and embraced them." Their conduct is for our imitation. Heaven is to us in the gospel promise. We obtain not possession of it in this life. But we are to be taking enfeoffment of the promise, by entering into that rest now which is to be had in Christ by faith, and pursuing after the earnest of heaven in the exercise of the various graces, and in due use of the means of grace, and endeavoring even now, in our measure to sit with Christ by faith in heavenly places in these ways.

there is no fact of the Sacred Scriptures, in which we may not find Christ upon a right understanding of their meaning; and that in many places where upon a superficial view taken of them, he will not be seen at all; upon a right enquiry into these very parts of Scriptures, we will find much of Christ and eternal life.

See from this passage. That things which are recorded in the Scriptures, as historical facts, are not recorded but for some special instruction to be had from them, or example set forth to us by them. And in reading them, we should not satisfy ourselves with the knowledge of the things related as they are mere historical facts: But we should endeavor, in a dependance on the Holy Spirit, which is promised to be given to lead us into all truth, to learn what use we are to make of them; what foundation for faith is here; what example for the practice of Christian duty is set before us; or encouragement to go forward in it is given to us. As a fact related in the Bible is a mere historical fact, it is but the shell that contains meat and sweet in it, and we have to breath through it, if we would have our faith strengthened; our souls nourished and our hearts comforted by it as a portion of God's blessed word. "Search the Scriptures," says Christ, "for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they that testify of me." We must look carefully into them, and enquire into their true import; take what instruction they give to us in every part, if we would find Christ in them and eternal life. We must dig into the field of the word to come at the rich treasure that is hid in it. Treasure is hid in this passage and in all the word of God throughout. We must dig to find it. Y.

ART. III. *Abraham commanded to Sacrifice Isaac.*

(Concluded from page 83.)

3. The name of this place of deliverance, and the mercy shown to Abraham, teaches us that God will still be ready to support his people in the hour of trial; and will, when in the path of duty, and obedient to his word, protect them, though a thousand dangers, though hosts of enemies, beset them on every side. "Though an host should encamp against me, mine heart shall not fear; though war should rise against me, in this will I be confident.—The Lord is my light and my salvation, whom shall I fear; the Lord is the strength of my life, of whom shall I be afraid?" Thus, the grace of the God of mercy supported Abraham under this trial, and filled his soul with calmness and submission. Thus the Lord supported Noah, when the whole world hated, and laughed him to scorn;—the blessing of the Eternal sheltered him and his, when the myriads of a faithless world sank beneath the waters of vengeance. Thus when Daniel would not be driven from his duty by the fear of certain death, but knelt upon his knees, three times a day, and prayed, and gave thanks before his God, as he did aforetime; the God whom he served, sent his angel to preserve him in the lion's den. Thus the Lord preserved his three servants in the furnace at Babylon, when they refused to defile their souls with idolatry; and made the fierce fires of that terrible furnace as harmless to them, as the refreshing breezes of a summer's sky. Thus he supported his martyr Stephen; and when his body was sinking beneath the blows of his ruthless murderers, the eye of his soul saw the heavens opened, his house of rest prepared, and the Son of Man standing on the right hand of God.

Believer, the same power which defended, the love that saved, the mercy that sheltered and blessed God's people of old; is pledged to protect

you, and to make all things work together for your good. He whose throne endureth forever, is your friend. He whose word controuls heaven, earth and hell, is on your side, and what need you fear.

Fear not for the church. In the hour of her deepest distress she will be supported, and brought safe through the sharpest trials. Thus, when Isaac lay bound on the altar, the hopes of the church seemed ready to receive their death blow. Isaac was the root of that chosen race, of whom Jesus the Messiah was to spring. Now, that heir of the promise is ready to be slaughtered; and unbelief might suggest, that the promises would fail, and the church's prospects of deliverance perish forever. Look to the issue, and acknowledge, that the Lord of Hosts is wonderful in counsel, and excellent in working. How low, again, was the church when her glorious Head was in his grave. When the blood of Jesus fell on the hill of Calvary, the hopes of the church seemed blasted forever. And yet, then was the hour of her triumph. The cross of the Crucified, becomes a bond of union between heaven, and earth; angels and men.—That cross, is the consolation and glory of the Christian on earth, his support and triumph in death, the theme of his praise through Eternity.

The church has often since been brought apparently to the very brink of destruction; but when enemies were triumphing; and trampling, as they thought, on her *grave*, and the blood of her last friends;—they have been made to feel, by terrible judgements, that God is the refuge and strength of his church, and that to persecute her, is to fight against him. The church *now*, is in a desolate and distracted state. Error has so marred her beauty, divisions and heresies have so torn and polluted her, that she is, indeed, brought very low. In the churches of the Reformation—in the pulpit, by her own ministers, has been forged the sword, that is now piercing her through;—the sword of error which has slain its thousands. She is like a ship tossed in a raging sea, where the winds and waves every moment threaten her destruction; and yet, when her earthly pilots, her ministers, should be awake and watching; like Isaiah's blind watchmen, "they are all dumb dogs, they cannot bark; sleeping, lying down, loving to slumber. Yea, they are greedy dogs which can never have enough" of popularity, and which, they fear, would be endangered by a fearless testimony for the truth.

The church (if the emblem may be used) is filling with error; the ship is among the breakers;—the waves of error are ready to close over her, and engulf souls in the horrible abyss. The enemy are at the gates;—the sword of the destroyer is drinking the blood of souls: and yet the sleepy pilot, the careless watchman, will not see; or, is heard weakly and wickedly boasting, that he is so "much occupied in trying to do good," that he has no time to guard against error, to point out the rocks on which the ship is ready to strike and be dashed in pieces:—so earnest in endeavoring to bring multitudes into the church, that he has no time to examine, whether enemies, are not entering with friends:—so anxious to save souls, that he has no time to look, whether the sword of error approaches his borders:—so earnest and so occupied, in endeavoring to feed souls, that he has no time to examine whether it is arsenic or flour, poison or bread, truth or error, he is administering! Alas! for the church, if such faithless and worldly minded watchmen, were her only protection. Christ is in the ship, and even if "covered with the waves," it cannot sink. The church is safe, the truth shall not perish. This bush may burn, but it shall not be consumed. "God is in the midst of her." The floods of error, and the storms of persecution may rise and beat against her walls, they will never fall; their foundation is the Rock of Ages. He whose hand is Omnipotence, is making the mighty wheels of Providence move in subserviency to her interests. Still, he expects his

ministers and members to be watchful and faithful. You are to defend the truth against the enthusiast, the innovator, and the worlding; to live as a pilgrim upon earth, looking forward to, and preparing for, Eternity:—and to say in holy sincerity of soul, though “all people walk every one in the name of his God, *we* will walk in the name of the Lord our God for ever and ever.” (Micah iv. 5.) The truth is assailed, and wo to them that are at ease in Zion. The gospel trumpet has called you to come to the rescue, and war a good warfare. It calls you not to a field of blood, not to the butchery of a brother—the strife of guilty war; but to the salvation of souls. The weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but spiritual; and rendered mighty by the power of God, for the rescue of precious souls, from the deadly embrace of error and sin. Leave the world to its dreams. Be willing to leave your property to perish, to sacrifice liberty, and life, reputation, and friends; but let not souls perish, nor the cause of truth suffer, by your coldness or selfishness *now*. And let no discouraging appearances dismay you. The church, we repeat, shall not perish, the truth shall not die. A day, a glorious day of deliverance for her, and for the truth will yet dawn. “He that shall come, will come, and will not tarry.” “The night is far spent, the day is at hand.” The very opposition of the enemies of the truth, is promoting its interests. Under the heaviest trials then, that may threaten you or yours, or the church of God; still trust with confidence in thy Beloved. Though a dark cloud of error covers the earth, though the truth lies trampled and bleeding, though the friends of truth should again be seen in dungeons and in flames, or, as now, pierced with the venomous tongue of the scorner:—though the haters of the truth, and the troublers of Zion’s peace, should be high in place, and should raise the throne of their popularity over the grave of buried truth; while the churches they have wasted, and the multitudes they have deceived, trumpet their fame, and shout their hosannahs;—yet be not discouraged. The church is safe. Though all the powers of earth and hell should encompass, “the daughter of Zion may despise them and laugh them to scorn.” (Isa. xxxvii. 22.) The truth shall triumph. The standard of heaven, though stained, so to speak, with the blood of martyrs; and assailed by the sword and the fires of persecution, will always have some to rally round it, willing to live and die in its defence:—it will be upheld and carried forward, till on the battle field of Armageddon, it is planted on the ruins of the strong-holds of darkness; and all the ends of the earth shall see the salvation of our God.

4. Look from the type to the antitype; from Isaac to Jesus, and see, by what motives, we are bound to obey all the commands of God; to bow to his will, and live to his glory.

It was the language of the Lord to faithful Abraham: “Now I know that thou fearest God, seeing thou hast not withheld thy son, thine only son from me.” Christians, how much greater cause have we to know and say, that the Lord loves us, when for our soul’s sake, He has not spared His own Son. God had given Isaac to Abraham; had blessed him with unnumbered and undeserved favours; and then, only recollect what he had given:—but now, he has manifested and proved his love to us, in that, while we were enemies, Christ died for us. Did Isaac bear the wood on which he was to be bound and slain?—Look from Moriah to Calvary, and see the sinless Son of God leaving Jerusalem, and as he bears the wood of his cross to the place of sacrifice, sinking down under the weight of that instrument of death. Isaac was rescued in the moment of extremity; the true Isaac was actually slain. Behold the beloved of the Father, bound to the accursed tree. The sword of justice is drawn to smite his soul. The commission was given from the throne:—Awake,

O sword against my Shepherd, and against the man that is my fellow, saith the Lord of Hosts.

That sword slept not. It is drawn out by the hand of justice, and returns not to its sheath till it is plunged in the hand of the Son of God. When the soul of Jesus was sinking in the garden under that load of wrath which was due to us:—when the victim was bound on the cross; God, the Eternal Father, comes forth clothed as in the robes of vengeance demanding from his Son, as the Surety of his people, full satisfaction for all their sins. The blow that would have crushed the Universe into dust is descending—but no voice is heard arresting the terrible stroke. Amazement, we may well believe, was in Heaven, when he, who fills its blessed abodes with glory, was seen, his form marred, his heart full of heaviness, and his soul encircled with the floods of sorrow. If angels ever wept, if sorrow ever entered the land of glory, it was, when the Lamb of God was hung, as the vilest criminal, between heaven and earth: when the blood of the Creator was given for the creature; when God spared not his own Son, but commanded the sword of justice to pursue him till it had entered his heart, till his life blood was poured out. Another victim was provided in the room of Isaac, and the son of Abraham is spared. But when the Saviour was suffering, God the Eternal Father refused to spare him. He loved him *as his Son* as dearly on the cross as on his throne; but as our Surety, he frowned upon him, and permitted the fires of wrath to drink his life's blood. It was our sins that the sword of justice struck at, when the soul of the Son of God was sinking under the Father's hand.

Isaac, though he could have escaped from the hands of his aged father, yet submissively bows to the will of his God. Christian, behold the Redeemer willingly offering himself, and consenting to lay down his life in your room. It is true, he was bound by the hands of wicked men and taken, at the will of his enemies, from the tribunal of the malignant Sauehedrim, to Pilate's hall, to the scoffing Herod's, and finally to the cross on Calvary. But all these sufferings and indignities were voluntarily borne. A word from his lips would have withered the arm that struck him. The hands that they were binding were clothed with Omnipotence. He whom they were dragging as a criminal to a bloody death, was possessed of infinite power. He had but to speak, and the guilty myriads of mankind would have perished, and the universe shaken into dust. The blinded Jews who demanded his death; Pilate who condemned him, the soldiers who crucified him, were his creatures, and held their life at his pleasure. And did the Son of God summon his angels to his aid, or commission his thunders to crush the murderers? O, no. He came to die. He came to suffer for our souls. For us his life was freely given. His agony and his prayer in the garden of Gethsemane, manifested no unwillingness to die. The cup he there plead might pass from him, was not the death of the cross. He did not plead that the decree which appointed him to death, as our Surety, might be revoked. No. Looking forward to the day when he was to be wounded and slain on the cross; he could calmly and cheerfully say, "I have a baptism to be baptized with, and how am I straitened till it be accomplished?" (Luke xii. 50.) When he was bleeding upon the altar; when he was hung upon the cross; when the nails were driven through his hands and his feet—when he was sinking under a lingering and cruel death, he never complained. His mysterious and agonized cry on the cross was not on account of his bodily sufferings. He complained, not that he was buffeted, spit upon, and crowned with thorns;—not that he was covered with ignominy, and his whole body racked with pain: his only complaint was, that his Father had forsaken him—that the cheering light of his Father's countenance was with-

drawn from his soul. The bodily pangs endured in a death by crucifixion, are indeed dreadful: But these tortures of the cross never dismayed the Son of God. One drop of that burning wrath which fell upon *his soul* in the garden and on the cross, would infinitely outweigh all the pangs, all the united anguish, endured by all the human race, from the apostasy to the present hour. When he plead in the garden then that "this cup might pass from him"; we are not to suppose that he prays for a removal of the death of the cross; and that we might be left to our deserved doom. No. The "cup" which he *then* pleads might be removed, was the mysterious and infinite anguish, which, as our Surety, was *then* convulsing his soul, and forcing from every pore of his body, "great drops of blood falling down to the ground." His soul *then*, as well as on the cross, was in the fire of wrath. It was the wrath, and the curse, due to our sins, that made his "soul exceeding sorrowful even unto death." *Then* as our Surety, the Lord was bruising him. The cup of wrath was at his lips; the sword of justice was entering his soul. It was the ineffable anguish, with which his soul was then struggling, and which he styles in a figure a "cup," which he prays may pass away:—those *penal* and *infinite* sufferings—those waves of divine wrath which for our sins then began to roll over his soul, and his prayer was heard. He is always heard. (John 11. 42. Heb. 5. 7.) "He was heard," says Paul, speaking of his prayer in the garden, and delivered not from death—but from the fear and the foretaste of divine wrath, which had then fallen upon his soul. The "cup" passed away. The agony under which his soul was weighed down, was removed. The floods of sorrow which were rushing upon him, were for a time driven back.

In all his sufferings then, he was a willing victim. He was rich in infinite greatness and glory, and for our sakes became poor. He willingly came down from the throne of heaven, and for us, took in exchange, the meanness of the manger, and the ignominy of the cross. He willingly left all the glory of the heaven of heavens where he had reigned from eternity, to dwell on our polluted earth, and die for the guilty. Though he was from eternity in "the form of God and equal with God," yet for us he willingly *made himself* of no reputation, and *took upon him* the form of a servant, and can we be insensible to such amazing love, or neglectful of the laws and the honor of such a friend?

He who reigns on the throne of heaven, appeared for us as an infant of days in the manger at Bethlehem. He whom the angels of heaven adore, was for us despised and rejected of men. For us, the Son of the Highest was sold, and dragged as the vilest slave before a guilty tribunal; that fallen fiends might not drag us down to hell, and forever glut their fury on the agonized soul. He gave his back to the smiters, to be torn by the lashes of the scourge; that by his stripes we might be healed. The crown of thorns was pressed upon his sacred head, that we might wear the crown of glory. The insulting reed, in mockery of his majesty, was put in the hand of him who sways the sceptre of the Universe; that clothed with white robes, and palms of victory in their hands, his people might stand triumphant in the new Jerusalem. And never did he regret having agreed to die in his people's stead. Even when his soul was suffering, when the cloud of wrath was coming over him, and shutting out the cheering light of his Father's countenance, he loved you still, and rued not the fearful price at which he was ransoming your souls. His heart indeed was broken in the conflict; yet, the load of wrath which crushed him he welcomed for your sake. "What shall we then render unto the Lord, for all his benefits?"—Remembering what your Saviour has done to redeem you, "I beseech you brethren, by the mercies of God that ye present your bodies, living sacrifices, holy and accepta-

ble, which is your reasonable service." Think of the unutterable agonies of the Son of God, and grudge not to serve him, or suffer for his sake. Let the remembrance of his love lead you to resist sin. The sword of justice has written in the blood of the Saviour, that sin is, indeed, an evil thing and a bitter, and will you love, and cling to that, which crucified your Lord? one duty wilfully neglected; one sin wilfully indulged in, may destroy the soul. Say not it is a trifling omission, a trifling sin. Can you think that any sin is a trifling evil, when you listen to the groans that burst from the breaking heart of the Son of God; when the soul of this true Isaac was stretched on the altar of justice, an offering for your sin? Rather say, resting on promised grace, if I forget thee, blessed Redeemer, let my right hand forget her cunning;—let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth, ere it should blaspheme my God—let it be stilled in death rather than be left to oppose his truths:—let "mine arm fall from my shoulder-blade," ere it should be lifted up against the cause of Zion, or be found assailing the banner of heaven;—let my body be hidden in its grave, ere it should be left to sin against my Saviour. Thus let every one that nameth the name of Christ, resolve to depart from all iniquity. Look forward to, and live for, eternity. Live as those who have broken forever with a wicked world, and are resolved to live at eternal war with sin. Welcome whatever you may meet with in the wilderness, as coming from the hand of your best friend. The God who supported Abraham, will support you. The love that never left him, will never leave you. The mercy that crowned his obedience with the blessing of heaven; will adorn you with glory, and carry your souls to the "city of the Living God," where, with all the spirits of the just made perfect, you shall serve and adore Him who "hath loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father. To Him be glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen.

From the (Edinburgh) Presbyterian Magazine.

ART. IV. *Illustrations of Scripture, Critical, Doctrinal and Practical.*

No. I.

Jeremiah xxx. 21. "And their nobles shall be of themselves, and their governor shall proceed from the midst of them: and I will cause him to draw near, and he shall approach unto me: for who is this that engaged his heart to approach unto me? saith the Lord."

It is to be remarked that in this chapter, and in many other places of Scripture, Israel is a type of the Elect or God's chosen. The captivity of the former, is a type of the bondage and misery of the latter, by reason of their apostacy from God: and the deliverance of the former, a type of the redemption and effectual calling of the latter. The descriptions given in this chapter of the captivity of Israel, with respect to its causes and consequences, and their deliverance as to its manner and effects, are still more expressive when applied to the natural state and the salvation of the elect world. The appearance and work of Christ upon earth are connected with both, as the happy result of the bringing again of the captivity of literal Israel, and as the ground of the redemption of spiritual Israel.

Some think that the "nobles" and "governor" mentioned in this 21st verse, refer to rulers of their own, who were to reign over them after their captivity, and who should be religious men, such as Nehemiah who re-

built the wall, and Zorobabel who rebuilt the temple of Jerusalem, and who were over the people. But a little attention to the words may serve to convince us that no human rulers or governors are meant. For, in the first place, the word here rendered "their nobles," is in the *singular* number in the original, and may with the greatest propriety be rendered as in the margin "his noble or glorious one," *i. e.* Jacob's noble or glorious One. Again, in the last clause God is introduced, speaking after the manner of men, in the language of wonder, at the person who has engaged his heart to approach unto him, "for who is this that engaged his heart to approach unto me? saith the Lord." This is language which he never uses concerning any of his creatures, for as no creature can approach unto him to endure his wrath, so in approaching him in a course of obedience, or in serving him, his rational creatures, instead of doing any thing wonderful, do no more than their duty. The wonder is, that any of them should be estranged from God and at a distance from him.

The reference in the text is therefore to none other than the second person of the glorious Trinity, who, in consequence of his Father's appointment, undertook to be the Mediator between God and man; and of his person and office and work we have a very wonderful description in this verse. Not only are the two words rendered "nobles" and "governors," both in the singular in the original, but the pronouns annexed to them are singular, "his noble one, and his governor." Here Jacob's or Israel's glorious One corresponds to "the Lord their God," in the first clause of the ninth verse; and Jacob's "governor" to David their king, in the last clause of the same verse. "They shall fear the Lord their God, and David their king, whom I will raise up unto them." Christ's being called Jacob's glorious One, denotes that he is in himself possessed of all glory and perfection, for Esaias saw his glory and spake of him; and that he is the ground of his people's glorying and rejoicing. Hence in the 45th of Esaias, verses 24 and 25, "Surely shall one say, in the Lord have I righteousness and strength, even to him shall men come, and all that are incensed against him shall be ashamed. In the Lord shall all the seed of Israel be justified and *shall glory.*" The same person who is Jacob's glorious or noble One, is Jacob's Governor, for he is frequently described as a King or Ruler over the church, the spiritual Israel of God. Thus Is. lv. 4, "Behold, I have given him for a leader and commander to the people." Micah v. 2, "Out of thee, Bethlehem Ephratah, shall he come forth unto me that is to be Ruler in Israel." There the word rendered "Ruler" is the same which is in the verse before us translated "Governor."

There is farther in the verse, which is the subject of our remarks, an expression which we must not omit, since it tends to elucidate what we have said, and furnishes a very striking view of the person of Christ, as God-man or Immanuel. The words which are here rendered "their nobles shall be of themselves," may be read agreeably to the original, "his noble or glorious One shall be of us," for the Hebrew pronoun is of the first as well as the third person plural; and the following words, "their Governor shall proceed out of the midst of them," are, in the Hebrew, "his Governor shall proceed out of the midst of *him.*"

Here then we are informed whence Jacob's glorious One and Governor is. He is from heaven, and also from earth. In this verse God declares that he shall be of us. This is the manner in which God speaks of himself, and is the expression used to denote the Trinity or Godhead, in Gen. iii. 2. "Behold the man is become as one of us." In the passage before us we are informed, that the person who is Jacob's Glorious One is of the Trinity: for the Father, as the representative of Deity, says, "He shall be of us." Hence he is called "God's Fellow." Zech. xiii. 7. Again, with respect to his human nature, he is of Jacob, the seed

of Abraham. "His Governor shall proceed out of the midst of him." This was verified in his appearing in the fullness of time, or between the Old and New Testament dispensations; and in his being the immediate descendant of one neither in the highest nor in the lowest, but in the middle rank of society. We have two expressions concerning him in the eighty-ninth Psalm, which correspond to the views which have now been given. "I have laid help upon one that is mighty," which corresponds to Jacob's "Glorious One." "I have exalted one chosen out of the people," corresponding to Jacob's Governor, who is said to proceed out of "the midst of him."

In the first clauses of the verse under consideration, we have a description of Christ in his divine and human natures. In what follows we have the manner in which the Father promises to act towards him as Mediator. "I will cause him to draw near;" we have the consequence of the Father's causing him to draw near him as a Judge, "He shall approach unto me." And lastly, the marvellous and eternal undertaking of Christ, which is the foundation of the Father's judicial procedure, and of his own obediential work. "For who is this that engaged his heart to approach unto me? saith the Lord."

No. II.

Zech. ix. 11.—"As for thee, also, by the blood of thy covenant, I have sent forth thy prisoners out of the pit wherein is no water."

At the ninth verse of this chapter God calls upon the church to rejoice because of the near and certain arrival of her King, and of the happy consequences of his coming. Along with the call to rejoice, we have a description of the personal and mediatorial dignity of Christ, of the nature of his work, and of his deep humiliation and abasement while accomplishing his work. "Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion," &c. These words were literally verified in Christ, when he rode in humble triumph from the Mount of Olives to Jerusalem, as is here represented.

In the first clause of the tenth verse, the Father intimates what a great work he would accomplish by Christ. "I will cut off the chariot from Ephraim, and the horse from Jerusalem, and the battle bow shall be cut off," which may be understood of his beating off the Jews from all their carnal confidences and refuges of lies, through the preaching of the gospel by Christ and his apostles; and of his slaying the enmity between Jews and Gentiles, by the breaking down of the middle wall of partition between them.

In the latter clause Zion is informed more particularly of the nature and extent of Christ's prophetic and kingly offices. "He shall speak peace unto the heathen, and his dominion shall be from sea even to sea, and from the river even to the ends of the earth."

In the verse under consideration the church is farther informed of something most interesting to her, and which she is most anxious to hear, viz. the nature and extent of Christ's priestly office, verse 11. "As for thee also, by the blood of thy covenant, I have sent thy prisoners out of the pit wherein is no water." Some have falsely supposed that the pronoun "thee," must be understood of Christ; and upon this ground the papists have endeavored to found an argument for their soul-deceiving doctrine of purgatory, as if the Father here promised to Christ that at his death the souls in purgatory were to be released from prison. But from the original it is clear that the pronoun "thee" cannot be understood of Christ, but of the church, who is called, in the ninth verse, "the daughter of Zion," and "the daughter of Jerusalem." Not only does the connexion prove that these are the words of the Father to the church, but, in the Hebrew language, the personal pronoun "thee" is in the fem-

inine gender, evidently because the church is here, as in other places of Scripture, personified and addressed as a woman.

That by the covenant here spoken of is meant the covenant of grace, and by "the blood of the covenant" the blood of Christ, will be evident from what is affirmed of this blood, viz.—"the bringing or sending of prisoners out of the pit." There are only two covenants of life and happiness mentioned in Scripture. These are the covenant of works and the covenant of grace. The former, before it was broken, was a bloodless covenant. The latter was to Christ a bloody covenant. Hence we read in the 10th of the Hebrews of "the blood of the covenant;" and in the 13th chapter, of "the blood of the everlasting covenant." Instead of being of the nature of the covenant of works to lead out of bondage, now that it is broken, it naturally and necessarily leadeth into bondage.—"These are the two covenants," says the apostle, "the one from Mount Sinai," (where there was given a fearful exhibition of the broken covenant of works) "which gendereth to bondage." But what is affirmed here of the sending of prisoners out of the pit, falls in admirably with the very nature and design of the covenant of grace, and agrees with no other covenant.

The covenant of grace is here called the church's covenant, because it was made from eternity with the surety of the elect, who constitute in God's view the principal part of the visible church—it is called hers because she enjoys a visible dispensation of it—and it is called hers because all her genuine members have by faith taken hold of it.

By the blood of this covenant, the elect are sent forth out of the pit, wherein is no water, intentionally in the eternal purpose of God, meritoriously when that blood was shed, and actually in the day of their effectual calling.

R. K. E.

ART. V. QUESTION—*Whether, to drink healths, be a thing fit to be practised, by the professors of the Christian religion? Answered in the following propositions.*

I. It is too notorious to be denied, that it was originally an heathen custom to drink those which were called, *the cups of health*, in token of respect to the object mentioned in their cups. The great *Austin* truly says, *De paganorum observatione remansit*. It is a *relique of Paganism*. And inasmuch as it is not a natural action, but an action of a religious nature, and as themselves called it, *a devotion*, it is now reached by those oracles of God, which forbid our learning the ways and the works of the heathen, and our walking as the Gentiles in the vanity of their minds, and our keeping the vain conversation received by tradition from our fathers.

II. That which very much adds to the obligations lying upon Christians to abandon this *relique of Paganism*, is the idolatrous and diabolical intentions that gave the first rise unto it. We are assured from all the monuments of antiquity, that the *healths* drunk by the Pagans were first of all *drink offerings* to their *demons*, they were a *cup of devils*; and then sufficiently to compliment their princes and patrons they carried on the offerings to those mortals also; and lastly, the compliment proceeded so far as to take in any friends, whom they saw cause to treat with such flourishes of affection. It becomes Christians to beware of having any *fellowship with such unfruitful works of darkness*.

III. To drink a cup, as a part, or sign, of our invocation upon the bles-

sed God, for the health of any person, is a *superstition* directly forbidden by the *second commandment*: nor is it ordinarily free from a violation of the *third*. And that the drinking of an health is thus designed, and so becomes no other than a *prophane sacrament*, was the judgment of *Ambrose*, when he wrote those words, *Quid memorem Sacramenta? Bibamus pro salute Imperatorum*. To drink an health implies an application to some object for that health: this way of it is unwarrantable.

IV. To begin or follow healths, which bind persons to drink off their cups, is a manifold offence against charity, justice and reason. Such healths being as the ancients truly called them, *the devils shooing-horns to draw on drunkenness*, are scandals wherein much brutish folly is committed, and more occasioned. The primitive Christians therefore justly refused them, and condemned them. Great emperors have made edicts against them. Pagan writers have satyrically lashed them. And even Popish writers have reproached the Protestant profession, for their being so much practised under it.

V. Not only the numberless, and prodigious exorbitancies of *health drinking*, are to be avoided by every Christian, but the very proposing our cups to the prosperity of what is therein remembered. 'Tis a vain plea, that we drink no more than a *civil remembrance* of the person, or affairs mentioned in our cups. Why is the action of *drinking* singled out rather than any other for the token of the remembrance? and why is there such stress laid upon a concurrence in the action? It is but a continuation of the old Paganism, which had better be utterly abolished, than thus refined and preserved. Every thing that serves either to revive, or maintain the old Pagan follies, and harden men in them, should be declined by them, that would adorn the doctrine of God our Saviour.—*Mather's Magnalia*.

ART. VI. Declaration of Sentiment, of the Ohio Anti-Slavery Convention.

The undersigned, citizens of the state of Ohio, having assembled in convention for the purpose of organizing a State Anti-Slavery Society, avail themselves of the opportunity thus afforded, to make an exposition of their sentiments upon the subject of slavery, and the means which they deem necessary for its removal.

THE SIN OF SLAVERY.

1st. We believe slavery to be a sin—always, everywhere, and only *sin*;—sin, in itself, apart from the occasional rigors incident to its administration, and from all those perils, liabilities and positive inflictions, to which its victims are continually exposed—sin, in the nature of the act which creates it, and in the elements which constitute it,—sin, because it converts persons into things, makes men property, God's image merchandise—because it forbids men to use themselves for the advancement of their own well-being, and turns them into mere instruments, to be used by others, solely for the benefit of the users—because it constitutes one man the owner of the bodies, souls and spirits of other men—gives him power and permission to make his own pecuniary profit the great end of their being, thus striking them out of existence, as beings possessing rights and susceptibilities of happiness, and forcing them to exist merely as appendages to his own existence;—in other words, because slavery holds and uses men as mere means for the accomplishment of ends, of which ends their own interests are not a party—thus annihilating the sacred and eternal distinction between a person and a thing—a distinction

proclaimed an axiom by all human consciousness—a distinction created by God, crowned with glory and honor in the attributes of intelligence, morality, accountability and immortal existence, and commended to the homage of universal mind, by the concurrent testimony of nature, conscience, Providence and Revelation, by the blood of atonement, and the sanctions of eternity. This distinction, authenticated by the seal of Deity, and in its own nature effaceless and immutable, slavery contemns, disannuls, and tramples under foot. This is its fundamental element—its vital, constituent principle—that which makes it a sin itself, under whatever modification existing. All the incidental effects of the system flow spontaneously from this fountain-head. The constant exposure of slaves to outrage, and the actual inflictions which they experience in innumerable forms, all result legitimately from this principle assumed in the theory, and embodied in the practice of slaveholding. What is that but a sin, which sinks to the level of brutes, beings ranked and registered by God, a little lower than the angels—wrests from their rightful owners the legacies which their Maker has bequeathed them—inalienable birth-right endowments exchanged for no equivalent, unsundered by volition, and unforfeited by crime—breaks open the sanctuary of human rights, and makes its sacred things common plunder—driving to the shambles Jehovah's image, herded with four-footed beasts and creeping things—and bartering for vile dust the purchase of a Redeemer's blood, and the living members of his body? What is that but a sin, which derides the sanctity with which God has invested domestic relations—annihilates marriage—makes void parental authority; nullifies filial obligation; invites to the violation of chastity, by denying it legal protection, thus bidding god-speed to lust as it riots at noon-day, glorying in the immunities of law? What is that but a sin, which stamps as crime obedience to the command, "Search the scriptures"—repeals the law of love—abrogates the golden rule—exacts labor without recompence—authorises the forcible Sunderings of kindred—and cuts off forever from the pursuit of happiness? What is that but a sin, which embargoes the acquisition of knowledge by the terror of penalties—eclipses intellect—stifles the native instincts of the heart—precipitates in death—damps the upward aspirations of the spirit—startles its victims with present perils—peoples the future with apprehended horrors—palsies the moral sense, whelms hope in despair, and kills the soul?

INFLUENCE OF SLAVERY.

2d. The influence of slavery upon slave-holders and the slave states, are—an abiding sense of insecurity and dread—the press cowering under a censorship—freedom of speech struck dumb by proscription—a standing army of patrols to awe down insurrection—the mechanic arts and all vigorous enterprise crushed under an incubus—a thriftless agriculture smiting the land with barrenness and decay—industry held up to scorn—idleness a badge of dignity—profligacy no barrier to favor—lust emboldened by impunity—concubinage encouraged by premium, the high price of the mixed race operating as a bounty upon amalgamation—prodigality, in lavishing upon the rich the plundered earnings of the poor, accounted high-souled generosity—revenge regarded as the refinement of honor—aristocracy entitled republicanism, and despotism chivalry—sympathy deadened by scenes of cruelty rendered familiar—female amiableness transformed into fury by habits of despotic sway—conscience smothered by its own unheeded monitions—manhood effeminated by loose reigned indulgence, and a pervading degeneracy of morals and manners, resulting from a state of society where power has no restraint, and the weak have none to succor.

3d. Slavery has framed and incorporated into the very structure of so-

ciety, a system of antagonist relations—fermenting jealousies between different sections, distracting our public councils, with the conflict of warring interests, weakening our national energies, and imminently jeopardizing our national existence. It has desecrated our federal city, smitten with its leprosy our national temple, turned its sacred courts into human shambles, and provided seats for them that sell men. It is at war with the genius of our government, and divides it against itself. It scoffs at our national Declaration, brands us with hypocrisy before the nations, paralyses the power of our free institutions at home, makes them a hissing and a by-word abroad, and shouts our shame in the ears of the world.

. BLESSINGS OF SLAVERY.

4th. What are the blessings that slavery has conferred upon **THE CHURCH**, in return for its Christian baptism, and its hearty welcome to the communion of the saints?—It revokes the command of her Lord—“Go ye into *all* the world, and preach the gospel to *every* creature.” It builds a new, and sanctifies the heathen barrier of a caste,—and while her prayers and her alms traverse oceans to find heathen in the ends of the earth, it shuts up her bowels against the heathen at her own door, and of her own creation; and, as if to make the church the derision of scoffers, it grants her special indulgence to make heathen at home for her own benefit, provided, by way of penance, she contributes a tithe of the profit for the conversion of heathen abroad. It makes her sacrifices a vain oblation, her Redeemer the minister of sin, terrible things in righteousness the answer to her prayers—and canopies the heavens above her with portents of coming judgments, which now for a long time linger not. It accounts her shepherds blameless as they traffic in the lambs of the flock—while round about Zion lamentation and wailing mingle with her songs, the daughters of Jerusalem weeping for their children, and refusing to be comforted because they are not.

THIS IS SLAVERY—slavery as it exists to-day, sheltered under the wings of our national eagle—republican law its protector, republican equality its advocate, republican morality its patron, freemen its body-guard, the church its city of refuge, and the sanctuary of God and the very horns of the altar its inviolable asylum!

Against this whole system, in itself and in its appendages, in its intrinsic principles and its external relations—we do with one accord, in the name of humanity and eternal right, record our utter detestation, and enter our solemn protest. Slavery being sin, we maintain that it is the duty of all who perpetrate it immediately to cease—in other words, that immediate emancipation is the sacred right of the slaves, and the imperative duty of their masters.

WHAT IS MEANT BY EMANCIPATION?

By immediate emancipation, we do *not* mean that the slaves shall be deprived of employment, and turned loose to roam as vagabonds. We do *not* mean that they shall immediately be put in possession of *all* political privileges, any more than foreigners before naturalization, or native citizens not qualified to vote—nor that they shall be expelled from their native country as the price and condition of their freedom. But we do mean that, instead of being under the unlimited control of a few irresponsible masters, they shall receive the protection of law; that they shall be employed as free laborers, fairly compensated and protected in their earnings; that they shall have secured to them the right to obtain secular and religious knowledge, and to worship God according to his word.

We maintain that the slaves belong to themselves—that they have a right to their own bodies and minds, and to their own earnings; that husbands have a right to their wives, and wives to their husbands; that parents have a right to their children, and children to their parents; and

that he who plunders them of these rights, commits high-handed robbery, and is sacredly bound at once and utterly to cease.

We maintain that every master ought immediately to stop buying and selling men, women and children—immediately to stop holding and using them as property; immediately to stop robbing them of inalienable rights which they have never forfeited. In a word, we say to the master—it is your duty to emancipate your slave immediately, that is, to stop taking away from the slave *those things which belong to him*, and to leave him unmolested in the possession of his body and soul, his earnings, his wife and children, as you are in the possession of your body and soul, your earnings, your wife and children.

PLAN OF OPERATIONS.

We shall seek to effect the destruction of slavery—not by exciting discontent in the minds of the slaves—not by instigating outrage—not by the physical force of the free states—not by the interference of Congress with state rights; but we shall seek to effect its overthrow, by ceaseless proclamation of the truth upon the whole subject—by urging upon slaveholders, and the entire community, the flagrant enormity of slavery as a sin against God and man—by demonstrating the safety of immediate emancipation to the persons and property of the masters, to the interests of the slave, and the welfare of community—from the laws of mind, the history of emancipations, and the indissoluble connexion between duty and safety—by presenting facts, arguments, and the results of experiment, establishing the superiority of free over slave labor, and the pecuniary advantages of emancipation to the master—by correcting the public sentiment of the free states, which now sustains and sanctions the system and concentrating its rectified power upon the conscience of the slave-holder—by promoting the observance of the monthly concert of prayer for the abolition of slavery throughout the world, that by a union of faith and works, we may bring our tithes into the store-house, and prove therewith the “God of the oppressed.”

We propose for our *system of measures* to organize anti-slavery societies throughout the state, employ agents, circulate tracts and periodicals embodying our sentiments, invoke the aid of the pulpit, wield the power of the press—and implore the church to purge herself from the sin of slavery, disowning all fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness,” and “hating the garment spotted with the flesh.” We shall practically testify against slavery, by giving a uniform preference to the products of free labor. We shall absolve ourselves from the political responsibility of national slaveholding, by petitioning Congress to abolish slavery and the slave trade wherever it exercises constitutional jurisdiction. We shall earnestly seek the emancipation of our free colored citizens from the bondage of oppressive laws, and the tyranny of a relentless public sentiment, and extend to them our hearty encouragement, and aid in the improvement of their condition and the elevation of their character. In the employment of these means, and in the prosecution of these measures—while we seek sedulously to “observe and do” the command, “Thou shalt in any wise rebuke thy neighbor, and not suffer sin upon him”—we trust ever to demonstrate in our intercourse with those of opposite views, that we are no less mindful of those other precepts, equally imperative, “Be gentle unto all men,” “Be courteous.”

With jealousy for the honor of God—with bowels of compassion for the perishing; with shame and confusion of face for the participation of the church in the accursed thing; with bitterness of soul for our sin, in no more remembering those in bonds as bound with them; with pity and prayer for those who hold them in bondage,—we utter in the ear of every oppressor, our own loud remonstrance and solemn warning, with

strong beseechings and many tears, that he will "undo the heavy burden, and break the yoke, and let the oppressed go free."

For success in this sacred enterprize, we cease from man, and look to God alone. In him is everlasting strength—with him the residue of the Spirit and plenteous redemption. His word has gone out of his mouth: "For the oppression of the poor, and for the sighing of the needy, now will I rise, saith the Lord; I will set him in safety from him that puffeth at him." His wisdom is our guide, his power our defence, his truth our weapon, his Spirit our comforter, his promise the anchor of our souls, his approval our exceeding great reward, and his blessing upon our past labors, a sure presage of the glory to be revealed in the triumphs of a redemption which already draweth nigh. Solemnly consecrated to the cause of EMANCIPATION, IMMEDIATE, TOTAL AND UNIVERSAL, we subscribe our names to this Declaration. The principles which it embodies we will, by the grace of God, forever cherish and fearlessly avow, come life or death. We may perish, but they shall endure.

ART. VII. *The Christian in Sickness.*

BY HANNAH MORE.

The sufferer has perhaps often regretted that one of the worst effects of sickness is the selfishness it too naturally induces. The temptation to this he will resist, by not being exacting and unreasonable in his requisitions. Through his tenderness to the feelings of others, he will be careful not to add to their distress by any appearance of discontent.

What a lesson against selfishness have we in the conduct of our dying Redeemer! It was while bearing his cross to the place of execution, that he said to the sorrowing multitude, "weep not for me, but for yourselves, and for your children." It was while enduring the agonies of crucifixion that he endeavored to mitigate the sorrows of his mother and of his friend, by tenderly committing them to each other's care. It was while sustaining the pangs of dissolution, that he gave the immediate promise of heaven to the expiring criminal.

The christian will review, if able, not only the sins but the mercies of his past life. If previously accustomed to unbroken health, he will bless God for the long period in which he has enjoyed it. If continued infirmity has been his portion, he will feel grateful that he has had such a long and gradual weaning from the world. From either state he will extract consolation. If pain be new, what a mercy to have hitherto escaped it! If habitual, we bear more easily what we have borne long.

He will review his temporal blessings and deliverances, his domestic comforts, his christian friendships. Among his mercies, his now "purged eyes" will reckon his difficulties, his sorrows and trials. A new and heavenly light will be thrown on that passage, "it is good for me that I have been afflicted." It seems to him as if hitherto he had only heard it with the hearing of his ear, but now his "eye seeth it." If he be a real christian and has had enemies, he will always have prayed for them, but now he will be thankful for them. He will the more earnestly implore mercy for them as instruments which have helped to fit him for his present state. He will look up with holy gratitude to the great physician, who by a divine chemistry in making up events, has made that one unpalatable ingredient, at the bitterness of which he once revolted, the very means by which all things have worked together for good; had they worked separately they would not have worked efficaciously.

Under the most severe visitations, let us compare, if the capacity of com-

paring be allowed us, ovr own sufferings with the cup which our Redeemer drank for our sakes—drank to avert the divine displeasure from us.—Let us pursue the comparative view of our condition with that of the Son of God. He was deserted in his most trying hour; deserted probably by those whose limbs, sight, life, he had restored, whose souls he had come to save. We are surrounded by unwearied friends; every pain is mitigated by sympathy, every want not only relieved but prevented; the “asking eye” explored; the inarticulate sound understood; the ill-expressed wish anticipated; the but suspected want supplied. When *our* souls are “exceeding-sorrowful,” our friends participate our sorrow; when desired ‘to watch’ with us, they watch ‘not one hour,’ but many, not falling asleep, but both flesh and spirit ready and willing; not forsaking us in our ‘agony,’ but sympathizing where they cannot relieve.

Besides this, we must acknowledge with the penitent malefactor, ‘we indeed suffer justly, but this man hath done nothing amiss.’ We suffer for our offences the inevitable penalty of our fallen nature. He bore *our* sins and those of the whole human race. Hence the heart rending interrogation, ‘is it nothing to you all ye that pass by? Behold and see if there be any sorrow like unto my sorrow, which is done unto me, wherewith the Lord hath afflicted me in the day of his fierce anger.’

How cheering in this forlorn state to reflect that he not only suffered for us then, but is sympathizing with us now; that ‘in all our afflictions he is afflicted.’ The tenderness of the sympathy seems to add a value to the sacrifice, while the vastness of the sacrifice, endears the sympathy by ennobling it.

If the intellectual powers be mercifully preserved, how many virtues may now be brought into exercise which had either lain dormant, or been considered as of inferior worth in the prosperous day of activity! The Christian temper indeed seems to be that part of religion which is more peculiarly to be exercised on a sick bed. The passive virtues, the least brilliant, but the most difficult, are then particularly called into action. To *suffer* the whole will of God on the tedious bed of languishing, is more trying than to perform the most shining exploit on the theatre of the world. The hero in the field of battle has the love of fame as well as patriotism to support him. He knows that the witnesses of his valor will be the heralds of his renown. The martyr at the stake is divinely strengthened. Extraordinary grace is imparted for extraordinary trials. His pangs are exquisite, but they are short. The crown is in sight, it is almost in possession. By faith ‘he sees the heavens opened, sees the glory of God, and Jesus standing at the right hand of God.’ But to be strong in faith, and patient in love, in a long and lingering sickness, is an example of more general use and ordinary application, than even the sublime heroism of the martyr. The sickness is brought home to our feeling, we see it with our eyes, we apply it to our hearts. Of the martyr we read, indeed with astonishment. Our faith is strengthened, and our admiration kindled; but we read it without that special approbation, without that peculiar reference to our own circumstances, which we feel in cases that are likely to apply to ourselves.

ART. VIII. *On the controversy respecting the use of wine in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.*

It has become a question with many, whether the Temperance Society is not likely to prove a curse, instead of a blessing, to the church of

God. Already many of its members, (and some of them learned and influential, too,) have been led to advocate the disuse of *wine* in celebrating the Lord's Supper. And from the present aspect of things, there is a strong probability, that the use of wine in that holy ordinance, will be abandoned by at least many of the churches in this part of the union. What friend of the purity of the ordinances of the gospel, can read, without alarm, the following extracts from a "Sermon on the danger of being over-wise," by the Rev. Dr. Sprague, pastor of the 2nd Presbyterian church, in this city? especially, too, when he is informed, that for these plain and honest remarks, the Dr. has received the grossest abuse, not only from individuals, but also from some of the *religious periodicals* of the day?

"Another way in which men make themselves over-wise on this subject is by *modifying the ordinance* [of the supper] to suit their own views; especially by inculcating the doctrine, or adopting the practice, of dispensing with the appropriate elements, or of substituting something in place of them, which the Scripture does not warrant; or to come fully to the point which I now have more particularly in view, and on which the movements of the present day will not allow me any longer to be silent—**THE EXCLUSION OF WINE FROM THE LORD'S SUPPER.** Do you say that it is impossible there should be any danger of such extravagance in an enlightened community like this, and that I am giving a false alarm in expressing the opinion that there is danger? You shall know then the grounds of my apprehension, and judge for yourselves of their validity. In the first place, there are several churches in different parts of the country, which, if I am correctly informed, have actually adopted the measure, and are of course strongly committed to its defence and extension. In the next place, there are in many of our churches, individuals, who suffer the cup to pass them in the communion service, on the ground that they believe the use of wine, even on that occasion, to be sinful. And then there are periodicals extensively circulated, lending their influence, in a greater or less degree, to this unhallowed innovation; and one religious newspaper especially, which has never, to my knowledge, been ranked among ultra publications, is giving forth a series of articles from the pen of an aged and highly respectable clergyman, designed to show that the exclusion of all that can intoxicate from the holy communion is essential to the triumph of the Temperance cause. And the writer of these articles is understood to be the author of a premium Tract about to be published, in which he endeavors to establish the same position, and which is soon to be scattered throughout our churches, and for aught I know to be sent to the dwelling of every one of you. And there are other great names too which stand pledged before the community to the same doctrine; and are doing all that industry, and zeal, and talent, and learning can do, to maintain and extend it. A distinguished professor of Biblical literature in one of our theological seminaries—a man whose name is known scarcely less abroad than at home, and is justly regarded as reflecting a lustre upon the character of his country—has told us in an Essay which has just appeared that, though he thinks wine *may* be used in the communion in such a way as to avoid reproach, and is not himself disposed entirely to abandon it, yet it is by no means necessary to the acceptable celebration of the ordinance; and is to be classed among the unessential accidents of the service, such as receiving the elements in a reclining posture, holding the service in an upper room, and other similar things, in which few churches now think of imitating the apostles. Another professor connected with one of our colleges, and a man too whose talents and acquisitions and virtues no one holds in higher estimation than myself, has written an Essay for publication, in which he endeavors to show that neither bread nor wine is essential to the acceptable observance of the Lord's supper; and that the Temperance cause cannot advance much farther until the use of wine is abolished from this ordinance.

"Does any one say what harm, after all, can result from the agitation of this subject in our churches, or even from the substitution of water for wine at the Lord's table? Will it not be the same thing, it may be asked, when the first shock occasioned by the innovation is over; and may not the ordinance be celebrated with greater safety, and equal acceptableness? I answer, if wine is not essential to the celebration of the communion, by the very conditions of the ordinance, I know not what is. I answer again, the very same spirit which would banish wine from the Lord's table, would banish the other element,—would annihilate the ordinance itself; and hence my respected friend, the professor, tells us that neither bread nor wine is essential to the acceptable celebration of the Lord's supper; and hence another individual with whom I have conversed, more than intimated his willingness to have the ordinance entirely abandoned, rather than it should stand in the way of the cause of Temperance

"Yet another reason, my friends, for bringing this subject before you :—the infidel

is casting upon this movement a look of self-complacent triumph. He is beginning to boast that we are getting rid of our Christianity by piece-meal;—and the signs of the times indicate to him, that under the wonder-working hand of modern theological refinement, both the doctrines and institutions of the gospel will gradually be frittered away, until his creed becomes our creed, and his hope becomes our hope. Is it worth while for Christians, by tampering with the ordinances of Christ, to give occasion to the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme?

“I cannot forbear to say too, that this innovation is a deep stab to the comfort of Christians in the commemoration of their Saviour’s dying love. When I come to the communion table, and administer or receive the sacramental cup, I wish to think of my Redeemer and his death, and the hopes and blessings which I enjoy through him: I wish not to have my mind distracted by having the question forced upon me, whether I am not committing a sin by taking into my lips a drop of wine; and I hesitate not to say, that they who have taken the lead in this effort, who are urging either from the pulpit, or the press, or even in a more private way, the expediency of banishing wine from the holy supper, are responsible in a great degree for these painful associations by which our communion is embarrassed and embittered;—are responsible for imposing upon many a weak conscience a load which renders the approach to the Lord’s table any thing else than a cheerful and profitable occasion.”

Some may wonder, by what process of reasoning the ultra advocates of Temperance have come to the conclusion, that it is sinful to use wine in the celebrating of the Lord’s Supper. The process is simply this: Not resting satisfied with the old doctrine, in relation to abstinence, which is so obvious both from reason and revelation, that “the use of alcohol, though in itself considered, it be a matter of indifference, that is, neither a sin nor a duty, unless rendered so by circumstances, is totally to be abstained from, whenever such use is calculated to *offend* or throw a stumbling-block in the way of others,” they have ascertained, in some way or other, that alcohol (the intoxicating principle) is rank poison, and that the smallest use of it, except as a medicine, is sinful, a positive violation of the sixth commandment: And hence alcohol being the same wherever found, whether it be in brandy, or in wine, in rum or in cider, they very naturally conclude, that all their drinks must be equally abandoned, by persons in health, otherwise great guilt is contracted, murder is committed. Accordingly when the Bible speaks of wine as a blessing and approves of the moderate use of it, they say, that the Bible in such places does not mean alcoholic or fermented wine, but only *must*, by which is meant the pure juice as at first expressed from the grapes and before fermentation has taken place.

This, they say, was the article, which our Lord miraculously produced at the marriage in the land of Gallilee. And this they say was that which our Lord used, and commanded to be used, in the celebration of the Supper, as the symbol of his shed blood. To admit that our Saviour enjoined the use of wine, properly so called, in celebrating that ordinance, they are aware, would be to admit that the use of wine is not *necessarily* sinful, and that therefore their fundamental principle above referred to is false; hence they most tenaciously maintain that the Saviour did not mean *wine* when he spoke of the “fruit of the vine,” on the occasion of the institution of the Supper, but only *must*, grape juice as it runs pure from the clusters, after being mashed by the feet of him that treadeth in the wine-press.

In lately reading in De Moor we discovered that there were some ancient heretics who strongly opposed the use of wine in the Lord’s Supper; and whose principles and mode of reasoning on the subject we found to be very closely imitated by our modern *Hydroparastatæ*. We had concluded to prepare, for our readers, some account of these ancient profaners of divine ordinances, when, very unexpectedly, we met with the following article in the Evening Journal, and which entirely supercedes the necessity of the labor we had in view.

"In these times of great discoveries on the subject of wine, having some curiosity to know whether the doctrines which now begin to prevail, are really something "new under the sun," I have been looking into some venerable vellum covered Tomes, and I find the words of the ancient preacher still verified, "that which hath been is now" — "it hath been already, of old time which was before us." If you think the result of my enquiries will amuse or instruct your readers, they are at your service.

"In the second Tome of Suicer's *Thesaurus Ecclesiasticus*, a very elaborate work, (for it is the fruit of twenty-four years of indefatigable labor, and professes to exhibit every thing relating to the *phrases, rites, dogmas, heresies, et hujusmodi alia*, mentioned in the Greek Fathers) we have some curious information on the great subject of Wine and Temperance. In p. 467, under the word *οἶνος*—*oinos*—which all the readers of the Temperance Intelligencer know is the Greek word for Wine, the author tells us "that some of the *heretics* entirely abandoned the use of Wine. This did *Tatian*, who, says *Theodoret*, was the leader of the *Hydroparastatæ*, (i. e. cold water men,) and the *Encratitæ*, (or temperance men). Concerning the latter, *Epiphanius* says, 'they entirely abstain from the use of Wine, saying that it is from the Devil, and that those who drink it or use it,' (that is, 'who drink it themselves, or provide it for their friends, or persons in their employment,') 'are wicked men and great sinners.' 'The followers of *Severian* also abstain entirely from Wine. *Photius* testifies the same thing, and assigns as the reason, 'that it is the cause of intoxication.' Of all these heretics, however, the *Hydroparastatæ*, or cold water men, appear to have been the most conspicuous. In the account given of them, page 1349, reference is made to *Epiphanius*, *Theodoret*, and the *Canons of the Concilium Trullanum*, in which this is denounced as a 'wicked heresy.' The learned author also quotes *Balsamo*, and *Augustin*, who say that "the *Hydroparastatæ*, or cold water men, were so called because they used water instead of wine in the *Sacramental cup*," and also from *Clemens Dænæus*, who has the following remarks on this subject: "This heresy of the cold water men, I believe, has arisen, not only in part from the *Severians*, who condemn the use of wine in the church, and partly from the *Helcesaitæ*, who worshipped water as a God, and revived the dogma, or, rather, error, of *Thales*, the *Ephesian Philosopher*, but, that it is the same with that of the *Encratitæ*, or temperance men, though under a different name. These men were entirely unworthy to be reckoned among the number of Christians, but should have been consigned to the rites of the profane Athenians denominated *Nephelia* and *Hydraphoria*, because in these, water instead of wine was poured out as a libation to their idols. The chief thing in this error is, that in the celebration of the *Lord's Supper*, water should be substituted and presented instead of Wine." In the opinion of this writer, the maxim of the Roman Satirist, "nemo repente turpissimus fuit—nobody becomes wicked all at once," was here exemplified, for he goes on to say, "This thing they could not have of, nor would have dared to do, had they not condemned Wine according to the ravings (*delirius*) of the *Severians*, and extolled water like *Helcesaitæ*; and regarded as abominable, and to be detested, certain kinds of food, like the *Encratitæ*. The foundation of this error seems to have been laid when men, not content with the holy and simple institution of the Supper which was established by Christ himself, added to it figments of their own. To the two symbols of bread and wine appointed by Christ, they added a third, namely, water, which, they taught, being mixed with the wine, signified the union of Christ with the Church. One change being thus introduced, the progress to another was easy. These water heretics had to advance but another step to substitute water only for the Wine of the original institution. Nor was this all, for who shall say to the ever restless spirit of change, "hitherto shalt thou come and no farther?" It was not long till the *Barsaniani* and the *Semidalitæ* rejected both the bread and the wine, and in their stead took only so much of flour or meal as they could hold between the finger and the thumb, which they scarcely tasted with their lips, and the *Manicheans* not only rejected wine, but added other practices too profane and abominable to be mentioned. "Thus," adds *Dænæus*, "nothing was left in the religion of Christ untouched by Satan, but all and every thing, even the most solemn, was shamefully polluted and debased."

"But to return: "Deservedly therefore," says *Suicerus*, p. 1123, "were these followers of *Tatian*, namely, the *Temperance men* and the *cold water men* condemned, who, under the pretence of temperance, avoided the use of wine, and in its place used water only, in the Holy Sacrament." This doctrine, characterised by a council already mentioned as a "wicked heresy," appears to have prevailed to a considerable extent in the primitive church; but, it is worthy of remark, among those only who previously condemned the use of wine. This brought out not only some of the most distinguished men of that day, but even the solemn decrees of councils in condemnation of these errors, and in defence of the purity and simplicity of the institutions of the church. Were not this article too long already, a superabundance of these might be produced. Take the following as a specimen. *Suicerus*, p. 467: "To the wicked doctrines of these men the ancients manfully opposed themselves." *Can. Apostol. LI.* 'If any

bishop, or presbyter, or deacon, or any one of the number of the clergy, not on account of the practice of piety, but through contemptible and disgusting singularity, shall abstain from wine, let him either reform, or be deposed and cast out of the church. So also with a laic.' The LIII Canon of the same council runs thus: 'If any bishop, or presbyter, or deacon, on festival days, shall not use flesh and wine, acting with disgusting singularity, and not with a view to the performance of religious duty, let him be deposed as one having a seared conscience and causing many to offend.'" Chrysostom in his first Homily to the people of Antioch thus speaks: "Let there be no intoxication, for wine is the production of God; intoxication is the work of the devil. The cause of intoxication is not wine, but luxury. Accuse not the creature of God, but the folly of thy fellow servant; for by neglecting to punish and correct the transgressor, thou reproachest thy Benefactor. Since, therefore, we have heard that certain persons say such things, let us stop their mouth; for not the use of wine, but the immoderate use of it, produces intoxication." Again. "Wine is not evil, but the immoderate use of it." So also Theodoret. "It is not evil to drink wine, but to drink it immoderately is pernicious." To the same purpose Photius. And again Chrysostom. "I am not opposed to drinking wine, but I am opposed to getting drunk. Wine is not an evil, but the intemperate use of it is disgraceful; for wine is the gift of God, but intemperance is the invention of the devil."

There have then been temperate excitements before the present, and it is manifestly incorrect to call the ultra temperance doctrines of the present day, and the practices founded upon them, "*new measures*." They are no such thing. Neither are their advocates "*innovators*," as they are sometimes called. They are only the humble followers of Tatian and Severian, of Thales, the heathen philosopher of Ephesus, and the cold water men and water worshippers of the second and third centuries. It is true, indeed, the moderns have not made the same proficiency as these ancient worthies, but they are making rapid progress in the same track, and to what extent they will go it is impossible to tell. A vast number of "*enquirers*," laying it down as an axiom that the use of wine is sinful, or at least a very improper and dangerous thing, already doubt the propriety of using it in the ordinance of the Lord's Supper; and there can be no doubt if the axiom be just, the conclusion is inevitable. Not a few, like those of old, plead for mixing water with the wine, so as to dilute the sin. Others thinking to avoid this absurdity, propose the use of *must*, which they think is the correct rendering of the Hebrew *Tirosh*, (a thought which did not occur to the Hydroparastatæans of old; or rather they foolishly thought that *must* was the invention of the devil, as much as wine itself; an opinion in which I believe they were not alone.) And some two or three individuals are spoken of as already nearly equal to their sires. Some may suppose from this paper that the writer is no friend to the temperance cause. It is not so. The temperance cause had his best wishes so long as it confined itself to its legitimate object, and pursued this by lawful means; but when its indiscreet friends, in order to build up this confessedly good cause, go to throw the institutions of our holy religion, and to assail the characters and impeach the motives of such as demur at their unhallowed proceedings, it is time for every serious and *temperate* man to say "ENOUGH."

ART. IX. On Patience.

Patience, is a holy behaviour in affliction; a rectitude of mind under a cross; a heart moving by the word of God, when whipt by the hand of God. Patience, is a soul enjoying itself in every condition.

Patience, is an even sea in all winds, a serene soul in all weathers; a thread even spun, with every wheel of Providence; it is a soul above extremes, neither in excess, nor in defect; neither over-sensible, nor under-sensible of any affliction; neither without tears, nor without hope; neither murmuring nor presuming; neither despising chastisement, nor fainting when corrected. Affected with all; cast down with nothing; quiet when tossed, very quiet while extremely tossed; expecting his salvation from God, when none can be had from man.

Patience—it is a soul at rest; a soul daily at rest in God. Wives gone, substance gone, houses plundered, Ziklag burnt, all mourning, many murmuring, ready to stone and kill David, and yet he makes up all

in God, and is at rest; this is patience. Patience—it is as Jacob sleeping heartily upon a stone; a heart at rest in hardships: it is a poor widow, cheerfully giving and obeying a prophet, though but little meal in the barrel, and but a little oil in the cruse; it is one cheerfully going to eat her last provision and die; it is one quietly going to take a view of Canaan, and die at the door, making death, life; Christ, Canaan. It is one going to sacrifice an only son, with a—*God will provide*. Patience can speak no worse divinity in the greatest strait; it is one breathing out a soul at rest, in the face of the cruelest misery—*Not my will, but thy will be done*. If this cup may not pass, let my blood pass; if this cause cannot live, without I die, let me die; let money go, let life go, that Christ may stay, the will of Christ may be done. *Let the will of the Lord be done*, that is a patient man's—*Amen*.—All runs into this. *That patience is a holy behaviour in affliction. Let patience have its holy work.*

ART. X. Summary.

SCOTLAND.—The General Assembly held its first meeting on Thursday last. Dr. W. Thomson was chosen Speaker, or Moderator, of this ancient body. The more rigid members are attempting to exclude from the lay eldership all such persons who do not practice religious worship twice a day in their families. This question it is expected will give rise to much discussion. The Assembly has refused to accede to the request of the Church of Geneva to send a deputation thither to join in celebrating the third century of the Reformation. It was announced by Dr. M'Farlane that the Genevese Church had lapsed into errors and heresies, and that, consequently, the Church of Scotland could not accept her invitation.

“The Philadelphian, of the 16th July, contains an article written in imitation of Scripture phraseology, imputing no very honorable motives to Drs. Green, Alexander, and Miller, touching, among other things, the newly appointed Professors in the Theological Seminary at Princeton. We have repeatedly seen the same style of writing adopted for purposes of slander, or for political effect. But we have yet to learn that it ever succeeded. The good sense and religious feeling of the community repel such attempts, as impious witticism and profane mockery. But it is quite tolerable in such cases, compared with the outrage which it inflicts when it appears in a religious paper, and assails religious men and religious institutions.”—*Charleston Observer*.

SELECT SENTENCES.—The following are copied from a little work by an old Puritan, *Ralph Venning*, entitled “Milk and Honey, or a miscellaneous collection of many Christian sentences,” first published 1653.—*Ch. Int.*

He that is little in his own eyes, will not be troubled to be little in the eyes of others.

What we are afraid to do before men, we should be afraid to think before God.

The best way to please all, or displease any with the least danger, is to please Him, who is all in all.

A man should not praise his works, but his works should praise him.

Free grace calls for full duty.

It is a mercy to have that taken from us which takes us from God.

A saint doth not so much good works to live, as live to do good works.

He that contemns a small fault, commits a great one.

Nothing keeps men more in folly than their wisdom doth, nothing makes them more unrighteous than their righteousness.

The soul is not so much where it lives as where it loves.

He is the best Christian, not who talks most of God, but who walks most with God.

Changes of condition are but exchanges of mercy for a gracious soul.

He lives long who lives well; for time mis-spent is not *lived* but *lost*.

Our holiness causeth not God's love, but God's love causeth our holiness.

Superstitious men do not *fear* God, but are *afraid* of God.

It doth not *befit* religious men to be religious by *fits*.

The returns of prayer call for the returns of praise.

He that is always angry with sin, shall never sin in his anger.

When thine hand hath done a good act, ask thine heart if it be well done.

THE
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,

AND
EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

OCTOBER, 1835.

ART. I. *To the Rev. Professor Stuart, of Andover.*

[In our last number we gave some account of the controversy now carried on respecting the use of wine in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, with an extract from Dr. SPRAGUE's Sermon on the subject. We now present our readers with the reply of Dr. SPRAGUE to a letter addressed to him by Professor STUART, respecting the Sermon. It is believed our readers will regard this letter as generally able and highly interesting.]

Albany, Aug. 21, 1835.

MY DEAR SIR,

In preaching, and especially in publishing, the sermon on the exclusion of wine from the Lord's supper, which has given occasion to your letter addressed to me, in the last number of the *Temperance Intelligencer*, I was well aware that I was taking a step which could not escape observation, and which must of course, be subject to a severe scrutiny. But I had determined to leave the sermon in the hands of the public, and let it take its chance whether for good or evil, without vindicating it from any exceptions, or noticing any strictures which it might call forth; and to this determination I should have adhered, so far as the *sermon* was concerned, if *you* had not thought proper to honor me with a public letter. Your right to address me in this way, I fully recognize; and especially, in view of my having made a distinct allusion in my sermon, to your Essay in the *Temperance Intelligencer* of June, as furnishing one of the reasons for bringing the subject before my congregation. I am induced to reply to your letter, partly from the respect which I bear for your character, and partly from other considerations; though I feel constrained to say, that I cannot commit myself to a protracted correspondence, or even hold myself pledged to reply to any future communications. I make this explicit statement the rather, as I infer from an intimation in your letter, that you have a goodly number of puzzling interrogatories still in store for me, when those which you have already put, shall have been disposed of. I say then frankly that my professional duties are too numerous and urgent, to allow my attention to be diverted by a lengthened discussion of this subject; that I am happy to see that it is in a way to be thoroughly examined by other men who are more com-

petent to do it justice, and have more leisure to discuss it, than myself; and that, in view of these circumstances, both you and the public must expect that this will be the first and the last of my communications.

I will take up the several queries suggested in your letter, and give to each the best answer that I can. My limits will require that I should be brief under each head, and should omit many things which seem to me to have an important bearing on the discussion; nevertheless I shall state those considerations which I deem most important; and if those which I *do* state have no weight, I freely acknowledge that those which I *do not* state, must pass for nothing.

After quoting from my sermon the following sentences—"There is no occasion for Hebrew learning, or Arabic learning, or any other learning than plain English to settle this question. The Master himself hath settled it"—you say, "But what, I beseech you, are we to understand by this? Did the Master then speak English at the institution of the Lord's Supper? Did he make use of our word *wine* in the same sense in which we now employ it? I had always supposed that in a dispute about the proper meaning of a word in the Scriptures, the only ultimate resort is to the original Hebrew or Greek of them. Do you mean to defend the doctrine that such an appeal in a controverted case is unnecessary and out of place? And is it a Protestant principle that such an appeal shall not be made?"

No, my dear Sir, I did not mean to defend any such doctrine, and I am sure you have too much candor and good sense ever to have thought of *seriously* attributing to me any such intention. I meant to assume the fact, not that the translators of the Scriptures were infallible, but that the translation which they have given us, is, in this instance, correct; and on this ground I said, and certainly should say again, under similar circumstances, that no other learning than plain English was necessary to settle this question. You yourself acknowledge that wine (*οινος*) was used at the original institution of the Supper: then in order to show that our Saviour "*did* make use of our word *wine* in the same sense in which we employ it," I have only to show that the wine which was used on that occasion, was the juice of the grape in a fermented state. The proof of this would involve the answer to one of your main inquiries, which must be reserved for its appropriate place. At present I assume the fact that it was so; and on it I build the conclusion that our Saviour used the word *wine* in the same sense in which we use it, and of course that our translation is liable to no exceptions. If I fail of the proof in its proper place, my conclusion must, of necessity, be abandoned.

You may possibly think me somewhat of an anti-orientalist in expressing so much regard for the translation. But I assure you that it is not from any want of respect to Greek or Hebrew learning that I do this: I honor those who have devoted themselves to deep and laborious research into the original languages of scripture, and no one do I honor more than the man who has taken the lead in this department of study in our own country. But still I cannot think that the translation ought to be set aside, or even called in question, but for good reasons; especially as the great mass of people are obliged to rely upon it, and whatever serves to unsettle their faith in the translation, is adapted to diminish their general confidence in the scriptures themselves. I know not in how many instances, since the discussion about *yayin* and *tirosh*, has been going forward, I have heard intelligent men remark that, if these things were so, there was no Bible for *them*; as they could read neither Greek nor Hebrew. You will observe that I do not mention this as a reason for not appealing from the translation where the translation is really wrong or defective; but only as an argument for not appealing from it *unnecessa*

rily; especially where, as in your own case, there would seem to be a virtual acknowledgment that it is correct.

In your next paragraph you say, "But supposing now that you concede to us that such an appeal should be made," [i. e. an appeal to the original languages of scripture] "(which I may presume your candour will concede); then I ask how the fruit of the vine is to be understood? If the mere phraseology, or the mere English translation is to decide this, why then *wine* is out of the question. *The fruit of the vine* in its plainest, most obvious and literal sense, means neither more nor less than *grapes*. *Grapes* then and bread are to be the elements of the Lord's Supper; for in vain do we seek for the explicit declaration that *wine* was drank there by the Saviour and his apostles."

But it is said explicitly that they *drank* the fruit of the vine; and did you ever hear of an individual drinking *grapes*? The truth is that this passage not only *admits* the construction that the fruit of the vine was the *juice* of the grape, but it admits of *no other*; and hence I cannot see why you should have suggested it to me in the form of a difficulty; or how it bears more unfavorably upon my doctrine than yours. You go on to add, "But you will say, 'This is to be *figuratively* construed.' You put your construction upon it, and make it mean wine, i. e. the Greek *οινος*." I do indeed put *my* construction upon it; but it so happens that in doing so, I put *yours* upon it also; for in the very next sentence you proceed to say, "I will not complain now of the liberty which you here take with the words, *fruit of the vine*. I also believe that wine, i. e. *οινος*, was drank at the sacrament in its origin; because I cannot see why the *cup* should be named, and *drinking* be spoken of, unless such was the case." Here then we are brought to a very happy issue of this part of the controversy;—that is, precisely to the same point. I only complain that you should have gravely put me to the proof of that which you yourself had no doubt; in other words, that you should have imposed upon me the necessity of showing that men do not drink grapes, when, in the very next paragraph, you intended generously to concede what you had called upon me to prove.

After admonishing me that "the matter is not yet at an end," and mentioning the various Hebrew words which the Jews employed to designate different kinds of wine, you proceed as follows:—"Now here we have at least *five* different names in Hebrew, two of them for *must* or *new wine*, and three for different sorts or qualities of fermented wine, and all these are rendered by the Septuagint translators, by one and the same Greek word *οινος*; which also is the new Testament word to designate all sorts of wine. Instead then of its being ascertained by the *English* new Testament, what *wine* means, we are not definitely informed by the original Greek itself, which of all the *five* kinds of wine, or rather of "the fruit of the vine," was exhibited at the table of our Lord. If the word *οινος* itself had been used, i. e. *wine* instead of *fruit of the vine*, it would have still left us in the same condition, *viz.* uncertain whether the first, second, third, fourth or fifth kind of wine, was used by our Saviour and his disciples. Will you show us, my dear sir, *how* this question is to be determined? We may then have a stand point, from which we can take a new survey of the subject. Until then we may well suppose that "the fruit of the vine" may be either of the five kinds of wine above noted, *inasmuch* as the Saviour has not been particular in his designation. You will allow us to insist on some specific proof here, before we can take it for granted that your position is certain. We wish to know *how* "the Master has settled it," and what is the proof that he has decided that such wine as we now employ was used by him at the sacramental table."

My first remark under this head is that, notwithstanding you have gi-

ven us *five* words to designate as many different kinds of wine, the only distinction with which we are concerned, so far as I can see, is that which exists between fermented wine and the unfermented juice of the grape; for no position which I have taken in my sermon requires me to show what particular *kind* of fermented wine was used; as we admit that that is an unimportant matter *now*; that Port, Madeira, Teneriffe, Malaga, &c. may be used with equal propriety. Without expressing any opinion then, as to the question whether the unfermented juice of the grape *may* not be used in the Lord's Supper at this day, I am going to attempt to prove that it *was* not used at its original institution; and that, in the example of Christ and his Apostles, we have our warrant for using on that occasion fermented wine.

1. My first argument is drawn from the fact that *yayin*, which you say means fermented wine, was not only allowed as a drink, but was spoken of as a blessing, under the old Testament dispensation. I shall not dwell much on the proof of this, as it has just been presented at length, and with great ability, by a correspondent, (J. M.) of the New-York Observer. I will only say that it was *yayin* which the Nazarite had an express permission to drink when the days of his separation were ended. (Num. vi. 19, 20.) It was *yayin* which the Psalmist, in enumerating some of the blessings of Providence, mentioned in immediate connexion with bread and oil. (Psalm: civ. 14, 15.) It was *yayin* which God, by the prophet Amos, promised to the people of Israel, among various other blessings, on their being restored from captivity. (Amos ix. 14.) It was *yayin* by which the Holy Ghost was pleased to represent the blessings of the New Covenant, which all were invited to accept without money and without price. (Isaiah lv. 1.) I might multiply quotations almost indefinitely to the same point, but the passages to which I have already referred are enough to show, not only that fermented wine was actually used under the ancient dispensation, but that it was regarded both by God and man as a blessing. If this be so, may I not at least ask, where is the *improbability* that it was used at the time of our Saviour, and in the sacramental supper?

2. It was exclusively *yayin*, or fermented wine, which was prescribed by divine authority to be used in the service of the temple. (Ex. xxix. 40; and Numb. xxviii. 7.) Now I ask, if it was not a sin to use it for religious purposes under the ancient dispensation,—if the use of it was even expressly enjoined by God himself, where is the evidence that it is wrong to use it for similar purposes under the present dispensation? Nay, does not the fact that God prescribed it for the service of the temple, infer the probability that Christ used it in the institution of the supper, unless you have something to show to the contrary? That it had been used for ages in the daily offerings of the temple, you certainly will not question: that it was used in those services at the time of our Saviour's advent, I can see no reason to doubt: and as the Passover was kept in Jerusalem, there is every ground for believing that the same kind of wine was used as in the ordinary service of the temple. At any rate, whoever asserts the contrary, is most unquestionably bound to prove it.

3. My next argument is drawn from the celebrated case of the church at Corinth, of which we have an account in the latter part of the eleventh chapter of the first epistle to the Corinthians. It is readily conceded that there is nothing in the language which our Saviour used at the original institution of the supper, from which it can be determined whether it was fermented wine, or the unfermented juice of the grape, which was used on that occasion; as "the fruit of the vine" may legitimately mean either. But within a few years after our Lord's ascension, there was a church established through the instrumentality of the apostle Paul, in the city

of Corinth. Paul must have understood perfectly the proper manner of celebrating the ordinance of the supper; for he expressly declares that he "received it of the Lord." And it were a reflection upon his character as a minister and an apostle, to suppose that he should not have made the Corinthians acquainted with every thing essential to the right observance of it; and that if the unfermented juice of the grape were the article to be used, that he should not have distinctly told them so. But it is certain that the Corinthians drank intoxicating wine; for the apostle informs us that some of them actually became "drunken." Perhaps it may be said that this proves nothing more than that they perverted the ordinance by the use of an improper beverage. I reply that the whole strain of the Apostle's remarks proves the contrary. He reproves them for drunkenness and irregularity, but not an intimation does he give that they have fallen into any error in respect to the article to be used in the service. If their error had really consisted in drinking fermented wine, is it not passing strange that the apostle when he set himself formally to rebuke them on the occasion, did not even advert to that which, on the principle I am opposing, must have constituted the root of the whole evil? Especially is not this a most unaccountable omission, when it is remembered that he wrote under divine inspiration, and for the benefit of the church in all coming ages? Is it to be supposed for a moment that an apostle, and especially the Holy Ghost who inspired him, should have witnessed such a dangerous innovation, without setting up a barrier against its progress, by a plain and pungent rebuke? Suppose it were a universally conceded point now that the unfermented juice of the grape was the only authorized beverage to be used in the communion, and some church, in imitation of the example of the Corinthians, were so far to deviate from the right way, as to substitute fermented wine, and get drunk upon it; what kind of a rebuke should any of us be disposed to administer, especially what kind of a rebuke would a temperance man administer, for such an irregularity? Would he be satisfied with reproving the drunkenness, or would he not look farther, to the cause of it? Would he not say, "You have made an unhallowed invasion of the ordinance by setting aside the article which the Saviour prescribed, and which has been universally used in the church, and substituting an intoxicating drink; and it is no wonder that you have fallen into such criminal excesses?" Under such circumstances, this certainly would have been a natural rebuke; such as the occasion would obviously call for. But no *such* rebuke came from the Apostle. Could the occasion for it then have existed? Or was he not a Temperance man?

4. I appeal to ecclesiastical history in support of my position. I have never seen an intimation in the history of the christian church, nor heard of an individual that had, that the unfermented juice of the grape was *ever* used in the sacrament of the supper. At any rate, it has not been used in our day, nor in the days of our fathers, or our forefathers, to any period of antiquity to which we can go back. Now I ask whether this is not a most speaking silence in ecclesiastical history, in favor of the conclusion that it was never used at all? If it had been the beverage with which Christ instituted the ordinance, and especially if it had been wrong to use any other, is it not marvellous indeed that fermented wine should have been introduced, and yet no record remain of the unhallowed innovation? Various other innovations in reference to this ordinance are distinctly marked, but to this no author that I have heard of even alludes. Could this have been so, if such an innovation had ever occurred? And if it did not occur, was not fermented wine originally used in the communion?

5. I have yet another authority to urge in proof of my doctrine which

I hope you will not be disposed to gainsay, as it is one for which I have been accustomed to entertain a high respect: Pardon me for saying it is the authority of PROFESSOR STUART himself. In your Essay published in the Temperance Intelligencer of June, 1835, two months before the publication of your letter to me, you have the following exceedingly pertinent and judicious remarks:—"But here again, it will probably be said that the argument against alcoholic drinks of all kinds, must prove too much, because it will prove that Jesus and his disciples who drank wine, did partake of drink which was injurious, and which therefore should be prohibited, in case the principle that I am defending be allowed. The reader will observe, however, that my argument has all along and throughout been directed against the frequent and common use of alcoholic drinks. To say now that because such a use must be injurious, and therefore should be prohibited, is quite a different position from saying that an occasional use of wine and drink less strong, is altogether prohibited." Again: "It is indeed only on sacramental occasions that a thorough disciple of Temperance at the present time, will feel disposed to taste of any liquor of this nature;" (including fermented wine.) "Here the example of Christ and his disciples, would seem to give a sanction to the use of wine, which may justly remove all scruples respecting it."

Now I insist upon it, if I have not proved my position, Professor Stuart is no authority. But really, my dear sir, I cannot express all the surprise that I feel that you should have raised up this second man of straw for me to contend with, when, in your Essay published but two short months before, you had considered the very thing which you now call upon me to prove as so clear, that you might take it for granted without any proof. If you have gained "new light," would it not be more fraternal that you should endeavor to impart it to me, and let me into the secret of your conversion from the error which you held two months ago, than that you should leave me to grope in the fog from which you have just emerged, and even challenge me to a defence of your recent error. If your views have undergone no change within this short period, then I must be permitted, notwithstanding the question you have proposed, and the earnestness with which you call for an answer, to claim you as a fellow-worker with me in proving that fermented wine was used at the communion; and in this case, I submit it to you, whether the public should not do us the justice to acknowledge that we have together made out "a stand point from which we can take a new survey of the subject."

I am led next by the course of your remarks to consider the subject of *diluting* wine at the Lord's table. And here I am happy to find that the questions proposed in your letter are entirely consistent with the views contained in your Essay.

You say, "How can it be taken for granted that the wine was drunk unmixed with water, when all the sober men of surrounding heathen nations, looked on such a practice as belonging only to drunkards or lovers of the cup? The remarks you make on this subject seem to imply, that if a man were to mix water with his wine at the sacrament, it would be a profanation of that ordinance. Is it to be supposed then that an essential part of commemorating the Lord's death consists in swallowing a given portion of undiluted alcohol in wine? Is it—can it be this which gives efficacy to such an ordinance, or is it rational to suppose that pious Hebrews, like temperate Greeks and Romans, *diluted* their wine, when they drank it?"

Now admitting the fact that it *was* the custom of surrounding heathen nations to drink their wine mixed with water, and without stopping to inquire whether the reason of this might not be that it would give them

an opportunity of enjoying their cups the longer without intoxication,—I am constrained to say that your conclusion from this fact seems to me entirely unwarranted. What! Is the fact that “temperate Greeks and Romans” diluted *their* wine, to be taken as evidence that the Hebrews did the same, when there is not the shadow of such an intimation in any of the writings either of the Old or New Testament? Especially, can we infer from any usage of the heathen on this subject, any thing in respect to the mode in which Hebrews drank wine at their *religious festivals*? I see not why you might not with equal reason select any other indifferent custom of the Heathen world, and infer that it prevailed among the Jews, though the supposition should not be sustained by the least particle of evidence. In respect to the question whether it is “to be supposed that an essential part of commemorating the Lord’s death, consists in swallowing a given portion of undiluted alcohol in wine,” I frankly confess that I do not comprehend your meaning. I will however undertake to answer the question, if not in public, yet in private, when you will show me that alcohol ever did, or ever can, exist *undiluted* in wine.

You proceed with your questions:—“Is it preposterous to call a man a *brandy-drinker*, or a *spirit-drinker*, who mingles half or two-thirds water with his brandy? Is not this almost exclusively the method in which these drinks are used? Yet common parlance never makes a man a *brandy-drinker* any the less, because he dilutes with water. How then are you going to show us that Christ and his disciples did not drink their wine at the last supper diluted? And how can it be shown that this was not drinking wine?”

This argument from “common parlance” has certainly some plausibility; but I am greatly deceived if it will bear examination. I admit that it is *not* “preposterous to call a man a brandy drinker or spirit drinker, who mingles half or two-thirds water with his brandy;” but I beg you to observe that this proposition is not analagous to the one in which the use of wine is spoken of in the institution of the supper. Christ says not a word about wine *drinkers*, but he says, “I will not drink henceforth of *the fruit of the vine*,” &c. He had the cup then before him,—perhaps in his hand, and he speaks of it as “*the fruit of the vine*.” Now while I admit that “common parlance” allows a man to be called “a brandy drinker, or a spirit drinker, who mingles half or two-thirds water with his brandy,” or if you please, allows a man to be called a wine drinker, who mingles half or two-thirds water with his wine, I ask *you*, my dear sir, whether “common parlance” would justify you in taking into your hands a cup of brandy and water, or wine and water, and speaking of it in the same definite manner as our Saviour did, only as brandy or wine? I confess this would not accord with any usage that I have been accustomed to observe. And in view of it I am constrained to attach as little importance to the argument from “common parlance,” as to the argument from the practice of the heathen.

These are the only arguments which I find in your letter to justify the practice of diluting wine; or rather the only difficulties which you have been pleased to propound for me to dispose of. I take it for granted you mean by the questions you have put to me, virtually to assert the opinion that the wine used in the Lord’s Supper *was* diluted. I cannot but think, my dear sir, that it yet devolves upon you to *prove* it. There is not an intimation in the Bible that this was the case; and the arguments you have already advanced, are, I am sure, to say the least, altogether inconclusive. Pardon me then for saying to you on this subject as you have said to me in regard to fermented wine;—that it “is a question on which we expect you to throw more light; for more is needed.”

But I will not dismiss this subject here. You shall have my reasons

for believing that the wine used in the original institution of the supper was *not* diluted, and that it *ought* not to be diluted at the present day.

1. There is not the least intimation in scripture that the wine used in the temple service, and by the priests, was diluted. If it was right to use it undiluted for sacred purposes under the *Jewish* dispensation, can it be wrong to use it in a similar manner, and for similar purposes, under the *Christian* dispensation? If it was *actually* used undiluted in the former case, is it not reasonable to presume, unless there is some evidence to the contrary, that it was originally used in the same way, in the latter? If our Saviour had made a change, and especially if he had considered that change important, would he not have distinctly marked it, so that the church might be effectually guarded against mistake?

2. In the only instance which I have been able to find in the scriptures in which the mixing of wine with water occurs, it is spoken of as a judgment. "Thy silver is become dross, thy wine mixed with water." (Isaiah i. 22.) Is it likely that Jesus Christ would have enjoined that as part of one of his own ordinances, which God had inflicted as a judgment upon a guilty nation, and which is not even mentioned in scripture in any other connexion?

3. The example of the Corinthians is as much to my purpose in this case as in the other. You expressly say in your Essay, "It is highly probable they drank undiluted wine, for intoxication could scarcely be produced in most persons by drinking ancient wine diluted by half or two-thirds water." If it is highly probable that *they* drank undiluted wine, then I maintain that, as they received the ordinance from the Apostle who had received it "from the Lord" himself, it is reasonable to conclude that undiluted wine was used at its original institution. And besides, on any other principle, the failure of the Apostle to rebuke them for having profaned the ordinance by using an improper element becomes utterly unaccountable. It supposes as in the other case, that he undertook to reprove them, and actually did reprove them with some degree of severity, and yet did not even allude to that which primarily constituted their offence.

4. I derive an argument under this head also from the history of the church. I am well aware,—and I think I have alluded to the fact in my sermon,—that a sect arose before the close of the second century, who contended for diluting wine at the communion. But what else is this than evidence that it was originally drunk undiluted? What gives the authority of the early ages its importance in these matters, is their nearness to the period of the introduction of Christianity; and the nearer we can trace any practice to the time of the Apostles, provided we cannot fix its date, other things being equal, the greater the probability that it was actually an apostolic practice. But if we are able distinctly to date the origin of any custom at a period subsequent to the apostolic times, it were absurd to claim for it any divine authority on the ground that it arose only in the second century; for a real corruption in the second century is no better than the same corruption in the nineteenth. I say then that the fact that the second century is appealed to on this subject shows that the first cannot be; for as the authority of the first is better than that of the second, so no man would be satisfied to stop at the latter, who was not conscious that the former was against him.

5. The nature of the ordinance furnishes another argument in my favor. It is not designed as a repast for the purpose of sustenance, but as a ceremony for religious instruction. Wine, as used in this service, is merely a symbol of the blood of Christ, shed for the sins of men; and of course the smallest quantity of it is sufficient to answer the end of the institution. If it had been designed that it should be used on this occa-

sion as in a common meal, for the sake of quenching thirst or gratifying appetite, there might have been some show of reason in its being diluted, with a view to prevent intoxication. The Corinthians indeed actually fell into this error; but I am not aware that the history of the christian church furnishes another example of it.

6. If the wine in the sacramental supper is to be diluted, who shall prescribe the measure? One individual may be satisfied with having half water; another may require three-fourths; another five-sixths; and another still, perhaps may think that the cause of Temperance requires that the smallest possible quantity of wine should be used, and that a drop of wine to a gallon of water will fairly come up to the spirit of the Master's injunction; while yet another, more scrupulous for the cause of Temperance, and less scrupulous for the authority of Christ, than the preceding, concludes that that single drop stands too much in the way of Temperance, and is of too little importance to the sacrament, to be retained; and behold he comes out for pure water. Now I ask whether, if the principle be admitted that we must not drink wine at the communion table without diluting it, so long as there is no standard given by which the mixture is to be regulated, the church is not almost of course to be involved in an endless controversy? Admitting even the lawfulness of diluting it,—a point which I am by no means prepared to concede, would not the dissensions which it would occasion in the church, far more than counterbalance any advantage which it could be supposed to ensure to the cause of temperance?

Before I pass to your next class of interrogatories, allow me to suggest a query whether there is not some slight inconsistency in your proposing to me one set of questions, which would seem to imply at least a doubt on your part whether *fermented* wine was to be used in the communion, and forthwith following them by another set, which plainly imply that you are an advocate for *diluted* wine on that occasion? If I understand the matter, these are two distinct theories, which cannot with any show of reason both find an advocate in the same person: For the only reason that I have ever heard given for diluting the wine is to lessen its intoxicating power; but the unfermented juice of the grape has no intoxicating power, and therefore there can be no occasion for diluting it. It seems to me, therefore, if you go for the unfermented juice of the grape, as your former series of questions would seem to imply, you must give up the *diluting theory*; if you declare in favor of diluting, then I submit it to you whether the *unfermented theory*, does not become at once useless and ridiculous. It seems to me that you are bound in consistency to abandon the one or the other; and yet I cannot resist the impression that you are holding on a little upon both, as if you were not yet quite certain at which point the light would be the strongest.

But I come back to your interrogatories. You say, "The bread which our Saviour brake, was surely *unleavened*. No other was in existence among the Jews on the passover day. How do you justify the use of *leavened* bread at our sacramental table?"

I justify it on the ground that the use of unleavened bread belonged peculiarly to the Jewish economy; and as that dispensation has passed away, this, among other of its peculiarities, has passed away with it. You remember that the question how far the Gentile converts were bound to Jewish observances, once actually came up, and was referred for decision to an apostolic council. And the decision was that they were bound to observe nothing, even then, except what was enjoined in the letter from Jerusalem, which contained no allusion to unleavened bread. It cannot reasonably be questioned that the Corinthian church, in celebrating the ordinance, used the bread which was in common use among them;

and as Corinth was a Gentile city, it was of course leavened bread. Is there nothing in this to justify the use of the same "at our sacramental table?"

You go on to remark, "We do not know whether the bread employed by Christ and his disciples was *wheat*, or *barley*, or *millet*, or *spelt*. Yet the Saviour says, 'This do in remembrance of me.' Note the word *THIS*. Reasoning as you do, now, I am not able to see why the *letter* of this command is not to be taken; nor what authority you find for administering the Lord's supper any where but in an upper chamber, at night, the guests lying down around a *triclinium*, the dress and wine and furniture and bread in all respects the same as originally; in a word, *this* is to be *literally* construed, and *literally* complied with. To depart from such an obedience in any one respect, is to give up the principle in question."

I utterly deny that any position taken in my sermon even remotely implies an obligation on our part to a literal imitation of our Saviour and his disciples, in respect to all the minute circumstances which attended the first celebration of the supper. For what is the great point which it is the design of the sermon to establish? Is it that Port wine, or Madeira wine, or some other particular kind of wine in distinction from all others, is essential to the validity of the ordinance? No such thing:—if it had been, I might undoubtedly have been called upon, and with some reason, to show whether the bread which was employed was made of wheat, or barley, or millet, or spelt. But the position of the sermon is, that *wine* was originally used in the supper, and that it ought therefore to be used still; without attempting to decide any thing in respect to the kind of wine, other than it should be "the fruit of the vine." Now all that this position requires me to prove in respect to the other element, is, that it should be bread;—the kind of bread, if you please, that happens to be in use in the country where the ordinance is celebrated. It seems to me, my dear sir, that your remarks go to annihilate the distinction between the essential and accidental properties of the institution. You call upon me especially to note the word *THIS*—*This* do in remembrance of me; as if the word *this* necessarily implied that, upon my principle, all the particular circumstances which you have enumerated as peculiar to the first celebration of the ordinance must be observed now. But read the next verse, (1 Cor. xi. 26) and you will there find that our Saviour himself has settled the meaning of *this*, past all contradiction. Immediately after saying, 'This do ye, as oft as ye drink it in remembrance of me,' he adds, "For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come." The design of the institution, as our Saviour himself expresses it, is "to show the Lord's death till he come." The essential things belonging to it, are eating the bread, and drinking the cup; while not a word is here said of the "upper room," or the "triclinium," or any other of the unessential particulars which you enumerate. Drinking the cup, as every one knows, is a figurative expression for drinking what the cup contained; and that it contained wine you admit; while the particular kind of wine which it contained, in distinction from all others, I have not been so "overwise" as to attempt to designate. It seems to me then that Christ himself has distinguished as clearly as possible, between what belongs *essentially*, and what belongs *accidentally* to this service; and that he has made *such* a distinction as to justify to the letter the position I have taken in my sermon.

I must beg leave to quote one more paragraph from your letter;—a paragraph which I confess I have read with more surprise than any thing else which the letter contains. It is as follows:—"I must beg you to re-

view one awful clause in your sermon. It is this: 'I say unhesitatingly, perish the hand,—no matter what hand it may be,—that would profanely withdraw from the supper either of the memorials of my Redeemer's death!' I am well aware how many things can be said to whittle away the force of such a declaration. But I am also aware that they are *subsequent* expedients; subterfuges resorted to in order to save one from the consequences of what he rashly uttered in a moment of passionate feeling, or a paroxysm of polemic zeal. The plain unvarnished English of the above malediction is, 'Let all who differ from me, and who maintain that the Lord's supper may be celebrated without the elements of bread and wine as they exist among us, or with diluted instead of undiluted wine—'let all such perish!' That is, let all who presume to differ from you, incur the wrath and curse of Almighty God! Standing in the connexion that your words do, I can construe them in no other way; and I shudder to give them such a meaning. It is, I verily believe, a fair construction of them; and I beseech you to look at them with serious contemplation of their nature and tendency. I know you will extenuate and parry, as to this part of the subject; but I appeal to all candid men whether your words are fairly capable of any other construction."

I certainly am not disposed to doubt that you supposed you were giving "a fair construction" to my words, and I do not marvel that you should have "shuddered to give them such a meaning:" I only wonder at the ingenuity that could have found such a meaning in them. If the expression had *admitted* of such a construction, I should have supposed that your accustomed candor would have led you to apply the most charitable principles of interpretation, and even to strain a point a little, rather than find me guilty of such a shocking imprecation,—an imprecation which must put me at once upon the list of the profane and heaven daring. But they do *not* admit of such a construction; and as you have not attempted to show *how* they admit of it, or rather require it, I shall at present simply oppose my *ipse dixit* to yours; with this single remark that of the great number of individuals, learned and unlearned, whom I have heard speak of it, there has not been one but has marvelled at the injustice you have done me. I cannot forbear to add that the apprehension which you express that I shall "extenuate and parry as to this part of the subject," indicates to me after all, a lurking distrust of your own interpretation of my language; and that you would have been better satisfied in stating it, if you had been more certain that it was correct. I am quite willing to leave the expression, strong as it may seem to be, to be interpreted by the common sense of the community; but I frankly confess that I complain of you for having suggested to those who may be more than willing to admit it, but who would themselves never have thought of it, so unreasonable and injurious a construction.

I have now, my dear sir, taken up every point suggested by your letter, and answered, according to my ability, the various questions you have propounded to me. And having done it, permit me to say that I consider myself as having performed an entirely gratuitous service;—a service to which the position I sustain on this subject in no wise obligated me. The ground taken in my sermon is, that the uniform practice of the church as it now exists, and has existed for ages, is right: if you say that it is *not* right, then surely it behooves you to prove that it is not,—not to call upon me to prove that it is. The presumption from long existing usage is, that it is right; and until you have furnished evidence to the contrary, I can see no reason why the church may not be at rest in respect to it. The present Reformers on this subject are evidently agreed upon nothing but that *some* change shall be made: for while some go for the *unfermented*, and some for the *diluted*,

there are not wanting those who think that the pure water system is better than either. If then these men cannot agree as to the nature of the change that is to be made, nay if they not only contradict each other, but in some instances, contradict themselves also, is it not a most unreasonable thing that we should be challenged to establish the correctness of our principles? Why wish to demolish the foundations of many generations, unless you have something *better*, at least unless you have *something*, to substitute in their place?

I will detain you with but one more remark. In reading your letter, and other recent communications which have been made to the public on the same subject, I have been struck with the fact, that there seemed to be a virtual acknowledgment of a principle on which Infidelity cannot fail to thrive. You well know how the opposers of revealed religion have triumphed in the alleged contrariety between certain *physical* facts which natural science, especially the department of Geology, has brought to light, and the Mosaic account of the creation; though there is no reason to doubt that natural science is destined, in her progress towards perfection, completely to correct the error which in her infancy she had seemed to originate. Now I ask whether Christians, in endeavoring to sustain this new theory in respect to the Lord's supper, are not unwittingly arraying certain *moral* facts or supposed facts, against the Bible; and thus supplying infidels with a weapon with which to make a bold thrust at Christianity herself. It is boldly asserted in defence of the new doctrine, that the least particle of alcohol,—no matter in what form it exists,—is injurious to the constitution of man. But from whom did man receive his constitution but from God? If then God has permitted, and on some occasions even required, the use of wine, what does this prove but that God is either ignorant of the constitution of his own creature,—the work of his own hands, or else that he has commanded the use of that which he foresaw must injure him? That God has actually permitted and required this, *you* surely will not question, if the Bible be acknowledged as a Divine Revelation. Here the infidel stands ready to complete the argument by saying that God cannot act contrary to his own perfections; and therefore the Bible has no claim to be considered as bearing the stamp of his authority. Is it not, to say the least, a sad mistake that, in our zeal to advance any good cause, we should virtually yield the best of all causes—the cause of our blessed Christianity—to the tender mercies of its enemies?

Wishing you the light and guidance of God's gracious Spirit, in all your efforts to ascertain and exhibit the truth,

I am, my dear sir,
with sincere regard and affection,
your friend and brother,

W. B. SPRAGUE.

ART. II. *Nature of Christian Communion.*

QUERY.—"Can a person, without having his conscience defiled, hold religious fellowship, particularly in the holy ordinance of the Lord's supper, with another, when he knows, or has good reason to apprehend, his continuing in sins which, according to the rule of God's word, would exclude him from the privileges of the church?"—*Mon. vol. xi. p. 256.*

ANSWER.—Yes. There may be a case in which this can be done. In the case supposed in the query, the conscience is defiled only when

we are partakers in the "other man's sins." And we are partakers in them, when we have not taken the proper steps to bring him to the exercise of true repentance; or, failing in that, to have him suspended from sealing ordinances. But if we have used all the means in our power to effect the one or the other of these purposes, and have failed to accomplish either, our conscience is surely not defiled, even if we sit down at the communion table where he is. And that this case may be of frequent occurrence, cannot be doubted.

There are some sins in which church members live, concerning which we cannot have a single doubt; but which, in most cases, cannot be reached, except by the key of doctrine, such as pride, unbelief, vanity, love of money, a carnal mind, and, in general, all sinful affections of the heart. The word of reproof and exhortation, may be applied with all diligence, both from the pulpit and in private intercourse, without producing any reformation. And when this is done, nothing more remains for us to do. For, although these sins in themselves are censurable, yet because the connection between them and the overt acts cannot be certainly made out, discipline cannot reach them. In this case our conscience is not defiled, although we sit with them at the Lord's table.

There may be sins whose connection with the overt act is indisputable; such as theft, drunkenness, lying &c.: Private dealing with the offender's conscience ineffectual, and for want of proof sufficient may be that the deed *was* committed, we can go no farther. Suppose that there is nothing but our own individual testimony, without a single corroborating circumstance along with it. In this case we must stop from entering any process. We have good reason to believe that he is living in this sin, and in the denial of a known transgression. But if we are continuing to deal privately with the conscience as opportunity serves, and if we charge him not to profane that holy ordinance, I do not think our conscience would be defiled by sitting with him at the Lord's table. But it may, in such a case, be extremely difficult, with the knowledge of such things in the mind, to be sufficiently composed for right exercise there. And sometimes it may be altogether impracticable.

Sometimes after scandalous offences have been, in an orderly manner, tabled before the session, presbytery or synod, as the case may be, and put through a regular trial, some view of the case, or of the evidence, or some undue regard to the persons of the offender, may prevent the court, or a majority of it, from giving a judgment according to the truth of the case. If the prosecutor has conducted the matter orderly, until he has no appeal, or till circumstances make it impracticable to carry it farther, and if he would not be warranted from the word of God to make the procedure of the court a ground for secession, which is often the case, then his conscience must stand clear, even if he sit down at the table with the offender. Provided, always, that he takes every opportunity not inconsistent with submission to the courts of Christ's house, to testify against the offence.

These views are supported, I apprehend, by several texts of scripture.

The course which we are to pursue with a *secret* offence is marked out in Deut. xiii. 6. "If thy brother, the son of thy mother, or thy son or thy daughter, or the wife of thy bosom, or thy friend, which is as thine own soul, entice thee *secretly*, saying, let us go and serve other gods, which thou hast not known, thou, nor thy fathers, namely, the gods of the people, that are round about you, nigh unto thee, or far off from thee, from the one end of the earth, even unto the other end of the earth, thou shalt not *consent* unto him, nor *hearken* unto him, neither shall thine eye pity him, neither shalt thou spare, neither shalt thou *conceal* him." And this implies that we ought to tell him his faults, first alone, and then

to take one or two more. But while one individual alone knows of the fact, without any other evidence, it is not to be brought to a public trial. For the words that follow verse 9: "But thou shalt surely kill him, thine hand shall be first upon him," must be understood of the case in which more than one have been "secretly enticed," and can witness to the fact, and must be explained by chap. xvii. 2—6. "If there be found among you, within any of thy gates, which the Lord thy God giveth thee, man or woman, that hath wrought wickedness in the sight of the Lord thy God, in transgressing his covenant, and hath gone and served other gods, and worshipped them, either the sun or the moon, or any of the host of heaven, which I have not commanded; and it be told thee, and thou hast heard of it, and *inquired diligently*, and behold it be true, and the *thing certain*, that such abomination is wrought in Israel, then thou shalt bring forth that man or woman which have committed that wicked thing unto thy gates, even that man or woman, and shalt stone them with stones, till they die. At the mouth of two witnesses, or three witnesses shall he that is worthy of death, be put to death, but at the mouth of *one* witness, he shall not be put to death."

The Apostle seems to quote this as a general rule for all cases in which the testimony of witnesses is the only evidence. "In the mouth of two or three witnesses shall every word be established. 2 Corinth. xiii. 1. Suppose then I have been enticed to an act as bad as the above, but I am the only one who knows it; if I walk up to the directions of ch. xiii. 6, I shall not be defiled by the fellowship of the offender.

It cannot be doubted, that our Lord held fellowship with Judas, in the worship of the temple, and set down with him at the passover, and yet he knew that Judas was living in sin; that he was a thief and had the bag and bear what was put therein;" that "he was a devil," and had all the time the heart of a traitor in him; and yet our blessed Lord was "holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners." His being the head of the church, instead of making this to be no example for us to follow, makes it so much the stronger. For in all his imitable conduct, he was "setting us an example that we should follow his steps." For he certainly knew that Judas was living in sin, but it could not be proved according to the rules laid down, for the church, she is not authorised to call in Omniscience to give testimony.

It may not be altogether irrelevant to the purpose of the querist, or at any rate to the design of the answer which I am writing, to notice some cases in which the conscience is defiled on occasion of another's sin, even when we *stand back* from fellowship, in sealing ordinances with him. It is not an uncommon thing to see members standing back on account of the offences, real or supposed of others. And by so doing, they commonly reckon that they keep their conscience clear. But it is frequently very far from it. We have this precept, Levit. xix. 17, applicable to such cases. "Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thine heart, thou shalt in any wise rebuke thy neighbour and not suffer sin upon him."

Now it not unfrequently happens, that professors come to the certain knowledge of their neighbour's sin, and take *no step* to have it purged, neither do they deal with the offender himself, nor take any measure to have it removed. There are different motives for this in different persons. "The offender is so much older or superior in knowledge, or is in office, that they think he ought to know it without being told of it," so they think themselves excused. Others suppose that "it would be of *no use* to speak," and thereby they are excused. Others again apprehend "that it would breed so much disturbance, that it had better be let alone." Others say, "the offender is a person of such influence, or contributes so much salary, that if he or she should be offended and go off, it might

break up the congregation." Others "do not like to be *the first to speak.*" Nevertheless, the above text seems to consider their conduct in this matter as equal to "*hating* their brother, and suffering sin upon him." Sin is, itself, so deadly an evil, and so poisonous to the soul, that no countervailing motive can free our neglect to warn him of it, from the charge of constructive hatred to him. If members, then, knowing certainly their brother to be in fault, or strongly apprehending him to be so, and reprove him not for it, supposing this to be within their reach, whatever they may allege to be their reason, whether they go to, or stay from, the table, their conscience is defiled. They are "suffering sin upon their brother."

Again: If, as may sometimes be the motive, they *will* not speak to him, because they despise him in heart, or because of some other deadly feeling toward him; or because they fear he would submit to them, whereas they wish to see him brought to open shame: the conscience of such persons are so much the more defiled, for they are *positively* "*hating* their brother in their heart." Their standing back from the table of the Lord on *this ground*, instead of keeping their conscience clear, is itself censurable.

Sometimes (I may say frequently) church members, while they have not spoken to the offender themselves, and for some reason or other, will not do it, but they take up a sore displeasure at the session, because *they* have not taken notice of it, and they stand back from the table. But are they therefore clean? Nay, they are doubly guilty and defiled. They, according to what was stated before, hate their brother in their heart, and are most inconsistently finding fault with the session, for the supposed neglect of their official duty, and sometimes this is most unreasonable and absurd, because their own negligence about the matter has been a bar in the session's way, and sometimes the session does not even know it at all. Such persons ought not to stand back on account of their neighbour's offence, but also to be kept back for their own fault.

It is sometimes the case, that professors have not indeed spoken to the offender, neither are they offended at the session, but they have diligently talked of the matter to all the neighbours round. They have arraigned, tried, and condemned their brother without being heard; without other evidence than their own, and without authority. It is needless to say they are defiled. The common sense justice of the very heathen frowns reprobation on their base conduct. Such a practice strikes at the very foundation of all order in society, civil and religious. The Lord's table is not a place for them, whatever be the conduct of their brother.

I would seriously beseech all those whose conscience applies to them the charge brought in these supposed cases, to pause a moment and enquire, whether their displeasure at their offending brother be indeed real or only affected? and if it be real, whether a *holy displeasure*, on account of God's dishonor and the jeopardising of their own precious souls; or a sinful wrath issuing from their corrupt heart, on which "the sun is suffered to go down" and rise again?

I would suppose once more a case, in which all the regular steps may be taken with an offending brother, until the matter is issued according to the rule of the word. But if the complainer has been moved through the whole business, by a secret antipathy to the offender, so that had it been any other individual, he would have suffered the matter to pass unnoticed; or if he is allowing the very same sin in himself at the time, or if he is pursuing some other sinful course, or trying to wreak his vengeance on some other person, on another account, will his *regular steps* in processing his offending brother clear his conscience? Will it free him from "*hating* his brother in his heart, and suffering sin upon him?"

I think not. Would not the great Master say to such a one, "thou hypocrite, why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, while a beam is in thine own?"

ART. III. *Westminster Assembly of Divines.*

The Westminster confession of faith, and the larger, and the shorter catechisms, are the authorized standards of doctrine in the Presbyterian church, and are very highly esteemed by other evangelical denominations. The more we become conversant with them the more will we appreciate their value—as characterized by plainness, precision, and fulness in the statement of evangelical truth. Wherever the use of them in the religious instruction of youth is neglected, it will be found as a token for evil in the departure from the simplicity and purity of the evangelical doctrines which they contain, in those churches, where they are embraced as the standards of faith. Although not among our doctrinal standards, yet they have always been held in high estimation among the members of our communion. The shorter catechism is very generally known, and frequently used among us. Our readers probably are not generally acquainted with the history of the Westminster Assembly, which prepared and issued the above documents, and from whom their name was derived. We have therefore selected and prepared the following brief historical account of it.—*Ch. Int.*

The Westminster Assembly of Divines, met in the Chapel of Henry VII, in Westminster Abbey, on Saturday, 1st of July, 1643, in the reign of Charles I. Charles I. ascended the throne in 1625 with elevated notions of the prerogative of the crown of Great Britain; inheriting all the despotic principles of the house of Stewart. As compelled by a law of the kingdom, he was a Protestant by profession, while if he really had a preference for any form of religion, he was attached to Popery. The pure doctrines of the Protestant faith, drawn from the Holy Scriptures, have been always favorable to rational liberty, and hostile to the tyrannical measures of despotic princes. Courting, and cherishing a spirit of liberal investigation, that spirit boldly ventured to examine the foundation on which civil authority rested. Arbitrary and unrighteous measures were arraigned before the tribunal of Truth and Reason. And however familiar all this may be in this age, and especially in the United States, to adventure so far in the days of the Reformation was the mark of a daring and noble spirit. The Popish religion has been always favorable to the doctrine of passive obedience, and non-resistance, where the powers that be, could be courted with success. Charles would very naturally lean towards such a religion. It favored the high prerogative which he claimed for his crown. Henrietta, his queen, was a bigotted papist, and had great influence at court, where she bestowed liberally her favors on the devotees of the Popish faith. Images, crucifixes, and all the trumpery of Rome, were re-instated in the churches, with as rapid a progress as he dared to adventure upon. Evening lectures were prohibited in the churches. Evangelical, and faithful Ministers were everywhere discountenanced, and in many instances compelled to desist from preaching. Arch-Bishop Abbot, too good a man to co-operate with the court, in these iniquitous measures, fell into disgrace, and his place was filled by Laud, who had before been made Chancellor of Oxford University. Laud not only seconded but outstripped the king in the exercise of his high prerogative, and oppression. The Arminian doctrine, hitherto considered almost the exclusive property of Jesuits, and other papists, was encouraged by the king, and his primate. The doctrine of predestination, total depravity, and other Calvinistic tenets were forbidden to be heard from the pulpits. Highly offensive forms of worship, and popish ceremonies were ordered, under pain of the royal and prelatical displea-

sure. A book of sports upon the Lord's day, that had been published by James VI, was reprinted by Charles, and circulated to encourage the profanation of the Sabbath. Those faithful ministers who dared to disobey the mandates of the King, or Primate, were exposed to vexatious prosecutions, and many to ignominious punishments. For refusing to read the Book of Sports, on the Lord's day, in their congregations, as ordered by Charles and Laud, many hundreds of ministers of the gospel were fined, imprisoned, or banished. Profligacy of manners prevailed to an alarming extent. Theatres, balls, revels, &c. were attended in the most public manner, on the Sabbath. The court was distinguished in this career of wickedness. It was extravagant and profligate. The exactions on the people were grievous and insupportable. Discontents and detestation of the court prevailed among all ranks. The Parliament entered into the feelings of the people. Charles had dissolved two Parliaments, on the grounds that instead of granting the monies which he demanded, they employed themselves in seeking a redress of the grievances of the people. The finances of the crown being reduced to the greatest state of depression by the prodigality of the court, and by a disastrous war, that the king had waged against Scotland—he was obliged to call another parliament, which met in 1640. It is this parliament which has been so celebrated in the history of Great Britain, usually called the long parliament. From their first convocation, they evinced that they were not likely to be more subservient to the views of the crown, than their predecessors had been. As the most violent oppressions of the people, had been, in relation to the church, on this quarter, the Commons, as the representatives of the people, thought themselves bound to interpose for their protection. Petitions from hundreds of thousands of persons, of the conflicting religious parties, were presented to the Parliament. They besought the king to call together an assembly of the most learned and upright ministers of England, of the different denominations, to consult on the best measures for advancing the moral and religious interests of the kingdom. With this request, the king perseveringly refused to comply. At length, despairing of his concurrence, the Parliament took measures for calling one in their own name, and for that purpose they wrote letters to the knights, and burgesses, of all the counties, requesting lists of the persons best qualified. From these lists they selected one hundred and thirty one divines, to which they added ten lords and twenty commoners, with equal privileges of debating and voting. Ninety six English divines attended. A great proportion were advocates for Presbyterianism. A number of the most learned Episcopalians were invited, among whom was Archbishop Usher, and Bishop Prideaux; but only a few attended, the king having declared against the convocation; and the Episcopal clergy had entirely deserted the assembly, before the covenant was brought in, so that the establishment was then left without advocates. The Independents, or Congregationalists, constituted a small number at first, but increased during the session of the assembly. Unquestionably the best talent and learning were selected to form the assembly of divines. The members of Parliament had access to the best sources of information, and they had every inducement to select the rarest talent of the kingdom. The assembly of the church of Scotland on her part would not fail to put in requisition the best intellect at their command. The members of the Westminster assembly had generally availed themselves of all the aid which the literary institutions of the day could afford them. The greater part of them were men of profound erudition, men who laid under contribution all the treasures of ancient and modern literature, for the illustration of the Holy Scriptures, in the originals of which they were deeply versed. *Dr.*

Twisse, the prolocutor, after having gone through the usual course of study, at Westminster school, at the age of eighteen entered Oxford college, where he prosecuted with intense application, his studies for sixteen years together, before he was licensed to preach the gospel. Here was the celebrated Dr. Lightfoot, one of the greatest oriental scholars of the age; and the learned Selden, a lay member, who by his vast skill in oriental learning, and Jewish antiquities, frequently silenced the most able divines. The names of Gataker, Greenhill, Arrowsmith, Bishops, Reynolds, and Wilkins and others, will ever be conspicuous among those who were most influential in the affairs of this venerable body. Baxter, who knew most of them says, "they were men of eminent godliness, learning, ministerial abilities, and fidelity; and being not worthy to be one of them myself, (says he) I may more fully speak the truth which I know, even in the face of malice and envy, that as far as I am able to judge by the information of history, and by any other evidence; the christian world, since the days of the Apostles, had never a Synod of more excellent divines, than this Synod, and the Synod of Dort.

As before stated, the Assembly was opened on Saturday, July 1st. 1643, with a sermon by Dr. Twisse, the prolocutor: both Houses of Parliament being present. They adjourned to Monday, when certain rules and regulations were drawn up, and agreed on. The Assembly being now ready for business, the Parliament sent them an order to review the thirty-nine articles of the Church. More than two months were spent in debating upon the first fifteen articles, and the result was only two changes in the 9th, and 11th. In this stage they called in the aid of the Scots, who stipulated a uniformity of religion and church government between the two countries. The Scotch Commissioners were the Rev. Messrs. Alexander, Henderson, George Gillespie, Samuel Rutherford, and Robert Baillie; and ruling elders, Lord Maitland, the Earl of Lowdon, and Archibald Johnston. They were introduced into the Assembly September 15. After much debate, the solemn league and covenant, which had been drawn up in Scotland, passed the Assembly with some slight amendments; was ratified by both Houses of Parliament, and by an order, dated Sept. 21, was printed and published. It was the object of this solemn compact to remove Episcopacy, and to unite the three kingdoms of England, Scotland, and Ireland, in defence of civil liberty, and the maintenance of the Reformed religion; taking the Kirk of Scotland, as a model of the greatest purity in doctrine, discipline and worship. About the middle of July, 1646, when the discipline of the Church had been established on a Presbyterian basis, it was moved to finish their confession of faith. The English divines would have been content with revising and explaining the doctrinal part of the thirty-nine articles of the Church of England, but the Scots insisting upon framing an entirely new system, the Assembly drew up the Westminster confession; and the Parliament, after a thorough examination of the several articles, agreed to its doctrinal part and ordered it to be published June 20, 1648, for the satisfaction of the foreign churches. While the Confession of Faith was under discussion in the Assembly, committees were appointed to reduce in the form of Catechisms, one larger, for the purpose of a public expositor in the pulpit; the other smaller, for the instruction of children, in both of which, the articles relating to church discipline were omitted. The shorter catechism was presented to the House of Commons on the 5th of November, but the larger, by reason of marginal references to scriptures, which the house desired might be inserted, was not ready till the 17th of April, 1648, when the house ordered six hundred copies to be printed for the service of the members, and having examined and approved it, they allowed it to be printed by authority, for public use, Sept. 15, 1648. The chief business

committed to the assembly now being finished, the Scotch commissioners took their leave.

It was not, however, until the 22d of February, 1649, about three weeks after the king's death, that the assembly now greatly reduced in number, when it had existed more than five years and a half, and held eleven hundred and sixty three sessions, was changed into a mere committee for examining and ordaining ministers, in which capacity it continued about three years longer, till the long parliament was turned out by Oliver Cromwell, when they broke up of course, without a formal dissolution.

The works of the assembly were :—1 Their humble advice to the Parliament for the ordination of ministers, and settling a Presbyterian form of Church government. 2 A Directory for public worship. 3 A Confession of Faith. 4 A larger and shorter catechism. 5 A review of some of the thirty-nine articles. The Annotations of the Bible, which go under their name, is not a work of theirs, but of certain divines appointed by a committee of Parliament. The influence of this assembly on the cause of religion in Britain and America, continues to the present day, and has, we believe, been great and salutary, especially in the now wide and extended Presbyterian church, where they are the acknowledged, and authorised standards of faith and order. There the ministers of our own country, as well as the great body of English dissenters behold the doctrines of the Bible, moulded into systematic shape and form, and giving a new impulse to the cause of truth. Here the minister finds the platform of his faith, and a model full and condensed for the instruction of the young, and of the aged in the pure doctrines of the reformation. The Westminster assembly will ever be considered as a landmark of the church—as a period when the cause of christianity received a new impetus, and the doctrines of the Bible, came home with additional power to the conscience and the heart.

ART. IV. On Searching the Scriptures.

That it is the duty and high privilege of all to whom the scriptures come, to search them according to John v. 39. is the doctrine of Protestants generally, however much it may be neglected in practice. The following rules or directions, if followed, will be found of much use, in the study of these holy writings. (1.) Search them with the full conviction that they are *inspired*—1 Thess. ii. 13. (2.) With *reverence*—they are 'holy scriptures,' and therefore must not be treated as something common. Rom. i. 2. 2. Tim. iii. 15. 'Put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground.' (3.) With *prayer*, to the Author of them, that he would save us from wresting them to our destruction, but that he would open our understandings to understand the scriptures—that he would lead us into all truth, and bring all things to our remembrance—give us to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, and open our eyes to behold wondrous things out of his law. Ps. cxix. 18. (4.) With a *sense of our spiritual misery, as destitute of eternal life in ourselves—in them* [in the scriptures,] 'ye think ye have eternal life.' (5.) With a full *persuasion that our search shall not be in vain*, but that they shall discover that eternal life to us, which is in Christ. God 'says not to any, seek ye me in vain :' we should therefore believe that we shall be profit

ed, and it will be according to our faith. (6.) With *application to ourselves*. Am I doing, have I done, or am I likely to do the thing forbidden in this passage? Am I neglecting, or have I neglected, or am I likely to neglect the thing required here to be done? Let us consider our age, our relations, our employments, &c. and consider what passages are peculiarly applicable to our circumstances, and apply such promises as suitable—promises of pardon, acceptance, assistance, perseverance, &c. through Christ. (7.) With *application to others*. What individual of my acquaintance, or denomination of people, professes this doctrine, or practises this duty, or the contrary? By this means we shall make a right estimate of others' worth, and if all would do so in the fear of God, it would lead to a scriptural union among christians. Gal. i. 8. 9. Is. viii. 20. Ps. xvii. 4. (8.) *Read the whole regularly through*, and notice what subject each book principally treats of. For example, the principal subject of the epistle to the Heb. is the Priestly office of Christ; and the chief subject of the epistle to the Romans, and of that to the Galatians, is justification. The same may be applied to the reading of single chapters. The observance of this direction will enable us to refer to places at pleasure, for proof of any thing in the scriptures. (9.) Compare one place with another, and notice whether one passage limits another, and this will often clear up verbal and textual difficulties. Marginal references and a Concordance will assist here. (10.) Consider whether the words are to be understood figuratively or literally, comparatively or absolutely. The neglect of this rule is the occasion of many gross heresies that prevail under the name of christianity; such as the Quaker doctrines, that of transubstantiation, &c. (11.) When any duty is commanded, or something is prohibited, consider whether it was something peculiar to the ceremonial, or judicial law of the Israelites, or whether it arose from the peculiar circumstances of those concerned. For example, the special grant of Canaan to the Israelites, will not justify our expulsion of the Indians from their lands; or the grant to hold slaves, if such grant was given, will not authorize our practice of slavery—the recommendation to the Corinthian females to abstain from marriage, was owing to the present distress. [12.] When actions are recorded, to consider whether they are approved by the Divine Being, and whether there was any thing peculiar in the circumstances of the agents; for example, the community of goods, mentioned Acts, ii. arose from peculiarity of circumstances; the means employed by Jacob to obtain his father's blessing, was not approved. [13.] Consult Commentaries, but follow their opinions no farther than they are supported by scripture and reason. The writers of these are generally the most eminent men in the church, and their extensive learning affords them great advantages in explaining scripture. A knowledge of the plains, deserts, mountains, hills, valleys, lakes, rivers, minerals, vegetables and animals; the climates, manners and customs referred to in the Bible, will be of eminent service in expounding many of those places of scripture, which to the unlearned, are 'hard to be understood.' Such knowledge is possessed to a greater or less degree, by commentators. Now, if their explanations be true, before they are written, they do not become false and injurious when written, as some absurdly insinuate. [14.] Attend to the public expositions of the scriptures, given by the lawfully appointed ministers of Christ, even though you should suspect them to be unregenerate. Deut. xxxii. 10; Prov. viii. 34; Mal. ii. 7; Matt. xxiii. 2 3; Luke x. 16; Acts viii. 30, 31; Rom. x. 14. [15.] Converse with the pious respecting particular passages. Deut. vi. 7, 8; Ps. cxlv. 5, 7, 11; Mal. iii. 16; Luke xxiv. 13, 32. For this purpose, attend praying societies. [16.] Meditate much on the word—commit particular passages, especially the Psalms. Ps. i. 2, 119; ix. 7, 99.

T.

ART. V. Revival in the Department of Saone-and-Loire.

BOLBEC, (Lower Seine,) May 19, 1835.

The Evangelists ordered to desist from preaching. New progress of the kingdom of God. Liberty to preach the Gospel restored.

The important work going on in the department of Saone-and-Loire continues to attract the attention of all the friends of the gospel in France and French Switzerland. I have already communicated to you, in two letters, the principal details which had reached me on this subject, in February and March last. Yesterday I received a letter from Geneva containing very interesting news upon the same subject.

My second letter led you to anticipate that the labors of our evangelists would meet with opposition. Already Mr. Zipperlin, the pastor, had been disturbed at Macon, and could not exercise his ministry with the same liberty as before. The fears of Christians were but too well founded. An order was sent on the part of the civil authorities to the three evangelists, Messrs. Hoffman, Zipperlin, and Archard, requiring them to desist from preaching. The reasons for this prohibition were that these evangelists were not French by birth, that they had studied at foreign schools, and that two of them had been ordained in a foreign country. The prohibition was founded in a great and palpable error; for the magistrates applied to free pastors the conditions exacted from pastors who are *members of the national reformed church*; and because the latter must be French, in order to be *paid* by the government, they concluded that pastors who are *not paid* ought also to be French. This was evidently confounding two things wholly distinct, and that the civil authorities could commit so great a mistake, shows how ill acquainted they were with the laws relating to religion.

Two of the evangelists, Messrs. Achard and Zipperlin, ceased to hold religious meetings. As to Mr. Hoffman, he had been ordained in France, and this circumstance authorized him to continue his preaching; he was only threatened with a law-suit, which, in all appearance, will now be abandoned.

The bishop of Autun and the priests of the department, who instigated these severe measures against our evangelists, exulted in having attained their aim to so great a degree, and declaimed violently from their pulpits against the preaching of these foreign pastors. They boasted of having shut their mouths; for it is characteristic of popery to prevent its adversaries from speaking whenever it can. When the Catholic priests are feeble and find themselves in a minority, they cry out for liberty. But when they are the strongest, they neglect no means, no artifice to prevent the free preaching of the Word of God. It suits them to stifle all discussion, to enslave the consciences of others and to speak *only themselves*. It is an excellent method, truly, of being always right; for when opposers can no longer raise their voice to disprove her doctrines, the Romanish church demonstrates easily that she teaches the truth and nothing but the truth.

But the joy of the bishop of Autun and other priests was brief. Our's is not an age when all religious discussion can be suppressed, and we have a charter which protects our rights. Under the reign of Charles X, the affair would have soon ended: the prefect would have had the three evangelists conducted to the frontiers by soldiers; the owners of houses where the religious meetings were held would have been threatened with imprisonment, and all would have been reduced to obedience. Unhappily for the Romish church, her priests no longer possess the power, and they must give up their despotism, however inclined they may be to be despots. As soon as Mr. Zipperlin was prohibited from his du-

ties, Mr. Adolphus Monod, who is a native Frenchman, went to preach at Macon, and the presence of this eloquent speaker still drew crowded audiences. Thus, the Romish ecclesiastics had changed one evil for another which was greater; for the preacher whom they had reduced to silence was succeeded by one more powerful. The only evil resulting from these severe measures was the interruption of preaching in the villages and the country. But, on the other hand, the persecution drew public attention still more to this work of evangelization, and gave occasion to the frequent enquiry, why peaceable men who prayed for the King, were forbidden to preach the gospel to such as came to hear them.

Some who had begun to be serious were encouraged to persevere, by this slight persecution; for nothing is better adapted than trials to strengthen the faith of those who desire really to come to God. A young Catholic recently converted said to one of the evangelists: "They can put you in prison, but they cannot imprison the Lord Jesus Christ." At Tournus, the members of the small flock became more closely united than ever. They petitioned the government for the return of their pastor. A young Catholic from the country, who has acquired, since his conversion, some knowledge of the Word of God, leads the small meeting of Tournus, and this church, trusting in the Saviour is as flourishing as it has ever been.

Mr. Hoffinan, who continues to preach in the town of Chalons, finds his ministry abundantly blessed. At Easter, he dispensed the communion to the converted members of his church, and the next day he wrote the following details, which you will read no doubt with interest.

"I spend part of the night in writing to you the circumstances attending the celebration for the first time, of the Lord's Supper, at Chalons-on-the Saone. In this, as in every thing since the beginning of my ministry here, we have been abundantly blessed of our Head and Saviour. Tears were shed during the performance of this holy feast, tears of gratitude and love. A deep interest was manifest, not only on the part of those who partook, but also of all assembled at this simple and affecting ceremony! Fifty or sixty people came to the holy table, among whom were a few women, and all much affected and serious.

Much good has been effected by addressing particular passages of scripture to each communicant. Many wept among those who did not partake of the supper, some came after the meeting, to tell me they desired to be considered members of the church, though they had not taken the communion, which they were unwilling to do before being fully informed on the subject.

"Several Jews attending our meeting for communion, that night I preached on the resurrection, taking for my subject the dry bones of Ezekiel, endeavoring to show the literal sense of the prediction applied to the Jews, and taking occasion to speak of the resurrection of the body, and also of spiritual resurrection. These Jews invited me to attend their ceremonies the next day. In the morning after their meeting, the Rabbi, the person officiating at sacrifices, and one of the race of Aaron, came to see me, bringing two loaves of unleavened bread, and a book of prayers. We read together in Hebrew some chapters of Deuteronomy. The Rabbi is a pious and educated man; he, and the person officiating at sacrifices, asked my permission to come and see me.— They seemed to have a great affection for me. Poor people! they have so much need of persons to love them, and are so eager for tokens of regard! I spoke to them of the Messiah whom they expect, endeavoring to point him out to them in the type of Moses, and to make them discern the spiritual meaning of the ceremonies of the law. They appeared to me ready for the knowledge of the Lord Jesus: they went so far as to say, perhaps this is the Messiah! * * * What a blessing would it be for us to see the hour of deliverance begun for Israel! This circumstance doubles my attachment to my dear flock at Chalons. Oh! pray for Israel in a special manner!— Give the Lord no rest until he has made Jerusalem a praise in the earth, until the prophecy of the New Testament is accomplished, even that resurrection of the dead of which the conversion of the Jews will be both the signal and the instrument. Oh! come, Lord Jesus, come quickly."

While Mr. Hoffman labored with so much zeal at Chalons, and Mr. Adolphus Monod directed the religious meetings at Macon, Christians at Paris were taking measures to enlighten the government on the existing facts, and petitioning that the evangelists should again have liberty

to exercise their ministry. This was an essential, fundamental question; of the utmost importance to our efforts for evangelization. Had the arbitrary step taken against the pious preachers of Saone and Loire been sanctioned, all our guarantees would have been threatened, and all our hopes endangered. But the government understood that the charter allows liberty to all religious opinions, and that the exercise of no worship whatever could be lawfully forbidden. They further knew, that when a pastor asks no salary from the public treasury, the same conditions are not required of him as of one who is salaried; and that, besides, French citizens have the power of choosing whom they please for a minister.— These considerations have induced the political government to leave evangelists at liberty to preach the word of God. It should be added, also, that the members of the government are, in general, favorably disposed towards christian preaching, being sufficiently enlightened to know that the Gospel is the firmest supporter of social order, and much solicitation was not requisite to induce them to revoke the severe measures against the evangelists.

Mr. Zipperlin then resumed his preaching at Macon, after an interruption of nearly six weeks, and in a letter, dated the 24th April, expresses, in the following terms, his faith and gratitude :

"I then took again possession of this pulpit, from which I had been banished for six weeks. My heart was full; I could preach and pray with fervor, and I believe I could say sincerely, that I was constrained by the love of Christ, when soliciting my hearers to leave the broad road, and enter in at the strait gate. Though the service lasted more than an hour and a half, I do not recollect ever to have seen an audience more quiet and devout. May our merciful God and father add his blessing to my resumed labors, and give me in future more fidelity, more love, more compassion for souls! O my Father! I consecrate myself anew to thy service! take possession of all my affections; of my whole being! May I have no other joy than that of serving thee faithfully, no other sorrow than that of offending thee! How solemn is life, beloved brethren! years roll away rapidly, and drag us on in their irresistible course. Soon eternity will be here; soon we must render up our account. Oh! work then while it is day; watch and pray; for the time is short."

Thus, thanks to the Supreme Arbiter of all things! the intrigues, the calumnies and machinations of the adversaries of the gospel have turned to their own confusion. The Romish clergy first tried to render evangelists odious and contemptible, uttering against them from the pulpit, base slanders; but the more they endeavored to injure these servants of Christ, the more the people took their part. The clergy attempted then to impose silence upon them, calling in the aid of the civil authority; but all the voices of the faithful preachers were not stifled, and now liberty to preach is restored. The result is, the priests of Saone and Loire are ashamed of having chosen such arms, the arms of tyrants, to sustain their priestly pretensions. A good cause does not fear the light, it does not shrink from opposition; but the papists feel that their cause is bad, and hence they seek to prevent the truth being heard. God has brought good out of evil, and has turned the devices of Satan into a means of advancing his kingdom.

Probably I shall soon have good news to communicate to you from this department. The harvest appears to be ripe, and ready to be gathered; the laborers are active, zealous, full of faith and zeal; some churches are already established upon a solid foundation, and go forward with fidelity. Every thing permits us to hope for great things. But evangelists are wanting. The Evangelical Society of Geneva have made a pressing appeal to young pastors who may be willing to devote a few years, or even months, to this interesting work. At present, this appeal has produced no effect. Pray that the Lord may send laborers into his harvest. Pious schoolmasters are also needed in the department of Saone and Loire, and

are not to be found. Let us wait patiently the accomplishment of God's wise designs. He who has opened this wide door, will certainly send laborers; having begun so good a work, he will carry it on. Let us not forsake God, and God will not forsake us.

I am yours, &c.

G. DE F.

ART. VI. *Religion of the Russians.*

The villages of the peasantry are all built of block wood, and covered with shingles or straw: they are nearly in the same style in every part of Russia; the gable end always turned to the road. Each hut has its own gate, leading into a court, from which is the entrance into the dwelling.

On entering the cottage, a large oven, built of brick, from six to eight feet square, and level on the top, is always seen occupying a prominent place in the dwelling. Part of the family always sleep upon the top of it in the winter season, for regular bedsteads are not in general use among them. They spread down their mats and sheep-skin coats in any place that best suits them; in summer, very frequently in an out house or in the open air. A common fir table, near to the small glazed or unglazed window; benches placed along the sides of the apartment; a few earthen pots, in which the food is cooked in the oven, (for they have no other fire-places for cooking,) some wooden trenchers, a salt-box, and spoons made of the same material, a wooden vessel or two for holding water, a trough cut out of the trunk of a tree, in which to wash their linen; with a chest to hold their clothes—these simple articles compose the whole amount of the furniture of a Russian *izba* or cottage. The poorest hut, however, is always supplied with one or more small pictures of their tutelary saints; sometimes, also, among the more wealthy, one observes the pictures of the Saviour and Virgin; and not a few possess a representation of the holy Trinity—the FATHER appearing seated on a throne as the Ancient of Days, the SON on the one side, and the HOLY SPIRIT, in the form of a dove, on the other. These small pictures are hung up in the corner of the hut facing the door, so that they catch the eye of every one who enters, and remind him of his duty. The stranger having passed the threshold, and shut the door behind him, stands mute, bows before them, crosses himself several times, repeats a few words of ejaculation, and then, and not till then, turns to the inhabitants of the hut with the salutation of "Peace be with you!" "Jesus Christ be with you!" and after this states the errand upon which he comes.

In the huts of the common people, the sacred corner, which is considered the family altar, and where, on a small shelf before the pictures, the Bible, in many of them of late years, has found a place, is the only part of the dwelling in which any symptoms of the arts of civilization are to be discovered: namely, in the pictures of the saints, neatly framed, and sometimes plated with silver and gilt: for there is scarcely another article to be observed in the hut, but such as belong to the manufacture of the very rudest state of human society: and how lamentable is it to find that this sacred corner, this family altar, should so often, to the rude and ignorant peasantry, few of whom are able to read, be little better than a temple of idols! Alas! they know no better. But when I had the gratification of beholding the Bible on the wooden support in the pre-

sence of the group of painted figures, and found the inmates anxiously inquiring after its contents, with one in their number who could read, I considered that the true antidote to the evil was provided.

I went to see the cathedral church of St. Sophia, in the Kremlin, where I found the archbishop officiating, amidst a crowd of worshippers, on occasion of the annual procession of one of their sacred pictures, denominated the "Virgin of Pestchera," (the Virgin of the Cave.)

After the mass was over, the whole clergy, except the archbishop, with a great concourse of the inhabitants, dressed in their best clothes, carried the sacred picture above mentioned in solemn procession, amidst loud psalmody and the ringing of bells, around the outer wall of the city. It was a truly humbling spectacle to behold thousands of the ignorant and superstitious inhabitants of this city and neighborhood crossing and prostrating themselves before a black, ugly female portrait, as it passed by, decked out with gold and gems! What but the light of divine revelation can dispel this heathenish darkness, and point out to the inhabitants of modern Plescovia the only object of worship, and the only Mediator between God and man! This image of the Virgin is very old, and is here "on a visit for a few days," as they express it, collecting money for the monastery to which she belongs.

The lower orders of the clergy were seen among the crowd, pleading for alms to the Queen of Heaven! Of what vast importance is it, then, to put the Bible into the hands of a people like this! for where it is unknown, or little known, spectacles like these must prevail; such has been the tendency of human nature in all nations and in all ages.—*Christian Witness.*

From the New-York Observer.

ART. VII. *Sandwich Islands Mission.*

SANDWICH ISLANDS, Dec. 1834.

The changes in affairs, at these islands, are so frequent and so various in their character, that individuals, in other countries, can know but little, correctly, respecting their true condition. Hence too, it is, in part, that there is so much contrariety in the statements made by those who, from time to time, visit here; and that false and erroneous impressions, are conveyed by the representations of some, who least intend it. No one who has not lived long at the islands, and on terms of familiar intercourse with the people, can understand, rightly, their customs, the nature and tendency of their institutions, the genius of their government, and the character of the people.

The character of this people is derived essentially from the character of the government. The chiefs exercise an arbitrary authority, and the people practice an abject and servile obedience. Whatever is prescribed or even recommended by the rulers finds, at least in appearance, an unhesitating and prompt compliance, on the part of the people. If the principal chiefs patronize industry and the arts, and encourage learning and religion, they all flourish. The people become increasingly industrious, attend schools and religious meetings, because it is popular; the other chiefs do the same: and because it is the law, for they make no distinction between the wish and the will of the principal chiefs. Whereas if the rulers are regardless of public improvement, and are immoral and vicious in their lives, the influence spreads, the subjects are forward to imitate, and iniquity stalks unblushingly abroad. There is no more of

an innate principle, among the natives of these islands, which leads them to prefer that which is good, than in other lands, nor have their feelings been so changed by moral influence and persuasion, as to keep them back from crime, when they are permitted and encouraged by the example of those in authority. At one time the schools languish and the minds of the people are almost entirely diverted from attention to learning; but before the ship, bearing the intelligence reaches America, a political change may occur, and a new impulse be given to improvement; the dilapidated school houses may be repaired, and teachers and scholars again collect in multitudes to resume their literary pursuits. And thus also in reference to the attention of the people to religion. At one period we have to state, that our meetings are but thinly attended, that the people turn a deaf ear to instructions, and that we have but little beside the promises of God to encourage us in going forward. The accession, however, of a new chief, or the rousing of one from sloth and inactivity, to greater effort, may exert a speedy and controlling influence, and collect multitudes, within the sound of a preached word. The influence thus exerted will be according to the rank and influence of the chief, whether he be a ruler of a district, of an island, or of the nation. On Kawai, schools prosper, because the governor encourages them; on Oahu, they have hardly a name to live, and improvements of every kind appear to be at a stand. The king rules there, and is regardless of the interests of his subjects. We have, however, of late, as we humbly trust, been visited by the Holy Spirit, and a more salutary and lasting influence has been exerted than that received from the chiefs. Several of our churches, have, during the past year been thus refreshed and increased, and there is now so much light and knowledge diffused among the people that with the aids of the Spirit we may expect that multitudes will be constrained to turn unto the Lord.

If a stranger now visits these islands, he will probably hear, among the first items of intelligence, that the princess has fallen and gone over to the side of the king; and that she has become a drunkard, an adulteress, and an encourager of the old, vile and abominable practices of the people. This, alas! is too true. Harieta Nahienaena, the sister of the king, and next to him in rank—she who for several years had maintained an acceptable standing in the church, and who, when her brother choose the evil, was the hope of the nation, has fallen, and fallen too, too low ever to rise again.

After the death of the Queen Regent, Kaa-hu-ma-nu, in 1832, no successor was appointed, and Ke-au-ki-o li, the young king, then only eighteen years of age, took the government into his own hands. For a while he made fair pretensions, and promised well, but under the influence of evil enticements and machinations, his downward career was rapid, and he soon became a thorough drunkard and debauchee. Meanwhile his sister remained steadfast; she resisted his efforts to draw her into his own course, refused the intoxicating drink when offered, used her influence to restrain his dissipation and heedlessness, and openly opposed him in many of his plans. The people, to a great extent, regarded her course with much complacency, and the church prayed "that men might be made to believe and turn, like Na-hi-e-na-e-na, who had remained steadfast from her youth up."

Perhaps the reason that she did not sooner fall, may be found in the fact, that she lived on a different island from her brother, and but seldom saw him. Several months since she visited Oahu, for the ostensible purpose of endeavoring to influence him to abandon his course, and to look more to the good of his subjects. It was, however, soon apparent, that the true object of her visit was kept entirely out of view, and that she was fast falling into the practice of all his vices. She had pledged entire

abstinence from the use of tobacco, but being removed from the immediate observation of her guardians and friends, she openly and unblushingly resumed the use of the pipe. She had been forward in checking the use of ardent spirits, both by her example and authority, but she was tempted, and drank, became drunken, and now uses intoxicating drink continually and excessively. She once manifested an abhorrence for the adulterer, but now lives in the practice of habitual incest with her brother.

Such is her present condition—a reproach and abhorrence among the people—a by-word among those who rejoice in iniquity, and who would prefer a return of all the abominations of the darkest times. But with such rulers at the head, what are the prospects of the subjects. Those who should be forward in the execution of the laws, live in the daily violation of them.

The governors of Hawaii, Maui, and Kauai, maintain an independent stand, opposed to the king, and enforce the laws on their respective Islands; but on Oahu the king bears rule, and drunkenness, and lewdness, and a long catalogue of other abominations follow in his train. The chiefs are now collecting from their respective islands. There is a proposal among them to take away the kingdom from Ke-ou-ki-o-li, and give it to another, and before this reaches you there may be a revolution in the government of these islands.

I am yours, &c.

ART. VIII. *The Rev. Leigh Richmond's Mother.*

I have frequently meditated upon the subject of my birth as connected with my death and resurrection. I have often contemplated the history of man, through its eventful course, from the cradle to the grave, and endeavored to make the practical application to myself. But I think I never felt its characteristic so powerfully, or at least so affectingly, as when I committed to the grave the friend, the nurse, the protector, the guide and guardian of my helpless infancy,—all summed up in the endeared name of *mother*. I seemed to recall the time “when as yet I hanged on my mother’s breast,” and to revert to the tender anxieties with which she watched over her first-born child. And now a few short years are rolled away, and how great the change! The eye that saw, the ear that heard, the tongue that encouraged, and the arm that upheld the babe of her youth, are mouldering in the dust! She is departed hence and is no more seen! It is my prayer for myself and my loved children, that we may so learn “to number our days, that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom.” And if such meditations as these may, through grace, lead us to see more of the vanity of the earthly state, the value of time, and the rapid approach of eternity, our visit to the tomb will not have been unprofitable.

I well remember, in the early dawn of my expanding reason, with what care she labored to instil into my mind a sense of the being of God, and of the reverence which is due to him; of the character of a Saviour, and his infinite merits; of the duty of prayer, and the manner in which it ought to be offered up at the throne of grace. Her way of enforcing these subjects was like one who felt their importance, and wished her child to do so likewise. First instructed by her to read, I have not forgotten, in my Bible lessons, with what simplicity and propriety she used to explain and comment on the word of God, its precepts and examples. These infantine catechetical exercises still vibrate in my recollections, and confirm to my own mind the great advantage attendant upon the

earliest possible endeavors to *win the attention and store the memory with religious knowledge*. Her natural abilities, which were of a superior character, enabled her to converse with a very little child with much effect, and there was a tenderness of affection, united to a firmness of manner, which greatly promoted the best interests of a nursery education.

My mother had six children, three of whom died in infancy. A very affecting circumstance accompanied the death of one of them, and was a severe trial to her maternal feelings. Her then youngest child, a sweet little boy two years old, was, through the carelessness of his nurse, precipitated from a bedroom window upon the pavement beneath. I was at that time six years of age, and happened to be walking on the very spot when the distressing event occurred. I was, therefore, the first to take up and deliver into our agonized mother's arms the poor little sufferer. The head was fractured, and he only survived the fall about thirty hours. I still preserve a very distinct and lively remembrance of the struggle between the natural feelings of the mother, and the spiritual resignation of the Christian. She passed the sad interval of suspense in almost continual prayer, and found God a present help in the time of trouble. Frequently during that day did she retire with me, and, as I knelt beside her, she uttered the feelings and desires of her heart to God. I remember her saying, "If I cease praying for five minutes, I am ready to sink under this unlooked-for distress; but when I pray, God comforts and upholds me: his will, not mine, be done." Once she said, "Help me to pray, my child; Christ suffers little children to come to him, and forbids them not,—say something." "What shall I say, mamma? Shall I fetch a book?" "Not now," she replied. "Speak from the heart, and ask God that we may be reconciled to his will, and bear this trial with patience."

The day after the infant's death, she took me to the bed on which my brother lay, and kneeling down, she wept for a few minutes in silence; and then taking his cold hand in one of her's, and mine in the other, she said, "Lord, if it had not been thy good pleasure it had not been thus. Thy will be done! I needed this heavy trial to show me more of myself, and to wean me from the world. Forgive my sins O God, and let me not murmur!" Then looking at the cherub countenance of her babe, she added, "Thou art not lost, but gone before!" She then put his hand into mine and said, "If you live, my child, never forget this, and may I one day meet you both in heaven!"

I have dwelt on this part of my dear parent's history with the more minuteness, because she has frequently told me, that it was the greatest shock which her feelings were ever called upon to sustain but that she was persuaded it was overruled by God for the most salutary purpose, as it contained the spiritual discipline of her own heart. To the end of her life she wore a little locket attached to her watch: it contained a lock of her poor little Henry's hair; and she often looked at it, and spoke of it, as a remembrance of God's goodness to her in a most trying season.—These things occurred at Stockport, when we were on a visit to my father's mother and sister, in the early part of the year 1778. The recollection of what I have related is still clear and impressive on my mind.

Memoirs of L. R.

ART. IX. *Present Moral State of the World.*

The whole inhabitants of the world are supposed at present to amount to eight hundred millions; of whom we may suppose the Jews to be two and a half millions; Pagans, four hundred and eighty-two. do. Christians (in name,) one hundred and seventy-five and a half, do.; Mahometans, one hundred and forty, do.

The christians may be thus subdivided : The Greek and eastern churches, thirty millions ; Roman Catholics, eighty, do. ; Protestants, sixty-five and half, do.

Humboldt, the celebrated Prussian traveller, estimates the population of Europe at one hundred and ninety eight millions, of whom—Catholics, one hundred and three millions ; Protestants, fifty-two, do ; Greek church, thirty-eight, do. Mahometans, five, do.

And what is *now* the spiritual condition of our race ? Five hundred millions [nearly,] it is notorious, remain to this hour, Pagan idolaters, and one hundred millions more [and upwards] are the followers of the imposter Mahummud [Mahomet.] Two hundred millions only are left wearing the christian name, and in order to make the calculations respecting the real state of this remnant as favorable as possible, we will suppose Princeton, [United States] to be a fair epitome of the whole Christian world. Is there one person in four there who appears to be brought decidedly under the influence of christian principles ? I fear not. We have, then, less than *fifty millions* of real christians on earth at any given time, and all the rest, *seven hundred and fifty millions*, are living and dying without God in the world ! and this is not the picture of the worst, but of the best period of time, next to the days of the Apostles. Perhaps there never existed more good men on earth at one time, than there are at present, and yet this leaves more than fifteen out of sixteen of the human race unacquainted with the salvation which is in Christ Jesus ; and this havoc made by sin and death has continued without interruption, day by day, and hour by hour, through all the ages since the fall.

There is something so fearful, so tremendous in this retrospect, that I do not wonder that men who have never known "the terrors of the Lord," and "the exceeding sinfulness of sin," should reject the theory altogether. While looking down into this abyss, my dear friend, I am seized with a shivering horror, I tremble exceedingly ; and yet the truth, which is here so deeply impressed on my mind, is the same as that which I learn from the history of the fallen angels, left without a Saviour ; as that which I received in Gethsemane and at Calvary ; and which is irresistibly confirmed, while I look at the civil, mental, and moral condition of these seven hundred and fifty millions of Pagans, &c. all proclaim the fearful truth, that there is a criminality, a turpitude, a desert of sin which we cannot comprehend.

The situation of the countries, which all these beings inhabit ; the degree of civilization to which they have attained ; their languages, their literature, their manners and customs ; the climate, soil, and productions, of each of these countries, and a great variety of other circumstances connected with the present existence of these millions, have been, to a certain extent, ascertained. No want of talent and zeal in those who have enriched our libraries on these subjects ; they deserve well of mankind. It is in the Christian church only that cowardice and indifference to the state of the world have been placed among the virtues. DELTA.

ART. X. Extracts from the Memoir of Dr. Payson.

Prudential advice on the preservation of health, addressed to a student in divinity.

"My dear brother,—I am very sorry to hear that your health is not better, but rather worse. I beg you will attend to it without delay. 'A merciful man is merciful to his beast,' and you must be merciful to your beast, or, as Mr. M. would say, 'to your animal.' Remember that it is your master's property, and he will no more thank you for driving it to death, than an earthly master would thank a servant for riding a valuable

horse to death, under pretence of zeal for his interest. The truth is, I am afraid Satan has jumped into the saddle; and when he is there in the guise of an angel of light, he whips and spurs at a most unmerciful rate, as every joint in my poor, broken winded animal can testify, from woful experience. Many a poor creature has he ridden to death by using his conscience as a spur, and you must not be ignorant, nor act as if you were ignorant of his devices."

The early part of the memoir affords an illustration of the preceding letter.

Though his letters are chiefly grave and serious, they occasionally display much humour. One instance may be given, in which he gives an account of his bodily ailments, which were heavy enough.

"Since I wrote last, I have been called to sing of mercy and of judgment. My old friend, the sick headache, has favored me with an unusual share of his company, and has seemed particularly fond of visiting me on the Sabbath. Then came cholera morbus, and in a few hours reduced me so low that I could have died as easily as not. Rheumatism next arrived, eager to pay his respects, and embraced my right shoulder with such an ardor of affection, that he had well nigh torn it from its socket. I had not thought much of this gentleman's powers before, but he has convinced me that I shall think and speak of them with respect, as long as I live. Not content with giving me his company all day, for a fortnight together, he has insisted on setting up with me every night, and what is worse, made me sit up too. During this time, my poor shoulder, neck and back, seemed to be a place in which the various pains and aches had assembled to keep holiday; and the delectable sensations of stinging, pricking, cutting, lacerating, wrenching, burning, gnawing, &c. succeeded each other, or all mingled together in a confusion that was far from being pleasing. The cross old gentleman, though his zeal is somewhat abated by the fomentations, blisters, &c. with which we welcomed him, still stands at my back, threatening that he will not allow me to finish my letter. But enough of him and his companions. Let me leave them for a more pleasing theme.

"God has mercifully stayed his rough wind in the day of his east wind. No horrible, hell-born temptations, no rheumatism of the mind has been allowed to visit me in my sufferings; but such consolations, such heavenly visits, as turned agony into pleasure, and constrained me to sing aloud whenever I could catch my breath long enough to utter a stanza. Indeed, I have been ready to doubt whether pain be really an evil, for though more pain was crowded into last week than any other week of my life, yet it was one of the happiest weeks I ever spent. And now I am ready to say, come what will, come sickness, pain, agony, poverty, loss of friends, only let God come with them, and they shall be welcome. Praised, blessed for ever be his name, for all my trials and afflictions. There has not been one too many; all were necessary, and good and kind."

"By religious romance," he once said in conversation, "I mean the indulgence of unwarranted expectations; expectations that our sins are to be subdued at once, in some uncommon way or by uncommon means, just as a man would expect to become rich by drawing a prize in a lottery, or some other hap-hazard way. We cannot expect too much, if we regulate our expectations by the word of God: but we may expect more than he warrants us to expect, and when our unwarranted expectations are disappointed, we are apt to sink into despondency. Christians whose natural feelings are strong are most liable to run into this error. But I know of no way to make progress in holiness, but the steady, humble, persevering practice of meditation, prayer, watchfulness, self-denial, and good works. If we use these means in a proper manner, our progress is certain."

As his life was eminently glorifying to God, so his death was most comfortable. Much might be quoted in illustration of this, but I shall only adduce a part of a letter to his sister, written a short time previous.

"Were I to adopt the figurative language of Bunyan, I might date this letter from the land of Beulah, of which I have been for some weeks a happy inhabitant. The celestial city is full in my view. Its glories beam upon me, its breezes fan me, its odours are wafted to me, its sounds strike upon my ears, and its spirit is breathed into my heart. Nothing separates me from it but the river of death, which now appears but as an insignificant rill, that may be crossed at a single step, whenever God shall give permission. The Sun of Righteousness has been gradually drawing nearer and nearer, appearing larger and brighter as he approached; and now he fills the whole hemisphere, pouring forth a flood of glory, while I gaze on this excessive brightness, and wonder why God should deign thus to shine upon a sinful worm. A single heart and a single tongue seem altogether inadequate to my wants. I want a whole heart for every separate emotion, and a whole tongue to express that emotion, &c. &c.

These extracts are sufficient as a specimen, and will induce many, I trust, to provide themselves with the work, than which few are more worthy of almost daily perusal.

CONSOLATOR.

ART. XI. *Remarkable Providences.*

It is a comfortable and a blessed truth, that all the concerns of God's people are under his *special* providence; and that He who is styled the Omnipotent, is able, by the simplest means, at once to defeat all the machinations of his enemies, and to rescue his own children from the jaws of the lion. The following are striking instances of the truth of this remark.

When war was levied and persecution raised against the Protestants in France, they were besieged by the royal army in Beziers, a city of Lower Languedoc, and after defending themselves with great fortitude and bravery, the besiegers resolved to make a violent attack on the city by night. Of this the Protestants had no apprehension. A drunken drummer, reeling home to his quarters at midnight, not knowing what he did, rang with vehemence the alarm bell of the town. At that very moment the enemy were making the assault. In a very short time the Protestants were all in arms, and made a bold and successful defence.

In the bloody massacre of St. Bartholomew, M. Du Moulin, an eminent and faithful servant of Jesus Christ, hid himself from the murderers in an oven; but having nothing wherewith to close the oven's mouth, and knowing that the strictest search would be made for him, he was apprehensive every moment of falling a victim to the bloody rage of his enemies. No sooner, however, had he taken refuge there, than spiders, by weaving their webs over the mouth of the oven, effectually concealed Du Moulin. Well might these exclaim, "blessed be the Lord God of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, who hath sent his angel, and delivered his servants that trusted in him."

C. J.

Edinburgh, April 7, 1834.

ART. XII. *Summary.*

EXPLANATION.—Some time ago an article of mine appeared in the Monitor, in which I offered some remarks on the terms made use of by good and sound men in speaking of Christ's purchase, which I am sorry to learn has given some offence. I have not been fully understood, and the reason of this probably was a want of sufficient clearness in my article. For I cannot believe that there is any difference between the doctrinal

views contained in the standards of our Church, and those which I hold, and intended to convey in the article referred to, on that subject. I can honestly use the language of our Standards respecting both the object and the extent of Christ's purchase. Viewing the matter, therefore, that has caused the uneasiness, as I do, only as relating to a form of expression, and not to any thing of sufficient importance to contend about, I withdraw *my* form of expression, and shall endeavor to avoid giving *this* offence, when speaking on that subject hereafter.

Ego,

Synod of Relief.—The annual meeting of the Synod of Relief was held on Monday evening, in the Rev. Mr. Brodie's chapel, Campbell Street, Glasgow. On Wednesday the Synod proceeded to consider the overture laid on the table at their last meeting, respecting the proposed union with the Secession Church. The overture was, in effect, that such steps should be taken, as would lead to a friendly intercourse with the Secession Church, as a sister Church, with a view ultimately to a union. After some discussion, a resolution was unanimously agreed to, to the effect that the Relief Synod cordially responded to the kind communication from the United Associate Synod; and hail with delight the prospect of a union with them; renew their resolution of 1821, approving of such a measure, suggested by the union at that time of the two Synods of Seceders; and recommend to presbyteries, sessions and congregations, to take the matter into serious consideration, and report to next meeting of the Synod. At the same time recommending christian intercourse between the two bodies, so far as was practicable.

Extract from a letter addressed to the editor by an original Seceder, dated

EDINBURGH, 31st March, 1835.

I observe Mr. Manson of Perth, one of our ministers, has announced a pamphlet, to shew that it is not our duty to return as yet to the church of Scotland, and against Latitudinarian unions in Britain and America. From the movement made by the old Burghers, the opinion was pretty general that our small body too would soon make advances for a union with the establishment. The publication of the *Vindication* has *laid* that rumor.

Since I wrote you, we have lost Mr. Aitken of Kerrymuir, the father of our little Synod, a most excellent man. There is a memoir of him in the *Presbyterian Magazine*,* I believe, by Mr. Gray, of Brechin. Mr. Sandison has been ordained at Arbroath,—Mr. Wright, late of Cupar Angus, settled as colleague and successor to Professor Paxton in this town. Mr. Whyte would have been settled as colleague and successor to Mr. Chalmers at Haddington, but for a call which has lately been given him by the congregation of Auchincloch, (late Mr. McDerment's.) There was an application to the Synod, in May, from a number of people inhabiting some of the small islands to the north of Scotland, called the Hebrides, who only understand the Gaelic language, for sermon and other christian privileges. They discover wonderful acquaintance with, and attachment to, reformation principles. A Mr. McBean, who is well acquainted with them, is about to be licensed by our Presbytery, and his ordination in that distant corner, is contemplated in the course of the summer.

In the dozen of congregations in Edinburgh and Leith, attached to the United Secession church, they have the sacrament four times a year, twice along with the rest of the town, at which time the old practice is kept up, though I believe it is confined to one discourse on the Saturday and another on Monday, and twice without the accompanying days, except a sermon on the evening of some day towards the end of the week, when the tokens are distributed. With few exceptions, I believe this is also the practice in other places. I heard that Dr. ——— had commenced, or was about to commence, to dispense the sacrament every six weeks. He and some others can interchange pulpits with Independants, but I believe the most of his brethren have not come that length yet. There is a considerable stir in different parts of the country, toward a union between that body and the Relief Synod, whom they used to regard as a very lax-body. Our established church party are so infatuated as to make an attempt at present to get a number of new churches endowed and new parishes erected. Not to say the proposal is unjust in itself, after they have driven so many away from the church, who have been compelled to provide and pay for churches and ministers, it seems particularly impolitic and unreasonable at present. If the present ministry are able to keep their places, it is probable this object will be obtained; but I fear it will only hasten the crisis.

D I E D.

At Edinburgh, on the 5th of August, in the 64th year of his age, and 40th of his ministry, the Rev. Dr. M'CAIG, minister of the Fifth Associate Congregation of Original Seceders, and author of the life of John Knox, &c.

* We shall probably insert this memoir hereafter.

THE
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,

AND

EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

NOVEMBER, 1835.

MINUTES

Of the Associate Synod of North America, at their Meeting in the Theological Seminary at Canonsburg, October 7, 1835, and continued by adjournment, being their Thirty-Fourth Annual Meeting.

The Synod met and was constituted with prayer by the Rev. Thomas Hanna, Moderator.

MEMBERS PRESENT.

Of the Presbytery of Albany.

MINISTERS.

James Martin,
Thos. Ferrier.*

RULING ELDER.

James Geery.

Of the Presbytery of Cambridge.

MINISTER.

James P. Miller.

Of the Presbytery of Philadelphia.

MINISTERS.

Thomas Beveridge,
Alex'r. T. McGill.

Of the Presbytery of Miami.

MINISTERS.

Andrew Heron,
James Adams,
James Templeton,
Sam'l Wilson,
James Wallace,
Thomas Kendall.

RULING ELDER.

George C. Harper,
Thos. Rough,
John Liggett,
Joseph Hamil,
Sam'l Robinson.

Of the Presbytery of Muskingum.

MINISTERS.

John Walker,
Thos. Hanna,
Vol. XII.

Joseph Clokey,
Andrew Isaac,
Sam'l Hindman,
David Lindsay,
Thomas Wilson,
S. Irvine,*
S. McLane.*

RULING ELDER.

John Pollock,
James Hanna,
Alexander McKitrick,
Thomas Jeffrey,
Matthew Taylor,
John Rankin,
Wm. Truesdale.*

Of the Presbytery of Ohio.

MINISTERS.

Daniel McLane, sen.
David Imbrie,
Isaac Beggs,
Matthew Snodgrass,
James P. Ramsay.
A. Murray,*
E. N. Scroggs,*
J. Donaldson,*
Wm. C. Pollock,*
Joseph Banks,*
Alexander Boyd,*

RULING ELDER.

Thomas Christie,

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

Thomas Roseburgh,
James Breden,
John Moore,
Thomas Robinson.

Of the Presbytery of Chartiers.

MINISTERS.

Dr. Ramsay,
Wm. Wilson,
Thomas Allison,
David French,
Alexander Wilson,
Alexander Donnan,
Wm. M. McElwee,
Bankhead Boyd,
J. Rodgers.*

RULING ELDERS.

James Pollock,
Joseph Brownlee,
John McNarey,
James Patterson,
Hanse Dunlop,
Samuel Livingston,

John Craig,
James Thome,
David Reid.*

Of the Presbytery of Alleghany.

MINISTERS.

J. Scroggs.
Robert Bruce, D. D.*
John France,*
D. Blair,*
J. McCaryl.*
John Hindman.*

RULING ELDERS.

Barnard Gilleland,
John Y. Stewart,
Nathaniel McKelvy,
John Wynkoop,*
James Hart,*
William Bell.*

Of the Presbytery of the Carolinas.
None.

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

The reading of the Minutes, was on motion, dispensed with, as they had been read and approved previous to publication.

The Synod agreed to have a recess till after public worship.

The Moderator having preached from Psalm lxxxiv. 22, [first clause,] "Arise O God, plead thine own cause," the Synod proceeded to business, and Mr. Clokey was chosen Moderator.

The following standing committees were appointed, viz :

Committee of Supplies.—Messrs. Martin, Miller, Beveridge, Templeton, Hanna, D. McLane, French and J. Scroggs.

Of Bills and Overtures.—Messrs. Adams, Walker and Donnan.

Of Arrangement.—Messrs. Martin and McElwee.

On the Funds.—Messrs. Hanna, Hamil and McNarey.

On the Theological Seminary.—Dr. Ramsay, and Messrs. Wm. Wilson and A. Wilson.

To Transcribe the Minutes.—Messrs. B. Boyd and Templeton.

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

No. 1. A letter from the Rev. D. Gordon, containing his excuse for absence, which was sustained.

No. 2. A petition from the session of the congregation of Barnet, containing certain enquiries respecting the Synod's fast. This paper was on motion, referred to the Committee of Bills and Overtures.

No. 3 & 4. Memorials from the sessions of Massies creek and Caesars creek on the subject of missions. Said memorials, were, on motion laid on the table, till the committee of Bills and Overtures report on the propriety of Synod adding to its standing committees, one on missions.

No. 5. Report of the Presbytery of Miami which was on motion referred to the committee of Bills and Overtures, and also that of Supplies.

Report of the Presbytery of Miami.

While there is doubtless, much to be deplored in that portion of the Church, committed to our care, we trust that we are not without evidence that the pleasure of the Lord is in some measure, prospering through our instrumentality. Through the good hand of our God, upon us, unanimity in a good degree prevails, ordinances are very generally attended with encouraging diligence ; in the eastern part of our boundaries, notwithstanding the drain by emigration, our numbers have been kept up, and in the west our congregations are greatly on the increase.

At the semi-annual meeting in the spring, Presbytery recommended it to the several ministers, to direct the attention of their respective congregations to the duty of public religious covenanting, instructing them in its nature, use, warrantableness and seasonableness, that they might be prepared for setting forward in the duty as soon as possible. It was also resolved, that as soon as the necessary preparations could be made Presbytery should appoint some convenient time and central place for such of our congregations as are contiguous to one another, to meet and renew our solemn covenant engagements.

According to the permission granted this Presbytery at the last meeting of Synod, it was agreed to take Mr. T. S. Kendall on trial, with a view to his ordination. The usual pieces of trial were received and he was solemnly ordained to the office of the holy ministry on the 26th Dec. A call on Mr. Kendall, from the united congregations of Pistol-creek, Big-spring and Fork-creek, has been made out and sustained, and by him accepted. Owing to the distance of these congregations from the other members of the Presbytery, the instalment of Mr. Kendall has not yet taken place.

In our last report it was stated that a call on the Rev. James Lyle, of the Presbytery of the Carolinas from the Associate Congregation of Bloomington, Indiana, had been sustained, by Presbytery, and forwarded to the Presbytery of Carolinas for presentation. We have heard nothing officially, respecting either it or Mr. Lyle since.

At a meeting of Presbytery on the 16th Dec. a petition was received from Carmel, and Clark branches of Mr. Henderson's charge for the whole of his time. No objection being offered by the other branches of his charge, Madison and Big-creek, the petition was granted. Thus two congregations, nearly ripe for a settlement, have been added to the list of our vacancies.

This season we have had under our care, two students of Theology, Mr. H. Walker and J. N. Lawhead. At our last meeting they delivered discourses before Presbytery, with great acceptance.

At the same meeting Mr. James Brown, a graduate of South Hanover Collge, was admitted as a student of Theology, and owing to particular circumstances in his case, he was permitted to prosecute his studies under the direction of Presbytery for the first year.

Mr. J. N. Lawhead, presented to us a request to be permitted to prosecute his studies under the direction of Presbytery, because of some particular circumstances in his case. His request was granted.

As liberal a portion of supply as can possibly be afforded is earnestly requested.

By order of Presbytery.

JAMES M. HENDERSON, Moderator.

ANDREW HERON, Presbytery Clerk.

Sept. 24th, 1835.

No. 6. Report of the Presbytery of Albany, which was on motion, referred to the committee of supplies.

Report of the Presbytery of Albany.

There has no particular change taken place in any portion of our bounds since our last report to Synod, and the state of our congregations is not much different from what it was at that time. At the meeting of Presbytery in April, the Rev. David R. De Freest was convicted on his own confession, of repeated acts of intemperance, and was suspended from the office of the ministry and the communion of the church, till such time as the Presbytery may see cause to remove the sentence, either in whole or part. At the same meeting a call from the Associate Congregation of York, Livingston Co. N. Y. for Mr. John S. Easton, probationer, was sustained, and is herewith transmitted to Synod, for its disposition. The supply allotted to us at the last meeting of Synod, was all received with the exception of Mr. Thomas Wilson, who did not appear in our bounds, and thereby caused great disappointment and injury to our vacancies, especially in Upper Canada. But notwithstanding Synod's liberality, our vacancies have suffered generally for want of supply. Our brother, Mr. Irvine, has in Divine providence, been disabled from preaching for the last four months, and his health is but little, if any better. His congregation call loudly on Presbytery for supply, and as constant preaching is necessary in their circumstances, Presbytery hope Synod in allotting us our portion of supply, will take their case into consideration, as also that of the congregation of Newark, N. Jersey, who have been petitioning Presbytery for some time, for constant supply. Their location being in a populous place, seems to render constant preaching necessary to their eventual success. Taking these circumstances into consideration Presbytery hope that Synod will see the necessity of sending them as large a portion of supply as practicable. We take this method of expressing our gratitude to the Presbytery of Philadelphia, for sending supply to the second congregation in New York, at a time that this Presbytery had it not in their power. Notice has been received from Messrs. Russell and Strang, of their intention to petition Synod to be dis-

joined from this and to be erected into a new Presbytery. Presbytery agreed to concur in this petition, and as no line of division between the Presbyteries was mentioned in the notice, would propose one running north and south through Cayuga Lake, in the state of New York, as a suitable boundary. The case of a member of this Presbytery who had brought a civil suit against a member of the church, and a student under our care, for an alleged slander on his moral and ministerial character, being under consideration, the following resolution was on motion, adopted. "That it is censurable according to the word of God and the discipline" of this church for a minister of the gospel to enter a civil suit against a member of his own communion, for a supposed injury to his moral character, without having first submitted the matter to the adjudication of the appropriate church court." Against this decision Messrs. Stark and Bullions protested, for reasons to be given in, which together with the answers are respectfully submitted to Synod, for their adjudication. Mr. Samuel McArthur, who had been under our care during the past year, and acquitted himself to the satisfaction of Presbytery, has taken his dismissal and left our bounds with a view of attending the Hall. He is a student of two years standing.

By order of the Presbytery.

JOHN G. SMART,
Clerk.

The excuse of Mr. Wilson for the failure in the fulfilment of appointments alluded to in the above report was heard and sustained.

No. 7. A communication from the Associate Synod of Original Seceders, in Scotland, which was on motion, laid on the table.

No. 8. The report of the Presbytery of Cambridge, accompanied with a communication from the Rev. A. Anderson, relative to certain funds belonging to the Synod. These papers were on motion referred to the committee on the funds, and also that of bills and overtures.

Report of the Presbytery of Cambridge.

The Associate Presbytery of Cambridge Report—That the order of Synod, at their last meeting, to this Presbytery, in the case of Dr. Bullions, has been fulfilled.

An appeal to Synod has been taken by the Rev. D. Gordon, from a decision of this Presbytery, in a case of the Rev. D. Stalker, as accompanying papers will show.

Two petitions were laid into Presbytery at their present meeting, which Presbytery agreed to refer to Synod, simpliciter for decision, and are herewith transmitted.

On application to this Presbytery for supply of gospel ordinances, by some people residing in Essex county of this state, Mr. D. Gordon was sent to them, and into the adjacent parts of the country for six sabbaths. Mr. Gordon reports promising prospects in some of the places where he had been, and particularly in Essex county, and in Lower Canada. Presbytery anxious to cultivate this field of missionary labor, earnestly solicit supply from Synod, and believe they can employ the whole time of one missionary till next meeting of Synod.

Presbytery would respectfully and earnestly call the attention of Synod to the alarming influence and progress of Popery at present, in these United States. Not only is Popery on the increase in this country, but it is susceptible of decisive proof that this increase is under the fostering care of an association in Europe, extensive and powerful, hostile to our civil institutions and to our religion, and organized chiefly for the purpose of giving Popery the ascendancy in these United States, both in church and state. According to the success of that association for years past; under their present measures, the extent of their means, and the system and energy with which they employ them; under the preparation for the reception and prevalence of Popery with us, no doubt, in many cases, undesignedly made, by the anti-christian liberality of the churches in this country, by the infidelity and apathy on religious principles, practices and privileges, among the people in general, by their employment of Popish instruction and discipline for their youth, by the partiality already shown by some of our civil authorities in favor of Roman Catholic Seminaries; and under the political corruption and intrigue which is prevalent at present, we have reason to fear that before many years elapse, we may, in the righteous judgment of God, be called under the connivance of civil authorities, if not under legal enactments, to submit to idolatrous prescriptions, and to testify against them at the expense of property, liberty and life.—Whatever, within the limits of the power of an ecclesiastical court, can be done to oppose this threatened evil, should be done speedily.

A. ANDERSON, Presbytery Clerk.

North Argyle, Sept 9th, 1835.

An excuse was offered for the absence of the Rev. Jas. Irvine, and sustained. And at his request he was released from the appointment given him last year to draught a Synodical Warning against Popery, and, on motion, Messrs. Anderson and Miller, were appointed to the performance of that duty.

On motion, resolved, that a part of to-morrow forenoon sitting be appropriated to the exercises of praise and prayer, and Messrs. Kendall and Thos. Wilson were appointed to lead in the exercises.

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

Thursday, October 8th.

After the exercises of praise and prayer, the Synod met and was constituted with prayer by the Moderator. Members present as above, together with Messrs. A. Murray, E. N. Scroggs, J. Donaldson, Wm. Pollock and Joseph Banks, ministers, of the Presbytery of Ohio; Mr. Rodgers, minister, and David Reid, ruling elder, of the Presbytery of Chartiers; Messrs. Blair and J. M'Caryl, ministers, and Messrs. John Wynekoop and James Hart, ruling elders, of the Presbytery of Alleghany; Mr. Thomas Ferrier, minister, from the Presbytery of Albany; Mr. S. Irvine, minister, and Mr. Truesdale, ruling elder, from the Presbytery of Muskingum.

The minutes of last sitting being read, Mr. Templeton was at his own request released from the committee to transcribe the minutes, and Mr. S. Wilson was appointed in his room.

On motion Mr. Heron was added to the committee on the Theological Seminary. Mr. Hanna was appointed assistant clerk. The committee of arrangement reported, and their report being amended was adopted as follows, viz:

Report of the Committee of Arrangements.

The Committee of Arrangements respectfully report—

That they find as unfinished business the consideration of the answers to reasons of protest in the case of the original seceders, and would recommend to Synod to take up the same, and other unfinished business, in its order, as soon as possible. And that all other matters be taken up in the order in which they are presented, unless otherwise ordered by special motion.

The papers mentioned in the report of the Presbytery of Cambridge, as reported to Synod by said Presbytery, for decision, were read. Said papers consisted of petitions from certain individuals, viz: William Livingston and wife, and George Arnot, to be disjoined from the congregation of Cambridge. These petitions were, on motion, referred to a select committee, and Dr. Ramsay and Mr. Donnan were appointed said committee.

Papers being called for these was given in and read,

No. 9. The Report of the Presbytery of Carolinas. While the disposal of said report was under discussion, the Synod adjourned till half past two o'clock.—Closed with prayer.

Half past 2 o'clock, P. M.

The Synod met and was constituted with prayer. Members present as above, together with Mr. John Hindman, minister of the Presbytery of Alleghany. Read the minutes of last sitting. Proceeded with the business left unfinished in the forenoon, viz: the disposal to be made of the report of the Presbytery of the Carolinas. After some discussion the report was, on motion, referred to a select committee, consisting of Messrs. Miller, Adams, and Walker. The report is as follows:

Report of the Presbytery of the Carolinas.

The report of the Presbytery of the Carolinas, might be made up of extracts from former reports. In our communication of 1823, we said that, "A prominent feature

of the church under the care of this Presbytery, is a general and ardent desire of divine ordinances. Calls for the distribution of the bread of life are loud and frequent. But alas! these urgent petitions can seldom be granted. The paucity of our ministers, (at this time 1833, two, where lately there were eight) and the disproportionate number of vacancies render frequent supplies impossible, even while our settled congregations generously yield a large proportion of their time to their destitute brethren. The harvest truly is great, but the laborers few. This is emphatically true in our case."

This representation which was true in our case twelve years ago, is more emphatically so at present. We have also occasion to adopt, as applicable to the present time, the report sent up to synod nineteen years ago, and so frequently renewed in your hearing. In this we say, "The Presbytery entertain a grateful sense of the disposition manifested by the Rev. Synod at their last session to assist them in contributing to the necessities of their vacant congregations. They have *again*, however, to express their strong regret that they have derived no benefit from the provision made. To what cause this is to be attributed they are destitute of the means of ascertaining, no communication having been received either from the individuals appointed or others, but if it shall be found to have arisen from disobedience to orders, they entreat the Rev. Synod to adopt measures to cause their authority to be better respected."

In the next report to Synod, speaking on this same subject, the Presbytery say, "We cannot avoid remonstrating with earnest solicitude and entreat the Rev. Synod to adopt a speedy and effectual remedy for an evil of which they have had so much and so frequent reason to complain. Of thirty-three months appropriated by the Rev. Synod, but two weeks' service have been received (in our case, at this time, of seven months granted, which is not the tenth part of what we could take and were wont to enjoy, not a single day has been put in.) A delinquency so enormous could not fail to produce most injurious effects. Independent of the positive aid, of which it has deprived us, and from which the most salutary effects might have been expected, it tends to destroy confidence and create despondency. They respectfully suggest, that it would be proper for the Rev. Synod, to enquire whether any of the Presbyteries be so inattentive to good order and so regardless of synodical authority, and so indifferent to the friendly relations that they should maintain with the other Presbyteries, as to connive at these irregularities—whether they advise or even permit the probationers to alienate their services from the Presbyteries to which the Synod had appointed them and to officiate in their churches in violation of their appointment."

It is painful to the Presbytery year after year to have occasion to represent to Synod that the preachers appointed to supply in their bounds, seem to account it a matter of indifference whether they fulfil their appointment or not. Neither Messrs. Pollock nor M'Gill came agreeably to appointment, nor communicated to Presbytery any reason or excuse for not coming. It is hoped the Synod will not overlook such insubordination, and if they find it inexpedient or impracticable to enforce their appointment, devise some other mode of providing supply for vacancies. It is altogether at variance with the solemn vows which Preachers of the Gospel come under, to assume the right to shape their course, where inclination or convenience invite, or to alienate their services from that portion of the church to which they have been appointed; by the promise of an individual or Presbytery to assume the responsibility. It is altogether at variance with the rules of our church for Presbyteries to permit, with approbation, probationers to preach steadily in their churches while under appointment elsewhere. And it is altogether at variance with the profession of Presbyterial Church Government for the Synod to tolerate a system of independency. Delinquencies, such as that of which we complain, though none manifesting greater outrage upon the rights of Presbytery and people, have been frequent of late years. The Synod have passed over lightly the offence, or remitted the case of offenders, to Presbyteries, and possibly the very Presbyteries who have enjoyed the services of the delinquents, and who are therefore inclined to judge favorably of the offence. No more enquiry is made by Synod, and consequently this remissness generates indifference. We think the case of the delinquents of whom we complain peculiarly aggravated, by the consideration that they were the only supplies appointed to the these bounds; that but three months or so of supply had been received for three years, and that ten vacancies at least are entirely dependent upon the services of one of your ministers, who has two congregations to whom he stably ministers. To run counter to the express authority of Synod, under such peculiar circumstances as these, requires reasons, of the validity of which, we hope the Synod itself will judge, or if remitted to Presbyteries, require the recorded excuses with the judgment of Presbytery thereon, to be sent up to next meeting.

The people in this region of country have year after year through the proper organ, besought the Synod to send them supply of preaching, and notwithstanding the sudden removal of their pastor, and the almost total destitution of ordinances for three years, the most of the congregation continue steadfast and look to us for supply. There are but few slaves among them, in some of them none at all. We are far from thinking they have put away the Gospel from them, judging themselves unworthy of eternal

life. We therefore urge immediate attention to their wants, and beseech the Synod to relax that rigor which appears to have been exercised of late years. To those of you who live remote from destitution, the care of this people may not appear so mournful as to those of us who are familiar with their wants. We hope the members of Synod will come up to this part of their duty with a proper spirit, feeling, as they ought, for other's woes, and make the case of this part of the church, which is afflicted, tossed with tempest and not comforted, their own. Neither of the ministers composing this Presbytery is tied down to this region of country for a living. But while providence has fixed our lot here, and we continue to be the medium of communication with the Synod, we cannot, without a violation of conscience, cease to urge the claims of this portion of Zion. The congregations of Smyrna and Neiley's Creek, S. C., and Cambridge, and N. Stirling, N. C., have made arrangements for taking the whole time of a special missionary from Synod. We hope the Synod will make a special appointment for their case as well as grant other supplies so earnestly sought, and so imperiously demanded by this portion of Zion. The congregation of Lebanon also transmit to you a petition of like import, to which we beg leave to call the immediate attention of Synod. Immediately upon the rising of Synod, would be the most suitable time for supplies. A succession, so as to have some constantly in the bounds, would be greatly desirable.

With respect to the subject of slavery, the Synod is already in possession of the views of this Presbytery. We agree with your committee, Messrs. Murry and Blair, sent out in 1820, that "To declaim against the principle of slavery and urge the immediate emancipation of slavery, without considering what is to be done for them, in their present state, has not, we believe, one salutary consequence; the blessing of christianity must be offered them, in their present situation; and it will be found as they advance in the attainment of christianity, throughout the community, so they will advance toward a general emancipation."

We have seen with joy the rise, and have hailed with gratitude the progress of a revolution in church and state, on the subject of the right and privileges of the colored population both in Virginia and North Carolina. We pray that no unhallowed spirit, from the soil of freedom, may arise, to blast it.

On the subject of the statistical table, it might be well enough to drop the congregations of Bethany and Pisgah, S. C., and Gilead, N. C. They have not made any formal petition for supply. It was mentioned in our last report that the Rev. J. Lyle had obtained a dismission from this Presbytery, to connect himself with that of Miami. He removed from these bounds in October, 1834. A. WHYTE, Moderator.

Rockbridge, August 3, 1835.

The following papers were given in and read, viz :

No. 10. A petition from the session of New Lebanon congregation, in Virginia, for supply of Gospel ordinances, which was, on motion, referred to the committee of supplies.

Messrs. Pollock and McGill were called upon for their reasons for the non-fulfilment of appointments complained of in the report of the Presbytery of the Carolinas. Their excuses being heard were sustained.

No. 11. The report of the Presbytery of Philadelphia, which was, on motion, referred to the committee of supplies.

Report of the Presbytery of Philadelphia.

We have had less reason than for some years past, to complain of failure in the supplies allotted us by the Synod and the Board of Managers. The only considerable failure happened, however, when we were least prepared to meet it. In consequence of this the congregation of Baltimore was left vacant three months, with the exception of two Sabbaths' supply by a member of the Presbytery. Calls were sustained for the Rev. A. T. McGill, from the congregations of Carlisle, Dickinson and Wheatfield; from Lewistown, Kishacoquillas and Stone Valley; and from Baltimore. The decision being referred to the Presbytery, it was agreed that Mr. McGill should accept of the call to Carlisle, Dickinson and Wheatfield. After the usual trials he was accordingly ordained to the ministry and pastoral care of the said congregations, on the 29th ult. A call is also sustained to Lewistown and branches, for Mr. William Galbraith, and it is the earnest desire of the congregation and Presbytery, that he should be appointed to continue with us for some time, that they may have an opportunity of presenting to him this call. The settlement of Mr. D. McGill, and the prospect of the settlement of Mr. Galbraith at Lewistown, have very much revived the hopes of these congregations, and we trust that the Lord may be about to build up among us some of the old waste places. We hope that the Synod will make provision for the constant supply of Baltimore. If our anticipations be realized, this will be nearly all the supply which will be necessary.

By order of Presbytery.

T. BEVERIDGE, Moderator, pro tem.

No. 12. The report of D. Murphy, Treasurer, at Philadelphia, which was, on motion, referred to the committee on the funds.

<i>Daniel Murphy, in account with Synod in Synod's Fund,—</i>		May 21, to cash from dividends on 22 shares Commercial Bank stock,	44 00
September 18, 1835, to cash from Steel Creek congregation, N. C. per Rev. A. Whyte, . . .	\$10 00	Nov. 10, to cash from dividends on 22 shares Commercial Bank stock,	44 00
To cash from Bethany congregation, N. C. per A. Whyte,	10 50	May 17, 1-34, to cash on dividends on 22 shares Commercial Bank stock,	44 00
To cash from Timber Ridge, Ebenezer and Old Providence, Va. per Rev. A. Whyte, . .	17 20	Nov. 25, to cash from dividends on 22 shares Commercial Bank stock,	44 00
	\$37 70	May 23, 1-35, to cash from dividend on 22 shares Commercial Bank stock,	49 50

<i>Daniel Murphy, in account with Synod in Student's Fund,—</i>		<i>Daniel Murphy in account with Synod in Missionary Fund,—</i>	
Jan. 1, 1833, to cash from dividends on 22 shares Commercial Bank stock,	\$38 50	To balance in hand as per last report,	\$49 49

The above is a correct report of the state of the Synod's, Student's and Missionary Funds, the Theological Hall Fund accounts remain balanced as heretofore reported.

DANIEL MURPHY, Assistant Treasurer.

Philadelphia, September 23, 1835.

No. 13. The report of Mr. H. H. Blair of the western mission, which was, on motion, referred to the committee of supplies.

To the Associate Synod to meet at Canonsburgh, the first Wednesday of October, 1835, is presented the following report :—

BRETHREN—Six Sabbaths intervened between your missionary's receiving his appointment, and reaching the first vacancy properly belonging to the mission, which he spent separately in the duties appropriate to his calling, at Pittsburgh, Cadiz, Massie's Creek, Xenia, Louisville, and on board the Steamboat under weigh. He reached Unity, Randolph County, Illinois, the last Sabbath of November, where at that time he remained four Sabbaths in succession. Thence he removed to Apple Creek, Green County. At which place he spent four Sabbaths also : three, during his first visit, and one, after spending three at Buffalo, and one at Sharon, your vacancies in Pike and Lincoln Counties, Missouri. The six remaining Sabbaths included in his appointment, were employed, one at McCoy's, near Jacksonville ; another at Montgomery's, Forks of Shoal, Bond County ; and a third, at Sugar Creek, Madison County. The last three were occupied at Unity, the first and last place visited in the mission.

In addition to his attending to the exercises expected of him on all these Sabbaths, he might state that he was engaged in public services on several week days, and attended to the Synod's fast in two of the vacancies, but owing to the shortness of his time, and the urgent demands of the places heretofore visited, he did not leave the beaten track. The state of the country, and particularly of your vacancies in the far West, may be learned from the report contained in your last minutes, and their increased desire for the stated administration of word and sacraments at present, may be gathered from the petition at this time to be laid before you, and the great liberality manifested toward your last missionary. Not in the Valley of the Mississippi alone, but throughout the bounds already occupied by your church, throughout the world, the wants of men, the combined efforts of hell and earth, and above all, your solemn Covenant Engagements before God, angels and men, demand of you more than of any church in the United States, at present, a more united, vigorous, and godlike exertion, not only to maintain but propagate the grand doctrines of the Reformation, " The faith once delivered to the saints." To accomplish which, may the God of all grace pour out upon us, one and all, not the spirit of fear, but of power, of love, and of a sound mind.

Respectfully submitted to the Associate Synod in session; by

HUGH H. BLAIR.

Your missionary received for the time spent previous to his entering the mission, what he considered a sufficient compensation, and within \$4,50 of the customary allowance whilst there, as will appear from the annexed account.

Synod to H. H. Blair, Dr. for 13 Sabbaths,	\$108 00
Received of Unity Congregation,	\$12 00
" of Synod's Fast,	4 25
" of individuals,	7 25
" Apple Creek,	24 00
" Sharon, Missouri,	5 75
" Buffalo, do.	9 25
" Mr. McCoy, Illinois,	8 00
" Forks of Shoal, do.	7 00
" Sugar Creek, do.	1 00
Amount received,	\$103 50

Balance due, but donated to the funds, \$4 50

In connection with this there was presented an account of the Rev. John Wallace, for missionary services rendered on the western mission. This account was, on motion, referred to the committee on the funds.

No. 14. A communication from the Rev. A. Anderson, declining the acceptance of the professorship to which he was elected last year. This communication was, on motion, referred to the committee on the Theological Seminary.

No. 15. The report of the Presbytery of Muskingum, which was, on motion, referred to the committee of Bills and Overtures.

Report of the Presbytery of Muskingum.

In presenting to Synod our annual report, it becomes us to record, with gratitude, the great goodness of God to us during the past year, in granting us peace and prosperity, and an increase of ministerial aid. Our vacancies have been favored with a reasonable portion of supply, and some of them have obtained a settled dispensation of Gospel ordinances. Mr. D. Lindsay was ordained and installed Pastor of the associate congregations of Jonathan's Creek, Truro and Goshen, on the 26th Nov. last.

A call from the congregations of Carmel, Sandy and North Union, for Mr. Thomas Wilson, has been sustained, although Mr. Wilson was not by Synodical appointment in our hands at the time of sustaining this call, yet being providentially detained, we judged it expedient to present said call, which was accepted, and after giving the usual trials with acceptance, he was ordained and installed Pastor of those congregations, on the 16th September last. A call from the congregation of Millersburgh, for a part of the ministerial labors of the Rev. Samuel Irvine, has been sustained and accepted. Mr. Irvine was accordingly disjoined from the congregation of Wooster, and is now the settled Pastor of Millersburgh and Salt Creek. Since that time, the congregations of Wooster, Newman's Creek, Mohican and Killbuck, have given a call for Mr. John S. Eaton, which has been sustained, and is herewith transmitted to Synod, with a request that it may be presented as soon as practicable for acceptance.

Before closing our report, Presbytery would beg leave respectfully to call the attention of Synod to the question now agitated respecting the testimony of the original seceders in Scotland.

It is well known that doubts exist in the minds of several members of Synod, as to the agreement of that testimony in some important particulars, with our own acknowledged principles, and it is also believed, that in some instances, these doubts have, of late, been much strengthened. As a means of removing their apprehensions, and promoting harmony among ourselves, we respectfully ask Synod to suspend, for the present, all further judicial procedure, in relation to the act, declaring a union with the original Seceders, and open a correspondence with those brethren, on those points in which there is, at least, a supposed discrepancy of views. We therefore suggest the propriety of appointing a committee for this purpose, who shall specify the articles in their testimony to which exceptions have been taken, and request them, by farther explanation, to show that we are *one* in sentiment. This suggestion we make with due deference to the wisdom of Synod.

Messrs. John M. French and William Smith, graduates of Franklin College, have been admitted to the study of divinity and are expected to attend the Hall the ensuing session.

By order of the Presbytery.

THOMAS HANNA, *Presbytery Clerk.*

No. 16. A petition from the Rev. Messrs. Strang and Russell, of the Presbytery of Albany, for the erection of a new Presbytery. The petition was accompanied with the excuses of these brethren for absence, which were sustained. On motion the prayer of the above petition was granted, and it was, on motion,

Resolved, That a new Presbytery be erected to be denominated, "The Presbytery of Stamford," and to consist of Messrs. Russell and Strang, together with all the territory beyond the boundary line proposed in the report of the Presbytery of Albany. Said Presbytery to hold its first meeting at Stamford, on the 3d Thursday of November next, and Mr. Russell to preside at said meeting as moderator.

On motion, Resolved, That the Presbytery of Albany be directed to transfer to said Presbytery of Stamford, all documents in their hands that concern said Presbytery.

On motion, Resolved further, That said Presbytery of Stamford be al-

lowed their proportion of any funds belonging to the Presbytery of Albany.

The communication containing the above petition was also, on motion, referred to the committee of supplies.

No. 17. A petition from Sharon York District, S. C., for a supply of Gospel ordinances. This petition was, on motion, referred to the committee of supplies.

No. 18. A petition from Thomas Gillespie, of Bucyrus, in the State of Ohio, for a supply of Gospel ordinances by the stated labors of a missionary for one year. This petition was, on motion, referred also to the committee on supplies.

No. 19. A remonstrance from the session of Caesar's Creek congregation, against the Synod's late enactment on the subject of marriage, which was, on motion, laid on the table. The majority of the committee of bills and overtures presented a report on the question submitted by the session of the Barnet congregation, and also on the report of the Presbytery of Miami.

The minority of the committee offered a counter report, both of which were, on motion, laid on the table, with the exception of a recommendation, in which all the committee concurred, that Synod should appoint a standing committee on the subject of missions. The recommendation was agreed to, and Messrs. Isaac, Adams and Beveridge were appointed said committee.

Papers relative to an appeal by the Rev. D. Gordon, alluded to in the report of the Presbytery of Cambridge, were given in, and on motion, laid on the table.

Presbyterial records being called for, the following committees of examination were appointed, viz:—To examine the records of the Presbytery of Miami, Messrs. Imbric and Beggs—to examine the records of the Presbytery of Muskingum, Messrs. Blair and E. N. Scroggs—of Ohio, Messrs. J. Scroggs and S. Hindman—of Chartiers, Messrs. Lindsay and Irvine. The clerk of the Presbytery of Alleghany not being present the appointment of a committee to examine the minutes of said Presbytery, was deferred.

Enquiry being made of the several ministers respecting their observance of the Synod's fast, it was found to have been generally observed. The excuses of a few who had not observed it were sustained, with the exception that Mr. Blair's reasons for its non-observance, and those of Mr. Adams', for omitting the public reading of Synod's act for fasting, were not sustained. Adjourned till 9 o'clock to-morrow morning.—Closed with prayer.

Friday, October 9.

The Synod met and was opened with prayer. Members present as above, together with Mr. S. M'Lane, minister. Read the minutes of last sitting. Papers being called for the following were given in and read, viz:—

No. 20. A memorial from the Presbytery of Miami on the subject of missions. Said memorials, together with the memorials from the sessions of Massie's Creek and Caesar's Creek, was, on motion, referred to the committee on missions.

The Presbytery of Alleghany requested the privilege of deferring the presentation of their report till the afternoon; the request was granted.

No. 21. The report of the Presbytery of Ohio, which was, on motion, referred to the committee of Bills and Overtures.

Report of the Ohio Presbytery.

As directed by Synod, we, at our meeting in Poland, in November last, presented

the calls referred to us to Mr. Ramsay, when he accepted the one from Deer Creek congregation, and having passed the usual trials, was ordained and installed in that charge on the 1st of July.

A call has been sustained by our Presbytery for Mr. Pollock, from the united congregations of Harmony and Unity, and having given in his trials was ordained and admitted to the charge of these congregations on the 27th of May.

A meeting of our Presbytery took place at Scroggsfield, assisted by Messrs. Walker, Hanna and Clokey, as directed by Synod, on the 9th of December last, when the case of the difficulties existing between Mr. Donaldson and the members of his charge, was taken up and discussed; and the matter has terminated in the application of Mr. Donaldson for dismissal from his charge. This application was sustained by our Presbytery, and the connection between Mr. Donaldson and the united congregations of Yellow Creek, Scroggsfield and Glade Run, been dissolved by Presbytery, and these places have been declared vacant accordingly, and Mr. Donaldson is by us considered without charge.

It has been resolved in our Presbytery, to make application to Synod for a division of the members into two Presbyteries, for the greater convenience of managing the government of the church; to be divided by a line commencing on Lake Erie, and following the state line until it intersects the western branch of Big Shenango, thence down Shenango to Newcastle, from thence east on the line between Beaver and Mercer Counties, and so on until it intersects with Alleghany Presbytery. The south-western part to retain the original name of Ohio Presbytery, and the north-eastern part to be constituted under the name of the Shenango Presbytery.

In our address of last year, we submitted a report upon the cause now pending in your court, respecting our connection with the Original Seceders. To this report we still adhere; as then we would highly deprecate the consequences arising from unfriendly litigations among our members, upon this or any other subject; as we then, so we still solicit Synod to institute such correspondence with that Synod, as might enable us to know for mutual satisfaction the sentiments of that Synod upon the subjects of disputation or misunderstanding, and as the decision of Synod upon the protest, and appeals before us might materially affect their standing with us, either one way or other, we would respectfully submit to Synod, the propriety of suspending, for the present, the prosecution of the subject, to make way for that correspondence; and that in the mean time it be fully understood that all their members claiming ministerial and christian fellowship with us, be admitted upon their adoption of our testimony.

Upon the subject of slavery, as formerly, we again come forward soliciting Synod to take due order that the act of Synod upon that subject in 1831, be carried into effect. And as it is evident the part of that act which recommended the appointment of an agent to transact that business, is not likely to facilitate measures with any prospect of success; it is our opinion, that part of the Synod's act ought either to be repealed or some way connected with or superceded by some other measures which might be efficient to secure the rights of justice and humanity to all the slaves belonging to the members of our communion.

On the subject of religious covenanting and other measures connected with the prosecution of that work as we have often solicited the attention of Synod, it is still to that body we look up for such directions and injunctions as may be calculated to strengthen our hands in this work of the Lord.

A call for Mr. Easton has been sustained in the united congregations of Glade Run, Scroggsfield and Yellow Creek, which is now referred to Synod, and to which, on behalf of the members of these congregations, we earnestly solicit your attention; from the difficult situation in which they stand under present circumstances, a supply of preaching is required as far as can be given.

DANIEL M'LEAN, *Moderator.*

Attest ALEXANDER MURRAY, *Clerk.*

No. 22. The report of the Presbytery of Chartiers, which was, on motion, laid on the table.

Report of the Presbytery of Chartiers.

No material change in any of our congregations, settled or vacant, has taken place since the last meeting of Synod. On the eighth of July last, we licensed Messrs. D. Strang, William Galbraith and George Hall, to preach the Gospel. Mr. Strang has been ever since in our bounds, and his labors, so far as we have learned, are very acceptable to our people. The few vacancies which we have under our charge are urgent for supply of preaching. We hope therefore, that Synod in the distributions of the time of their probationers, will remember us.

J. RAMSEY, *Presbytery Clerk.*

No. 23. A petition from the congregations of Glade-run and Scroggsfield, in the Presbytery of Ohio, praying for a new organization and a

change of name. This petition was, on motion, laid on the table. Verbal information was given of a petition which had been forwarded from certain congregations on the western mission, praying for a stated supply for one year, and particularly that Mr. H. H. Blair be again sent among them, which petition the clerk had forgotten to bring up. Said petition was, on motion, referred to the committee of supplies.

Messrs. S. Hindman and M'Elwee, were, on motion, added to the committee of supplies. The committee of Bills and Overtures presented a report on that portion of the report of the Presbytery of Muskingum which regarded the Associate Synod of Original Seceders. This report was, on motion, laid on the table. The Synod proceeded to the consideration of unfinished business in accordance with the report of the committee of arrangements as adopted. The committee appointed some years ago to answer Mr. Walker's reasons of dissent from the Synod's deed respecting the baptism of wards, were called on for their report, but not being ready were ordered to be prepared before the adjournment of Synod.

The committee on the Book of Discipline were called upon, and not being prepared were ordered to be ready during the sitting of Synod.

The Committee appointed last year to answer Mr. Heron's Reasons of Protest against the Synod's enactment on the subject of marriage, craved further time, which was granted till this afternoon.

Entered on the subject of the Synod's act respecting our union with the Associate Synod of Original Seceders in Scotland. Reasons of Protest against said deed as published by order of Synod last year were read. Before proceeding to read the committee's Answers to said Reasons, 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, together with Mr. Alex. Boyd, from the Presbytery of Ohio. Read the minutes of last sitting.

The committee on the Theological Seminary presented a report, which on motion, was adopted.

Your committee have had Mr. Anderson's letter under consideration, and are of opinion that as he declines accepting the Professorship, it would be altogether inexpedient and improper for the Synod to require him to officiate in that department the ensuing winter, although he expresses a willingness to do so, should Synod so order. At the same time we think that the interests of the Seminary require that the chair should be speedily filled. We would, therefore, respectfully recommend that the Synod proceed without delay to the election of a Professor. Believing that the Synod will at once see the necessity of this measure at an early period of the session, we think we need not specify the reasons which lead us to this conclusion.

JAS. RAMSAY.
WM. WILSON.

On motion the election of a professor contemplated in the above report was made the order of the day for to-morrow morning.

The committee on the reference from the Presbytery of Cambridge, presented a report, which was on motion adopted, as follows.

As to the reference from the Presbytery of Cambridge, your Committee report that as the Session of Cambridge is not heard, as we know not the local situation of the families petitioning for disjunction, and while there is a standing rule of Synod that geographical lines shall determine the boundaries of congregations, we cannot see that Synod, with any propriety, can in present circumstances, grant what petitioners ask. It seems a little strange that Presbytery should have referred to Synod for judgment a matter so destitute of documents upon which to form a judgment.

ALEX. DONNAN.
JAS. RAMSAY.

Proceeded with the business left unfinished in the forenoon, viz: the reading of the committee's answers to the reasons of protest in the case

of the original Seceders. After the reading was finished the following resolutions were offered, in order to issue the matter, viz :

Resolved, That the Synod adopt the answers to the reasons of protest against our continuing in union with the Synod of original Seceders, so far as to declare them to be a sufficient vindication of their act.

Resolved, Farther, that as the Synod have not adopted the testimony of their brethren, as their own, or declared their concurrence with it, further than not finding a difference between that testimony and our own, sufficient to warrant a separation, they do not judge it expedient to declare their approbation of all that the committee have said in defence of the statements of our brethren on one or two intricate subjects, in respect of which it is supposed by some that there is a difference between them and us.

While these resolutions were under discussion, Mr. James Patterson asked and obtained leave of absence, and Synod adjourned till 9 o'clock to-morrow morning.—Closed with prayer.

Saturday, October 10.

The Synod met and was opened with prayer—members present as above. Read the minutes of last sitting.

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

No. 24. A petition from the congregation of Salem, Tennessee, for supply of gospel ordinances, which was on motion, referred to the committee of supplies.

No. 25. The report of the board of managers of the Theological Seminary, which was on motion accepted, and laid on the table.

Report of the Board of Managers of the Theological Seminary.

The Board of Managers of the Theological Seminary, beg leave respectfully to report, that at their meeting at the close of the last session, it was ascertained that the following students had attended the lectures, viz : Messrs. Wm. Gallbraith, James Dixon, and George M. Hull, of the 4th year. Messrs. Joseph McKee, James McGill, John M. Scroggs and James Strang, of the 3d year. Messrs. Wm. Y. Hamilton, Robert Forrester, Edward Small, James P. Smart, and Wm. H. Walker, of the 2d year. Joseph T. Cooper, James M. Harsha, Isaac N. Laughhead, James Law, and John L. McLane, of the 1st year. Mr. Alexander Tedford, who attended last year, has been removed by death.

All the students except those of the first year, delivered discourses before the Board, which were approved as specimens of improvement. They were all examined at considerable length, on Hebrew and the system of Theology, and acquitted themselves to the satisfaction of the Board. Messrs. Gallbraith, Hull and Dixon having completed the full term of study, were assigned to their respective Presbyteries for licensure. The Board also judged it expedient to appoint Mr. Strang to be taken on trial for license, although he had not completed his full term. The peculiar circumstances of his case were the reasons of this decision.

By order of the Board.

THOMAS HANNA,

Sec'y.

The committee of Bills and Overtures reported on the report of the Presbytery of Ohio, and their report was on motion, accepted and laid on the table.

The committee appointed to examine the records of the Presbytery of Miami, reported that having examined said records they find them correct. The report was on motion, accepted.

On motion, the order of the day was suspended for the present, in order to make way for other business.

The request of the Presbytery of Ohio, for a division of said Presbytery, was taken up and granted, the boundary line to be that which is marked out in the report of the Presbytery of Ohio, and on motion it was resolved that the first meeting of the Presbytery of Shenango, be held at Mercer, on the 2nd Tuesday of November next, and that the Rev. D. McLane, sen. preside as moderator.

Proceeded to the order of the day, viz : the election of a Professor.—The clerks were appointed tellers and Messrs. Beveridge, Martin, Donnan and Heron, were put in nomination

After prayer by a brother, the votes were taken and the Rev. Thomas Beveridge was elected on the first ballot. Dr. Ramsay and Messrs. Miller and Hanna were appointed a committee to confer with Mr. Beveridge relative to his acceptance.

The next meeting of Synod was appointed to be held at Philadelphia, on the 4th Wednesday of May, 1836, at 4 o'clock, P. M. Sermon at early candle lighting. Mr. Martin was appointed the moderator's alternate, to preach the Synodical sermon.

Messrs Rodgers and John Y. Stuart asked, and obtained leave of absence.

Proceeded with the business left unfinished, viz : the resolutions offered last evening to issue the matter respecting the answers to the reasons of protest against the Synod's deed in the case of the Original Seceders. A question arose on a point of order, viz : whether the protestors and the answering committee are entitled to a part in the discussion now pending.

The Moderator decided this question in the affirmative. An appeal being taken the Moderator's decision was sustained.

On motion, agreed to postpone the order of the day, in order to make way for considering the case of Mr. Donaldson, as adverted to in the report of the Presbytery of Ohio, and this business was on motion made the order of the day for this afternoon. Mr. Isaac obtained leave of absence for this afternoon. Adjourned till 2 o'clock.—Closed with prayer.

2 o'clock, P. M.

The Synod met and was opened with prayer. Read the minutes of last sitting. Papers were read informing the Synod of a legacy of £100 sterling, left to the Synod by Mrs. Elizabeth Marshall, late of Perth, Scotland. These papers were on motion laid on the table.

Proceeded to the order of the day, viz : the case of Mr. Donaldson.—A paper formerly laid upon the table, as connected with this case was read, viz : the petition from Scroggsfield and Glade-run. After a brief discussion, it was on motion, resolved that the petitioners have leave to withdraw their petition.

Mr. Donaldson proposed to Synod the following enquiry, viz : Whether it is his right to preach without Presbyterial appointment when his preaching will not interfere with any Presbyterial appointment or with the orderly dispensation of ordinances in any congregation? After some discussion the question was withdrawn.

On motion, resolved, that the salary of the Professor of Biblical literature and church history be five hundred dollars per annum, to be paid half yearly out of any monies in the treasury not otherwise appropriated. Adjourned till 9 o'clock, on Monday morning.—Closed with prayer.

Monday, October 12.

The Synod met and was opened with prayer. Members present as above, together with Dr. Bruce, minister, and Mr. William Bell, ruling elder, both from the Presbytery of Alleghany. James Harper in the room of John Craig. Frederick Whitely in the room of Hanse Dnlap, and John Gilmer in the room of Joseph Brownlee. Read the minutes of last sitting. An excuse for the absence of the Rev. A. Whyte was offered and sustained.

A communication from the associate session of the congregation of Pittsburgh, inviting the Synod to hold its next meeting in that city was read, and on motion, laid on the table. Notice was given that at next meeting of Synod a motion will be made to set aside the practice which

has hitherto obtained of meeting alternately on the east and west of the Alleghany mountains.

On motion, Resolved, That a preacher be appointed to officiate as a stated supply in the second congregation of New-York, till otherwise ordered. Mr. James Dixon was appointed accordingly.

On motion, Resolved, That the territory of Michigan be added to the missionary ground of this Synod, and that a missionary be appointed to labor in that district for some time. The committee of supplies were instructed to attend this business.

The following resolutions were offered for consideration, and on motion, laid on the table, viz :

Whereas this Synod is now spread over so great an extent of territory that all the members cannot, without great inconvenience and expense, meet in any one place, and that our numbers are so increased as to render it difficult to overtake the business of Synod at one meeting—

Resolved, That it is expedient to divide this Synod into three Sub-Synods, as follows, viz :—

1st. The Presbyteries of Cambridge, Albany, Philadelphia and Stamford, to compose the Eastern Synod.

2d. The Presbyteries of Chartiers, Alleghany, Ohio and Chenango, to compose the ——— Synod.

3d. The Presbyteries of Muskingum, Miami and Carolina, to compose the ——— Synod.

Resolved further, That a general Associate Synod, composed of two ministers and two ruling elders from each Presbytery, meet once every two years.

Resolved further, That the decisions of the Sub-Synods be final, except in matters of doctrine, in which only, appeals be allowed to the General Synod.

Resolved further, That the Theological Seminary, General Missions, the revision and publication of the Testimony and Book of Discipline, and all overtures respecting any subject of general interest to the church, be under the care of the General Synod.

Proceeded with the business left unfinished on Saturday, viz: the resolutions respecting the answers to reasons of protest in the case of the Synod of Original Seceders. After some discussion the resolutions were withdrawn, and 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, except that William Hervey attended in the room of James Hanna. Robert Jeffry in the room of Thomas Jeffry. John Stewart in the room of Thomas Roseburgh. John M'Call in the room of Samuel Livingston, and Hugh M'Clelland in the room of James Thorne. The minutes of last sitting were read and approved.

Papers being called for there was given in and read,

No. 26. The report of the Presbytery of Alleghany which was, on motion referred to the committee of Bills and Overtures.

Report of the Presbytery of Alleghany.

We, as a Presbytery, enjoy the blessings of peace and harmony among ourselves, as ministers, and in our congregations. Blessings for which we have great reason to be thankful, in these days of ecclesiastical contention; and religion seems to be revived in our small vacancies this fall, by the dispensation of Gospel ordinances.

The pastoral relation between the Rev. John P. Dickey and his congregation was dissolved at our last meeting. When he went to Ireland, as reported last year, for his health; he left a paper containing the resignation of his charge in the hands of a member of the congregation, and on the presentation of it to Presbytery, the pastoral relation was dissolved.

We hope Synod will consider these things as reasons for affording us our proper share in the ministry of our travelling preachers.

With regard to the answers to reasons of protest partly read in Synod last year, and published to the world for information, we have to repeat that we think it cause of regret that they were printed by the authority of Synod, without a careful examination. There are statements made in these answers, which, we think, no one acquainted with the principles of our church, could hear attentively without suspecting them to be inconsistent with our profession.

For example: in the 49th page there is a formal quotation from our Testimony, in the following words, "the civil magistrate is bound to promote the faith of Christ, to oppose the enemies of this faith, to support and encourage true godliness, to discourage whatever, in principle or practice, is contrary to it, and to judge who are the professors of the true religion." Who would think, on hearing the above quotation read, of ever finding it in the testimony of our church uttered in behalf of the magistrate's official obligation? Our late contentings with the Reformed Presbyterian Synod respecting their unjust plan of making quotations from our testimony, should have prevented such a new exhibition of our principles to the public. This part of their answers is of a piece, we think, with the charge of irreligion brought against our civil government for prohibiting ecclesiastical establishments; and of a piece with the reasoning that we were in communion with the Constitutional Presbytery, even when that Presbytery was in a state of separation from the General Associate Synod; and that we were in communion with this new Synod, united under their new testimony, previous to any decision of ours about that testimony. We hope that, as the resolution of Synod brought to light this publication, they will examine it without delay, and prevent the public from considering it as a document having the authority of our church.

By order of Presbytery.

JOHN HINDMAN, *Presbytery Clerk.*

Proceeded with the business left unfinished in the forenoon sitting, viz: The consideration of the answers to the reasons of protest in the case of the Synod of Original Seceders. A motion to adopt the answers was the subject of considerable discussion.

Before taking the vote on the above motion, the moderator having decided on a question of order that the protestors have not a right to vote. An appeal was taken from the decision, and when put to the vote was sustained. Against this decision a protest was taken by Dr. Ramsay and Messrs. Miller, Martin, Walker, E. N. Scroggs, Isaac J. Scoggs, Lindsay, Templeton, M'Elwee, Banks, Beveridge and Geery. Mr. Hanna craved his dissent to be marked.

The question was then taken on the above motion, viz: "Adopt the answers or not," and carried "not adopt," by a vote of 40 to 2. The protestors, with one exception, declined voting.

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

Tuesday, October 13.

The Synod met and was opened with prayer. Members present as above. Read the minutes of last sitting. Mr. Miller was, on motion, added to the committee on the funds, and Mr. Murray to the committee of supplies. Papers being called for the following were given in and read, viz:

No. 27. The report of Daniel Houston, Treasurer, which, with the accompanying documents was, on motion, referred to the committee on the funds.

Report of Daniel Houston, Treasurer.

<i>Daniel Houston, Treasurer, in account with Associate Synod's Fund,—</i>	Jan. 30, from Peter's Creek cong.	10 00
Sept. 22, 1831, to balance in Treasury on all funds,	Dr. 31, to Mr. Calahan's receipt for lumber from James M'Nary,	20 00
Sept. 24, to cash from Cadiz con. per Rev. T. Hanna,	\$80 00 31, to Mr. Calahan's receipt for laths from William Anderson,	8 00
Sept. 24, cash from Piney Fork, per Rev. T. Hanna,	15 00 Jan. 31, to cash on Mr. Calahan's bill in respecting junks in Seminary,	10 00
Sept. 24, cash from Carmel cong. Indiana,	5 50 March 10, by Rev. D. Thompson, from Banno cong. New-York,	10 00
24, from Unity cong.	10 00 March 11, from treasurer of Chartier's con.	60 00
Oct. 11, from Jas. Sterling, per Rev. Mr. M'Elwee,	24, Unity con. per Rev. J. Walker,	33 41
Oct. 11, from Mr. Leiper, by Mr. M'Elwee,	25, N. Buffalo cong. contri.	10 00
28, from Syn. by the hand Dr. Ramsay	25, from Ligonier cong.	5 00
28, from Margaret Moore, int. on legacy	26, from Tumbleton's Run cong.	10 00
Nov. 5, from Chartier's cong. Seminary fund, per Dr. Blunday,	1 00 26, from S. Buffalo cong. contri.	8 82
Nov. 11, from Ligonier con. per Rev. J. Scroggs,	75 00 27, from Buffalo cong. subscription,	15 00
Nov. 15, from Allen Cassils by Mr. Laughlin	12 00 27, from Service & King's Creek con.	14 00
18, from Jane, John, Robert & Ezekiel Lyons, and Isaac Boghart,	10 00 April 10, by Rev. J. P. Miller £200, one hundred of which is interest on Elener Henry's legacy, the balance on James M'Dougal's donation,	200 00
Nov. 20, from Dr. Ramsay, int. on James Saxon's legacy,	2 50 April 19, from Deer Creek cong.	5 18
Nov. 25, from Ligonier congregation,	18 00 May 9th, from Cancaut, Chery Run and French Creek congs.	10 02
Jan. 7, 1835, from Chartier's con.	22 50	
		\$1000 96½

	Dr.		Dr.
Amount brought forward.	\$1060 96½	7, from Hebron cong.	9 00
May 9, to amount of brick from J. Cochran	560 95	7, two years' int. Mary J. Whiteside's	18 00
25, from Dr. Ramsay on loan, it being		legacy,	0 62½
Mr. James Paxton's legacy,	300 00	Oct. 8, from Rev. James Patterson, per Rev.	25 00
June 22, from Liberty con. per Mr. Ramsay	9 03	T. Kendal,	12 00
July 1, from Mercersburgh and M'Conels-	22 00	8, from S. Argyle cong. contribution	8 50
burgh cong.		8, from Putnam cong. do.	25 00
July 1, from Mr. Carother, esq. (G. Sander-		8, from Hebron cong. do.	25 00
son's legacy to Theological Sem.) after	1741 56	8, from S. Argyle cong.	10 00
deducting Mr. Carother's fees for colic.		8, Darlington & Bethel cong. contri.	10 00
July 1, to note on Harrisburgh, Carlisle &		8, Albany cong. per Rev. J. Martin.	20 00
Chambersburgh Turnpike Company in		8, from West Beaver cong.	2 37½
part of George Sanderson's legacy,	60 61	8, from James M'Kinzey, donation,	5 00
The above sum does not amount to the bequest nam-		8, from Erastus Eis, do.	5 00
ed in Mr. Sanderson's will to Seminary, but includes		8, from Mathew Adams, do.	3 00
all G. Sanderson's personal estate after deducting pre-		8, from Robert Oowe, do.	5 00
vious bequests and expenses of settlement, which will		8, from Rev. E. N. Scroggs, do.	5 00
be seen by referring to an accompanying paper marked		8, from Slipery Creek cong. contri.	3 00
No. 1.		8, from Wm. Murray's cong.	30 00
The title papers to about 300 acres of land in Erie		8, from Rev. A. Frazer, (service cong.)	6 00
County, Pennsylvania, were received at the same time,		8, from Rev. William M'Elwae,	5 00
the present situation, and probable value of which may		8, from Rev. J. Ramsay for Testi. sold	8 12½
be seen by an accompanying letter, marked No. 2.		8, from Berachah, Concord, & Glade	6 46
July 4, from Mrs. Jane Barcraft, Lees-		Run cong.	44 00
burgh, Ten.	2 00	Oct. 8, from Salem and Shenango cong.	22 39
July 4, from Miss Eliza Alexander, Ten.	1 00	per Rev. D. M'Lean, sen.	10 00
4, from Miss Susan Alexander, Ten.	0 25	Oct. 9, from C. Webster for sales of Testi-	10 00
4, from Miss Mary Alexander, Ten.	0 25	monies, per Rev. J. Martin,	10 00
4, from Bigspring & Pistol Creek	6 00	Oct. 12, from King's Creek cong. per Mr.	10 00
congs. Ten.	2 00	Harper,	10 00
July 4, from S. M'Kinley, Knoxville, Ten.	60 00	Oct. 12, from S. Buffalo cong. contri.	10 00
8, from Rev. William Wilson,	0 75	12, from N. Buffalo cong.	6 00
27, to balance of window springs,	9 31	12, from Monteuere's cong.	20 00
Sept. 9, from Johnstown con. per Mr. Smart	10 00	12, from Pittsburgh cong. per Mr. Bell	23 00
Oct. 6, from Rev. T. Beveridge for Teste-	33 12½	12, Indiana cong. per Rev. D. Blair,	7 00
ments sold,	44 00	12, Pigeon Creek cong. per B. Boyd,	15 75
Oct. 6, three qurt'y col. from Phila cong.	19 00	12, Mt. Pleasant cong. per Rev. A.	15 00
6, from Wm. Morris, Baltimore, dona.	20 00	Donnan,	8 25
6, from Guinston and Lower Chance-	10 00	Oct. 14, from Rev. D. Thompson,	6 00
ford congs.	20 00	14, from Glade Run cong. for 1833-34,	5 00
Oct. 6, from Henderson cong. per Rev. J.	55 00	14, Glade Run cong. for 1835,	2 00
Adams,	20 00	15, from S. M'Cune, Mt. Hope cong.	1 00
Oct. 6, from Caesar Creek cong. per Rev.	20 00	15, from Margaret Moore, int. on M.	13 55
A. Heron,	4 18½	Moor's legacy,	11 46
Oct. 6, from Xena Cong. Synod's fund, per	10 00	Oct. 15, rec'd from Cambridge cong. cont.	\$4684 26½
Mr. J. Hamil,	6 00	Oct. 15, rec'd Wm. Stevenson & wife, Cam-	
Oct. 6, from do. do. Hall fund,	20 124	bridge, cong.	
6, from Massie's Creek cong. per Mr.	20 00	Oct. 15, 1835, amount of monies received	
Rough,	10 00	since last report,	
Oct. 6, from Tumelsans Run cong. per Mr.	10 00		
Calhoun,	20 124	<i>Contra Cr.</i>	
Oct. 6, from Deer Creek cong. per Rev. J.	20 00	Oct. 17, 1834, cash paid J. Calahan,	\$50 00
Ramsay,	20 00	28, paid Rev. A. Heron by Dr. Ramsey	50 00
Oct. 6, from Mrs. Nancy Cowden, Deer	11 124	Nov. 5, paid J. Calahan,	150 00
Creek cong.	10 00	5, paid for chair for Professor,	5 00
Oct. 6, from Barnett cong. Vermont,	10 00	5, paid for paling garden, locust posts,	
6, from Cadiz cong.	5 00	removing rubbish, leveling lots at Semi-	86 25
6, from Mount Pleasant cong. Ohio,	6 00	nary, &c.	4 50
7, from collec. for Hall, Salem cong.	7 28	Nov. 13, paid for scrubbing Seminary,	1 00
7, from Unity cong.	6 00	20, paid Henry Havelin for shovel &	170 00
7, from John Bishop, Mission. fund,	22 50	poker,	7 50
7, from James M'Dougal, in part of	9 00	Nov. 27, paid J. Calahan,	10 00
donation made in Books by the hand of	18 75	27, paid J. Cochran for brick,	26 60
Rev. J. P. Miller,	7 00	Dec. 29, paid Mrs. Jane Carson,	15 00
Oct. 7, from Jefferson, Piney and Cherry	11 00	Jan. 5, 1835, paid do. do.	5 00
Run congs. per Rev. M'Caryl,	1 43½	7, paid do. do.	5 00
Oct. 7, from Deer Creek cong. per Rev. J.	8 15	7, paid for desk,	15 00
Ramsay,	10 00	22, paid Mrs. Jane Carson,	4 33
Oct. 7, from A. Roseburgh in full for Testi-	80 00	23, paid John Calahan,	10 00
monies sold,	7 35	30, paid do. do.	38 00
Oct. 7, from Burgetstown cong. collection,	5 00	31, paid do. do.	0 25
7, from William M'Craken,	3 31	Feb. 28, paid postage,	
7, from Bloomfield cong.	7 68	Jan. 10, by note on Rev. Wm. Douthet,	30 00
7, cash from Dr. B. Thompson,	11 00	previously charged and now in this acct.	
7, from Robinson cong. per J. Pollock	8 00	credited,	
7, Londonderry cong.	7 00	March 14, cash paid J. Calahan, per Tem-	60 66½
7, from William and John Auld,	8 00	pleton and Buchanan,	23 00
7, from East Nottingham cong.	3 00	March 26, paid Paul Harsela on oven,	67 00
7, from Sugar Creek cong. Syn. fund	2 30	26, paid J. Calahan,	15 00
7, from Sugar Creek cong. Hall fund	8 00	April 1, paid Mrs. Jane Carson,	0 37½
7, from Mansfield cong.	7 00	7, paid postage,	60 00
7, from Clearcreek cong.	8 00	10, paid Mrs. Jane Carson,	120 00
7, from Burnett's Creek, cong.	7 00	17, paid J. Calahan,	1 50
7, from Pleasant Run cong.	8 00	17, paid for scrubbing Seminary,	560 95
7, from Carmel cong.	8 00	17, paid J. Campbell for coal for Semi.	100 00
7, from Big Creek cong.	1 00	15, brick pd. J. Calahan per J. Cochran	220 00
7, from Cherokee cong.	100 00	26, paid Dr. Ramsay's salary,	6 50
7, from Darby cong.	20 00	26, paid J. Calahan at settlement,	5 75
7, from Ligonier cong.		June 9, paid Mrs. Jane Carson,	20 00
7, from Piney Fork cong.		9, paid drapery for pulpit in hall,	
7, from R. Hanna, esq. Cadiz,		22, paid Mrs. Jane Carson,	
7, from Francis Grove, Cadiz,			
7, from a friend of Secession Church,			
to be applied to missionary purposes, with interest			
thereon,	100 00		
Oct. 7, from E. Cook, Cambridge, N. Y.	20 00		

Amount brought forward,	\$1941 52	Oct. 3, paid for stove, pipe and halling,	37 75
July 1, paid postage, & c.	0 13½	Oct. 7th, paid Henry Havelin, shovel and poker,	1 50
July 1, Expenses of Treas. to Carlisle,	45 00	Oct. 10, paid Rev A Heron,	101 00
1, paid for copy of court verdict in Sanderson's case,	1 50	12, paid Dr. Ramsay in full of salary to end of session, last March,	400 00
July 8, paid Mrs. Jane Carson in full,	131 90		
17, paid J. Calahan in full for Seminary building,	520 75	Oct. 15, Treasurer claims Cr. for payment as per account exhibited,	3218 63½
July 17, paid Paul Harsha in full for oven,	32 40		
July 27, paid for putting springs in windows in Seminary buildings,	4 31½	Oct. 15, 1835, Balance in Treasury,	\$1705 63½
Sept. 2, paid postage,	0 50½	DANIEL HOUSTAN, Treasurer.	

From a hasty glance it appears that the cost of lot, Seminary buildings, stable, carriage house, coal house, fencing lot and yards, well, pump, grates, paling garden, smokehouse, stove, desk, chair, benches, shovels, pokers, &c. is \$6398 and 60 cents, all of which is paid. D. H.

By order of the Board of Trustees, the undersigned committee have examined the foregoing report, with the accompanying papers and statements, and find it to be correct.

ROBERT HENDERSON, }
D. S. STEVENSON, } Committee.

No. 26. A memorial from the Rev. H. Kirkland, which was, on motion, referred to the Presbytery of Alleghany.

The committee appointed to examine the records of the Presbytery of Chartiers, reported that having examined said minutes, they found them correct. The report was, on motion, accepted.

Proceeded with the business left unfinished last evening, viz: the answers to reasons of protest, &c. A motion was made to reconsider the vote of last evening, sustaining the appeal from the moderator's decision regarding the right of the protesters to a vote. It was agreed to reconsider, and the question was again taken on the original appeal from the moderator's decision. After a free discussion the vote of last evening was reversed.

The question was then taken on the motion to adopt the answers to the reasons of protest, and was carried "not adopt" by a vote of 39 to 19.

On motion, Resolved, That the appeal from the Presbytery of Albany, noticed in the report of said Presbytery, be made the order of the day for this afternoon.

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, except that Nathaniel M'Dowel attended in the room of James Patterson. Read the minutes of last sitting. Mr. M'Clelland asked and obtained leave of absence for this afternoon.

The memorial of Mr. Kirkland mentioned in the minutes of the forenoon sitting, as referred to the Presbytery of Alleghany, was by said Presbytery referred back to Synod. Wherefore it was, on motion,

Resolved, That said memorial be referred to a select committee to report thereon, and Messrs. M'Lane, senior, Irvine and Beggs, were appointed said committee.

Proceeded to the order of the day, viz: the appeal of Messrs. Stark and Bullins from the decision of the Presbytery of Albany, declaring it to be censurable according to the word of God and the discipline of this church, for a minister of the Gospel to enter a civil suit against a member of his own communion for a supposed injury to his moral character, without first having submitted the matter to the adjudication of the appropriate church court.

The reasons of protest with the Presbytery's answers were read. At this stage of the business, its progress was arrested by the following resolution which was offered, and after discussion adopted, viz: "Moved that it is inexpedient to decide upon the abstract question proposed by the

Presbytery of Albany, inasmuch as there may be a diversity of circumstances in different cases, and no particular case is before Synod."

Against the decision adopting the above resolution Messrs. Martin and S. Hindman protested for reasons to be given in.

On motion, Resolved, That the Presbytery of Albany have leave to withdraw the papers in this case. Against this decision Messrs. Miller, Martin and S. Hindman, entered their protest.

The committee appointed to confer with Mr. Beveridge relative to his acceptance of the professorship reported that he agrees to accept the appointment.

The report of the Treasurer of the Bible Society was read, and, on motion, laid on the table.

Report of the Treasurer of the Bible Society.

<i>T. Beveridge to the Bible Society of the Associate Church.</i>		<i>Dr.</i>	<i>Oct. 1834, Bibles to Albany,</i>	<i>Contra,</i>	<i>Cr.</i>
Oct. 1834, cong. of Salem,		\$30 00	do. to Salem,		\$15 40
Nov. 24, J. L. Porter, Lewistown,		10 80	Nov. 24, J. L. Porter, Lewistown,		30 00
July 23, 1835, Wm. Graham, Holmesburgh,		1 00	Jan. 32, 1835, to Baltimore,		10 80
Oct. 8, cong. of Derby, by Mr. Patterson,		2 00	May 12, Bibles for Canada,		19 65
8, cong. of Derby, by Rev. J. Wallace,		3 00	do. for Western mission,		50 00
8, cong. of Cherokee, do do,		3 00			50 00
11, cong. of Caesar's Crk. by Rev. A. Heron		7 50			\$175 85
11, West Hebron, by Rev. A. Anderson,		47 50	Balance in the Treasurer's hands,		127 48
14, cong. of Salem,		10 00			
Balance by last report,		191 63			\$303 43
		\$303 43			

T. BEVERIDGE, *Treasurer.*

Resumed the business left unfinished in the forenoon.

The following preamble and resolution were offered for discussion, viz :

"Whereas the answers to reasons of protest against the act declaring our union with the original Seceders in Scotland, are not adopted by the Synod, it is moved to appoint another committee to answer said reasons."

The consideration of this resolution and of the business with which it is connected, was, on motion, postponed till to-morrow morning.

Entered on the consideration of an appeal by the Rev. Joseph Banks, laid on Synod's table last year, against a decision of the Presbytery of Ohio, inserting a certain addition in their minutes at a subsequent meeting to that at which the minutes had been approved, which addition the appellant considered as affecting a cause in which he had been concerned before Presbytery. The reasons of protest and their answers were read, and the parties heard and removed, and the Synod adjourned till 9 o'clock to-morrow morning.—Closed with prayer.

Wednesday, Oct. 14.

The Synod met and was opened with prayer—members present as above, together with Mr. John France, minister, from the Presbytery of Alleghany.

The minutes of last sitting being read, Mr. Hanna claimed the privilege of joining Mr. Martin and others in their protest taken last evening against the Synod's decision, in giving the Presbytery of Albany leave to withdraw the papers in the case of protest and appeal.

Proceeded with the business left unfinished last evening, viz: the appeal of Mr. Banks. The remarks of members of Synod were taken at some length, and the question was put, sustain the appeal or not, and carried sustain.

The draught of an act for a fast was read, and after some correction adopted.

An Act for Fasting.

So long as the church is in her wilderness state, encompassed with enemies, and sanctified but in part, it will not be difficult to find substantial reasons for fasting and humiliation.

It is evident from the word of God, that there is an observation and intelligence of the events of the times, which is closely connected with the knowledge and perform-

sance of our duty, and that this understanding of the times is especially needful to those who are placed as watchmen on Zion's walls.

"The children of Issachar, it is said, were men that had understanding of the times, to know what Israel ought to do." Such an understanding of the signs and events of the times is necessary to determine the special duties to which God calls us in our several places. It is recommended in scripture and the want of it severely reprov'd. Thus Isaiah says "In that day did the Lord God of Hosts call to weeping and mourning and to baldness, and to girding with sackcloth. But behold joy and gladness, slaying oxen, and killing sheep." In similar language does our Lord reprove the unbelieving Jews. "Ye hypocrites, ye can discern the face of the sky, but can ye not discern the signs of the times?"

From the present aspect of Divine Providence, it is evident the Lord hath a controversy with the inhabitants of this land, the reason of this controversy it becomes us carefully to search out. A spirit of insubordination to good and wholesome laws prevails to an alarming extent, in these United States. This spirit manifests itself in trampling on all law, and setting the civil authorities at defiance, and tends to the wildest anarchy and confusion. May we not justly deprecate the prevalence of such an evil, as foreboding the complete subversion of our civil institutions.

The growth of both practical and avowed atheism, and the increase of infidelity is doubtless one leading cause of God's controversy. We enjoy all the advantages of Divine revelation—have the means of knowing God and his will, which in infinite sovereignty are decreed to many nations, yet many are saying "Who is the Lord that we should obey him? We know not the Lord, neither will we obey his voice."

Gross ignorance of the scriptures, and wilful neglect of the means of information, whilst contributing to the growth of infidelity, are signs of God's wrath. Though great and laudable exertions are used for disseminating the oracles of truth, yet it may be said of many, as God says of the Jews, "My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge."

As another cause of God's controversy with us, may be mentioned the gross profanity which abounds, both with respect to the name of God and his holy Sabbath. The evidences of this are too plain and palpable to be denied. Because of swearing, the land mourneth. This includes not only the common profanation of God's name in conversation, but all irreverent uses of that great and fearful name, in lawful oaths, as also all profanations of it by unlawful and extra-judicial oaths, such as are practised by the society of Free-masons; and it is matter of lamentation that so much countenance is given by many of the Reformed churches to this latter abomination, by retaining in their fellowship, those who are involved in its guilt, and have given no proper evidence of repentance.

The profanation of the Sabbath, an iniquity, in some instances decreed by law, and the general disregard of the sanctity of that day, calls loudly for deep humiliation and mourning. In connexion with this it may be observed, that covetousness, fraud and lying, are so connected with the commercial dealings of men, and so interwoven with their daily pursuits as to demand our serious notice.

One particular, which embraces a train of attendant evils deserves a prominent place among our reasons of fasting, we mean the execrable crime of slavery. God in his providence, seems to be opening the way for the diffusion of light on this iniquitous traffic, and to be calling the attention of the inhabitants of this land to a contemplation of its abominations. Yet, notwithstanding the obvious immorality of slavery, it still exists, and that too, in the church of Christ. An evil which disgraces our national character, ought surely to be repudiated by the church. In vain do we fast and pray, unless we "loose the bands of wickedness, undo the heavy burdens, and let the oppressed go free," for whilst a sin so glaring is persisted in, our repentance can only resemble that of Pharaoh, who cried out, "I have sinned," but would not consent to liberate the oppressed Israelites. Were it not that men's worldly interest is involved in this traffic, and prompts them to desire its continuance, we cannot but think all would, with one voice, condemn it as grossly repugnant to the law of God and the rights of men.

The rapid increase of Popery, and the favor with which many Popish superstitions are regarded by some Protestant churches forms another reason for fasting and humiliation. From the acknowledged character of Popery, and its avowed principles, it is evident that its prevalence to any great extent, must prove the subversion of our civil and religious liberty. It is therefore, a matter of humiliation that so many Protestants instead of testifying against this mystery of iniquity, in all its forms, are gradually falling in with many of its superstitions, and countenancing their observance. The increase of error in doctrine, together with a latitudinarian spirit in practice and the consequent evil of laxness in church discipline in many of the Reformed churches, are alarming evidences of the backsliding state of Zion. "How is the gold become dim and the most fine gold changed!" The glory of the Reformation is obscured; the vain speculations of a blinded understanding and perverse heart, are in many instances substituted for the simplicity of gospel truth, and the extravagant inventions of men, for the pure ordinances of Christ. A corrupt system of doctrine, which flatters the pride

of the human heart, and detracts from the glory and riches of free grace, finds many advocates; and a cold indifference to many precious truths of God's word, under the deceitful garb of a spurious charity, prevails to an extent which may well alarm those whose hearts tremble for the ark of God. The time has come "when men will not endure sound doctrine, but heap up to themselves teachers having itching ears."

When we turn our attention to our own particular branch of the church, we find much to lament and deplore. God has given us "a banner to be displayed because of the truth," and we are united under the common bond of a testimony for its defence. But alas, we have not been valiant for the truth, in proportion to its worth; ignorance of the distinguishing principles of God's word and our witnessing profession prevails; ministers are not sufficiently diligent in teaching them to the rising generation, and parents too often omit, or superficially perform this necessary branch of duty. The scriptural zeal in behalf of God's cause, which distinguished our fathers in the purer ages of the church, has degenerated with us, into lukewarmness or a cold formality; and though we adhere to the external forms of duty, yet it is to be feared that much of the life and power of Godliness is gone. A time-serving worldly spirit is evident both in ministers and people; mutual jealousies, personal contentions, "emulations, wrath, strife, envying," and such like evils, seem to have supplanted the fruits of the Spirit, such as love, joy, peace, long suffering, gentleness, meekness.

Though we have the means of grace in great abundance, yet we may justly adopt the lamentation of the prophet, "my leanness, my leanness, woe unto me." We have reason to fear that, in many instances the duties of secret and family devotion, are either totally neglected, or irregularly performed.

For these and such like aggravated evils, it becomes us to weep, and cry to God to visit deserved strokes of judgment. May he not justly say of us "you only have I known of all the families of the earth, therefore I will punish you for your iniquities." Let us humble ourselves because of our abominations, and with weeping and with fasting, and with supplication, return unto the Lord our God. Let us search into the causes of God's wrath, that by seasonable repentance, they may be removed. Let us pray for the special out-pouring of the Holy Spirit on the church at large, and this witnessing branch of it, in particular. Let us seek the fulfilment of the precious promises of his word, which respect the purity, prosperity and glory of the church, "when the envy of Ephraim shall depart and the adversaries of Judah shall be cut off, when Ephraim shall not envy Judah and Judah shall not vex Ephraim," "and when there shall be nothing to hurt or destroy in all God's holy mountain." Then "shall her peace be as a river and her righteousness as the waves of the sea."

The 2nd Thursday of January, 1836, was appointed as the day of fasting.

Messrs. Isaac and Walker were appointed a committee to prepare the draught of an act for a fast, to be laid before the Synod at its next meeting.

On motion, resolved, that a committee be appointed to explain the nature of the duty of fasting, and the scriptural manner of its observance. Dr. Ramsay and Mr. Beveridge were appointed said committee.

On motion, resolved that the Presbytery of Philadelphia, be authorized to present to Mr. Wm. Galbraith, the call from Lewistown, before the expiration of his probationary year, it being understood that Mr. Galbraith shall fulfil Synodical appointments till the end of his probationary year.

On motion, resolved, that whatever calls are already reported, or may be in train for Mr. John S. Easton, be transmitted to the Presbytery of Albany, with orders to present them.

Resumed the business left unfinished last evening, viz: the resolution for appointing a committee to answer the reasons of protest in the case of the Associate Synod of Original Seceders. The resolution, after a brief consideration, was adopted and Messrs. Adams, Templeton, and Wallace, were appointed a committee to answer said reasons.

Various resolutions were then offered in order to issue the whole business respecting the Synod's act. Wherefore, it was on motion, resolved that a committee be appointed to whom shall be referred all these resolutions with instructions to mature and report this afternoon—Messrs. Martin, Hanna, Beveridge and Dr. Bruce, were appointed said committee.—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.

The committee to which had been referred the memorial of Mr. Kirkland, presented a report which was read and on motion laid on the table.

The committee of supplies presented a scale which being read, was on motion laid on the table.

A majority of the committee appointed in the forenoon on the subject of our connection with the Associate Synod of Original Seceders reported a resolution which after a full discussion and slight amendment was adopted and is as follows:

"Resolved, that while this Synod do not see ground to rescind the act passed at Philadelphia, in 1832, in relation to the Original Seceders in Scotland, yet we consider it proper to declare that in said act it was not intended formally to approve of their Testimony respecting the magistrate's power *circa sacra*, and national covenanting; and while we still agree on the ground of this act, to continue in communion with them, yet for the above reason, and also as it is necessary that we should have a distinct Testimony adapted to our peculiar circumstances, and that all who stand in the same relation to these circumstances should unite in that Testimony, we judge that this act sufficiently warrants us to require that all ministers and members emigrating from that Synod into our bounds, should declare their adherence to our Testimony in order to church fellowship with us."

On the adoption of the above resolution Dr. Bruce and Messrs. McLane, Blair, Clokey, and Wm. Wilson, declared that they withdrew their protests.

On motion, the resolutions relating to Sub-Synod's, lying on the table, were made the order of the day for to-morrow forenoon.

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

Thursday, Oct. 15.

Synod met, and was opened with prayer. Members present as above, except Mr. Donaldson, absent without leave.

The minutes of last sitting being read, Messrs. Donan, A. Wilson, and France, craved it to be marked that they withdrew their protests and its reasons, for the sake of peace.

On motion, the committee appointed yesterday, to answer said reasons of protest, were dismissed.

On motion, the report of the committee of supplies was re-committed.

Mr. J. Hindman craved the privilege of recording his dissent from the Synod's decision of last evening, in reference to our connection with the Associate Synod of Original Seceders.

The committee on the funds presented a report which was on motion, adopted.

Report of the Committee on the Funds.

The committee on the funds beg leave respectfully to report that they have examined the documents submitted to them, and find in the hands of Mr. D. Houston, treasurer, a balance of \$1765,63½; in the hands of Mr. Murphy, treasurer, at Philadelphia, including Synod and Missionary funds, the sum of \$37,19; in Students fund \$264.

From the document, accompanying Mr. Houston's report, it appears that the tract of land in Erie county, Pa. containing 300 acres, bequeathed to this Synod, by the late George Sanderson, deceased, is supposed to be worth twenty-one hundred dollars—with respect to other things, connected with the funds of Synod, your committee would recommend the adoption of the following resolutions.

1. That all the papers connected with the legacy of Mrs. Whitesides, of North Carolina, be committed to the Board of Trustees, and that they be directed to take measures for securing the payment of said legacy to Synod's treasurer.

2. That the claim of Rev. John Wallace for missionary services, on the western

mission, amounting to \$18,25 cents, be allowed, and that the treasurer be directed to pay said claim.

3. That the sum of one hundred dollars, being the rent agreed upon between the Trustees and Mrs. Jane Carson, for the use of the Seminary buildings, (as per article of agreement,) be remitted to Mrs. Carson, in consideration of the claims of the late Rev. David Carson, deceased, on Synod.

4. That the Trustees of the Theological Seminary, be authorized to make such an alteration in their agreement with Mrs. Jane Carson, as would allow a deduction of what would be a fair room rent in an unfinished state, for such rooms, in the Seminary as may be occupied by Theological Students, from the rent agreed to be paid by the said Mrs. Carson, and that the amount of this deduction be made up to her in money. Further, that it shall be the duty of the Trustees, to see that rooms thus allowed to students be properly taken care of.

5. That the paper relative to a legacy of Peter Fenton, late of New York, deceased, be handed over to the Trustees.

Respectfully submitted.

THOMAS HANNA.
J. P. MILLER.
JOSEPH HAMILL.

The committee of Bills and Overtures presented a report on the report of the Presbytery of Alleghany, which was, on motion, laid on the table.

Proceeded to the order of the day, viz: the consideration of the resolutions lying on the Synod's table, in relation Sub-Synods, and, on motion,

Resolved, That said resolutions be transmitted to the several Presbyteries belonging to this Synod, with orders to report thereon at next meeting.

Resolved further, That the several Presbyteries be required to report their views on the propriety of the Synod's meeting by delegation with out a division into Sub-Synods.

Mr. M'Kitrick asked and obtained leave of absence.

Entered on the consideration of the report of the select committee on the memorial of of Mr. Kirkland. A motion to adopt the report being under consideration, the following substitute was offered and adopted, viz:

Resolved, That the case of Mr. Kirkland be re-committed to the Presbytery of Alleghany, with instructions to deal with him in order to his restoration according to their views of truth and duty, from the evidence that may be before them.

The select committee on the report of the Presbytery of the Carolinas presented a report, which was, on motion, laid on the table.

The committee on slavery presented a report. While a motion to adopt said report was under discussion, Dr. Bruce and Messrs. Wm. Wilson and M'Gill, obtained leave of absence, and 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. Mr. France petitioned Synod to be disconnected, together with his congregation; from the Presbytery of Alleghany, and annexed to the Presbytery of Shenango. The petition, after some discussion, was granted.

The report of the Committee of Supplies was taken up, and being amended, was adopted.

Scale of Appointments.

Rev. Robert Lang and Rev. Peter Bullions, in Presbytery of Albany, till next meeting.

Rev. A. Whyte, sen. Cambridge till next meeting.

Rev. John Donaldson, Muskingum, November, December; Shenango, January, February; Stamford, March, April.

Rev. James Lyle, Miami till next meeting.

Thomas Ferrier, Chartiers, October; Mr. Hindman's cong. November, December; Alleghany, January; Muskingum, February; Miami, March, April, May.

S. M'Lean, Philadelphia, October, November; Monroe, Va. December, January, February; Miami, March, April, May.

John Wallace, Alleghany, October; Ohio, November, December; Muskingum, January, February; Alleghany, March; Chartiers, April, May.

John S. Easton, Albany, October, November, December; Stamford, January, February; Muskingum, March, April, May.

James Patterson, Philadelphia, October; Monroe, Va. November; Carolinas, December, January, February; Philadelphia, March, April, May.

H. Blair, Philadelphia, October, November, December, January; Albany, February, March; Philadelphia, April; Alleghany, May.

D. Thompson, Alleghany, October, November; Ohio, December; Mr. Hindman's cong. January, February; Muskingum, March; Ohio, April, May.

Wm. Galbraith, Cambridge, October, November; Philadelphia, December, January, February; Albany, March, April; Cambridge, May.

James Dixon, Albany, October, November, December, January; Philadelphia, February, March; Albany, April, May.

G. M. Hall, Cambridge, October; Stamford, November; Muskingum, December, January; Miami, February, March, April, May.

D. Strang, Ohio, October; Stamford, November, December, January, February; Cambridge, March, April, May.

The Rev. S. Hindman was, on motion, appointed to itinerate as a missionary for four months, in the Territory of Michigan, and the north-west part of Ohio, and the Synod made the following appointments to supply his pulpit, viz: Mr. Ferrier, Nov. and Dec., and Mr. D. Thomson, Jan. and Feb.

The Committee on Missions reported, and their report was, on motion, laid on the table till next meeting, and ordered to be published in the minutes.

Report of the Committee of Missions.

The committee of Missions beg leave to report as follows.—

It cannot, indeed, be denied that the circumstances of this church are different, in some respects, from those of other churches around us. We have a less number of ministers in proportion to the number of vacant congregations dependent upon Synod for the supply of Gospel ordinances. While others are able to occupy every spot of ground where they have a call from members of their own communion, and at the same time have many in the ministry who are destitute of fixed charges and unable to obtain them; we appear unable in many instances to supply the demands of destitute congregations, without appropriating to this purpose part of the labors of our fixed pastors.

Yet it must, on the other hand, be conceded that the number of our efficient men in the ministry in proportion to the whole, may well compare with that to be found, perhaps, in most other denominations. It is likewise obvious, that with us the number of ministers has increased, and this increase nearly kept pace with the increase of demand for their labors. It may be well, moreover, to consider the import of that scripture, "There is that scattereth, and yet increaseth; and there is that withholdeth more than is meet, and it tendeth to poverty." We are not always to delay the attempt to perform a commanded duty until we find ourselves in the best circumstances, and possessed of all the necessary means to perform it. "Who will roll away for us the stone from the sepulchre?—And when they came, they found the stone rolled away; for it was very great." The recent establishment and organization of our Theological Seminary, is calculated to inspire us, in reliance on the divine blessing, with the hope of increasing facilities, in respect to ministerial force, for conducting with success an enterprise of the kind now contemplated. And the present encouraging, although not flattering, state of your funds, together with the evident ability of our people to augment them, for reasonable and pious purposes, if proper inducements be offered them, by a call from Synod for new means, in order to secure a new and important end, should not be underrated or overlooked, in forming an estimate of our resources for meeting the demand of missionary expenses.

We do, therefore, humbly conceive that it is the duty of Synod at this time, when a wider and fairer field for evangelical exertion presents itself, than has been heretofore offered, to institute with a prospective view to future action, a train of operation expressive of the sincerity and faith of our hearts, in our daily prayer, "Thy kingdom come." Let our plan of operation be devised, and preparative measures taken as early as may be, and yet a considerable time, it is evident, must elapse before we can carry such plan into effect.

We beg leave, therefore, to offer the following resolutions:—

1. Resolved, That a special and distinct fund be instituted by this Synod, to be termed the Missionary fund, and to be, like other funds belonging to Synod, managed by Synod's Treasurer, subject always to the order of Synod, or to a committee of missions, appointed by them; and that all monies contributed to this fund by collection, subscription, donation, or bequest, and also all monies accruing to said fund from the sale, rent, or proceeds of lands, tenements, stocks, or other property donated, conveyed, quit-claimed and released, demised, willed, or bequeathed, shall be appropriated and applied by this Synod, to the purpose of outfitting, sending forth, and supporting of missionary laborers, among some of the heathen nations or tribes, and to no other purpose, according to the true intention of the donors.

2. Resolved, That this Synod shall appoint annually a committee of missions, to consist of ——— ministers, and as many ruling elders, whose duty it shall be to transact all business relating to the missionary interest, not otherwise disposed of, or provided for by Synod, and to report to Synod at each of its meetings.

3. Resolved, That it shall be the duty of this committee, so soon as practicable, after being appointed, to make enquiry for, and to report to Synod, such ministers, probationers, and students ready for licensure, as may be considered by them competent to discharge the work of a missionary, and are found willing to embark in the same, in order that such persons may be by Synod appointed, and sent forth, being, if necessary, first ordained by some Presbytery, according to Synod's direction.

4. Resolved, That the first missionary effort shall be directed to some part of ———, according as the committee of missions shall direct; and that two or more ministers of the word, aided by one or more suitable teachers, shall be sent thither as soon as practicable; and that it shall be the duty of the persons thus sent, to report to the committee of missions, their progress and success, as often as they may have convenient opportunity.

5. Resolved, That ——— copies of the above preamble and resolutions, accompanied with an appropriate address to our people on the subject of missions, be published for gratuitous distribution, and that the pastors of congregations be required to read the same to their respective congregations, and to endeavor to raise subscriptions or collections for the missionary fund.

Reasons of protest by Messrs. S. Hindman, Martin, Miller and Hanna, in which Messrs. Beveridge and J. Scroggs concurred, against Synod's decision of yesterday, giving leave to the Presbytery of Albany to withdraw their paper in the case of the appeal by Messrs. Bullions and Stark, were read, and Messrs. Adams and Blair were appointed a committee to answer said reasons.

The committee appointed to review the records of the Presbytery of Ohio, presented a report, which being read, was, on motion, accepted and laid on the table.

Resumed the business left unfinished in the former sitting, viz: the report of the committee on slavery. After a free discussion, the consideration of the first resolution in the report, was, on motion, deferred till next meeting of Synod. Against this decision Messrs. Walker and Martin entered their protest for reasons to be given in. Messrs. Templeton and Wallace were appointed a committee to answer said reasons.

The 2d and 3d resolutions in the report were adopted.

Report of the Committee on Slavery.

An act having been passed by the Associate Synod, in 1831, prohibiting the holding of slaves by members of our communion, and it appearing from the report of the Presbytery of the Carolinas, that something of this evil still continues to exist in the congregations under their care, it is recommended by the committee that the following resolutions be adopted.

1. Resolved, That it was not the intention of Synod by the provisions appended to said act, to set aside, in any measure, the obligation of the act itself, but only to suggest to our brethren of the slave holding states, certain ways by which its purpose might be carried into effect; and as it appears that these provisions have not been so understood, they are hereby rescinded.

2. Resolved, That the Presbytery of the Carolinas be required to report to the next meeting of Synod, whether any, and if any, what measures have been adopted by them to carry into force the aforesaid act.

3. Resolved, That the Synod sincerely sympathise with their brethren in slave hold-

ing states, and will continue to favor them with supply so far as is found practicable and consistent with the safety of their missionaries.

JAMES MARTIN,
T. BEVERIDGE,
J. P. MILLER.

On motion, Resolved, That a committee be appointed to address our brethren in the south on the subject of slavery, and also to enquire what can be done to aid such as are endeavoring to free themselves from this evil, and report to next meeting of Synod. Messrs. Miller, Martin and Anderson were appointed said committee.

On motion, Mr. Wm. S. Young, of Philadelphia, was appointed agent for the sale of Testimonies, in the room of Mr. Beveridge, resigned, and Mr. D. M. Hogan, of Pittsburgh, in the room of Adam Sheriff.

On motion, Resolved, That a committee be appointed to answer the letter from the Synod of Original Seceders. Messrs. Martin and Miller were appointed.

On motion, Resolved, That the Moderator be directed to affix his signature to the Instrument transmitted from Scotland, as a discharge to the Executors of the Estate of the late Mrs. Elizabeth Marshall, for the legacy bequeathed to this Synod by the said Testatrix.

Adjourned till half-past 6 this evening.—Closed with prayer.

Half-past 6 P. M.

The Synod met and was opened with prayer. Members present as above. Read the minutes of last sitting.

The appeal of the Rev. D. Gordon, referred to in the report of the Presbytery of Cambridge, was, on motion, taken up.

Reasons of protest with the answers were read. Said protest was laid against a decision of the Presbytery of Cambridge adopting the report of a committee of the whole, which report Mr. Gordon alleged terminated without inflicting any censure in a case in which the Rev. D. Stalker was defendant.

The question was taken "Sustain or not," carried unanimously, "not sustain."

On motion, proceeded to the election for Board of a Trustees for the Theological Seminary for the ensuing year. The following were elected, viz: Rev. A. Donnan, Matthew M'Nary, esq. Rev. Thomas Beveridge, William Bell, D. French, Rev. Dr. Ramsay, D. S. Murdock, Rev. Alex. Murray, David Scott, esq. Daniel Houston, Dr. D. S. Stevenson, and Robert Henderson.

On motion, proceeded to the election of the Board of Managers for the ensuing year; and the following were elected, viz: Messrs. Donnan, Alexander Wilson, French, Walker, Blair, Hanna and Clokey.

On motion, Resolved, That the Board of Managers, together with the Professors, be directed to appoint a Librarian, and draught a system of rules for the regulation of the Library.

On motion, resolved, that an annual sum, not exceeding \$100 be appropriated to the increase and improvement of the library, under the direction of the Professors and the Board of Managers.

The report of the Committee of Bills and Overtures on that part of the report of the Presbytery of Miami which regards the Students of Theology, was called up.

A motion to adopt the report, after some discussion was withdrawn, and the report was, on motion, laid on the table.

The following resolution was offered, and after some discussion adopted, viz:

Resolved, that it is the standing rule of this Synod that Students of The-

ology be required to attend the lectures at the Theological Seminary four regular sessions.

Whereas, it frequently happens that the usual enquiries respecting the observance of appointments and decisions of Synod, are never made of absent members,

Resolved, that it is the duty of Presbyteries to see that the appointments and decisions of Synod be duly observed in their bounds respectively, and that the reports of Presbyteries supercede the usual enquiries of Synod.

At the request of the members of the Presbytery of Alleghany, Messrs. Murray, Imbrie, and McElwee, were appointed to meet with said Presbytery to aid them in the case of Mr. Kirkland.

Reasons of protest against the deed of Synod in reference to publication of marriage, with the answers, were called up, and on motion ordered to lie on the table till next meeting.

On motion, resolved, that the Minutes be published in the Religious Monitor. Three hundred extra copies ordered, and the expense to be defrayed from the Synod's funds.

On motion, the Synod went into Committee of the whole, on the subject of the Bible Society, the moderator in the Chair.

When the Committee rose, the following resolutions were reported, and on motion, adopted, viz :

Resolved that S. Young be appointed Treasurer in the room of Mr. Beveridge, resigned.

Resolved, that the following gentlemen be appointed as the Executive Committee for the ensuing year, viz :

Messrs. Daniel Murphy, Joseph R. Dickson, Robert Laird, Wm. Morris, and James Geery.

The minutes of the present sitting were read and approved, and after prayer, and singing the 122d Psalm, and the Apostolical Benediction, pronounced by the Moderator, the Synod adjourned, to meet at Philadelphia, on the 4th Wednesday of May, 1836, at 4 o'clock P. M. Sermon at 7.

ANDREW HERON, Clerk.

STATISTICAL TABLE OF THE PRESBYTERY OF MIAMI.

Ministers.	Congregations.	Nearest P. O.	Counties.	States.	Fam.	Com.
James Adams,.....	Massies Creek,.....	Xenia,.....	Green.....	Ohio.	97	210
Nath. Ingles,.....	{ Burnets Creek,.....	Burnettsville.....	Carrol.....	Ind.	30	58
	{ Pleasant Run,.....	do.....	do.....	do	29	60
James Templeton, ..	Sugar Creek,.....	Centreville.....	Montgomery..	Ohio.	50	120
Samuel Wilson,.....	{ Xenia,.....	Xenia.....	Green.....	do	72	170
	{ Bellefontaine,.....	Cherokee.....	Logan.....	do	25	60
James Wallace,.....	{ Darby,.....	do.....	Union.....	do	23	60
A. Heron,.....	Caesar creek,.....	Jamestown.....	Green.....	do	40	108
James C. Bruce, ..	{ Henderson,.....	Monmouth.....	Warren,.....	Illin's	58	160
	{ Carmel,.....	Smockville.....	Jefferson.....	Ind.		
James M. Henderson,	{ Clarke,.....	do.....	Clarke,.....	do		
	{ Pistol Creek,.....	Maryville.....	Blount.....	Ten.		
Thos. S. Kendall....	{ Big Spring,.....	do.....	do.....	do	70	158
	{ Fork Creek,.....	do.....	Monroe.....	do		
Vacancies,.....	Racon,.....	Russelville.....	Park.....	India.		
	Bloomington,.....	do.....	do.....	do		
	Otter Creek,.....	do.....	do.....	do		
	Big Creek,.....	do.....	do.....	do		
	Madison.....	Madison.....	Jefferson,.....	do		
	Princeton.....	Princeton.....	Gibson,.....	do		
	Salt River,.....	do.....	do.....	Ky.		
	Salem,.....	do.....	do.....	Tenn.		
	Limestone,.....	do.....	do.....	do		
	Rocky Spring,.....	Abingdon.....	Washington.....	Va.		
	Apple Creek,.....	do.....	do.....	Illin's		
	Sugar Creek,.....	do.....	do.....	do		
	Unity.....	do.....	do.....	do		
	Buffalo,.....	do.....	do.....	Mo.		
	Mount Prairie,.....	do.....	do.....	do		
Sharon,.....	do.....	do.....	do			
Auxvasse,.....	do.....	do.....	do			

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.....	{ Salt Creek.....	Fredericksburgh	Wayne.....	do		
	{ Millersburgh.....			do		
Thomas Hanna.....	{ Cadiz.....	Cadiz.....	Harrison.....	do	76	155
	{ Piney Fork.....			do	46	100
Daniel McLane.....	{ Bloomfield.....	Cambridge.....	Muskingam.....	do	103	221
	{ Cambridge.....			do	19	41
Joseph Clokey.....	{ Mount Pleasant.....	Mt. Pleasant.....	Belmont.....	do	33	60
	{ McMahan's Creek.....			do	52	60
Andrew Isaac.....	{ Belmont.....	Londonderry.....	Guernsey.....	do	45	77
	{ Londonderry.....			do	66	160
Samuel Hindman.....	{ Sharon.....	Mansfield.....	Harrison.....	do	17	38
	{ Mansfield.....			do	25	57
David Lindsay.....	{ Clear Creek.....	Reynoldsburgh.....	Franklin.....	do	18	41
	{ Washington.....			do	44	93
Thomas Wilson.....	{ Truro.....	Perry.....	Wayne.....	do	28	60
	{ Jonathan's Creek.....			do	17	17
Vacancies.....	{ Goshen.....	Carroll.....	Tuscarawas.....	do	8	16
	{ Carmel.....			do		
Thomas Wilson.....	{ Sandy.....	Carrollton.....	Carroll.....	do		
	{ North Union.....			do		
Vacancies.....	{ Wooster.....	Wooster.....	Wayne.....	do		
	{ Newman's Creek.....			do		
Vacancies.....	{ Mohican.....	do.....	do.....	do		
	{ Killbuck.....			do		
Vacancies.....	{ Paris.....	Richland.....	do.....	do		
	{ Bucyrus.....			do		
Vacancies.....	{ Clear creek.....	Crawford.....	Guernsey.....	do		
	{ Claysville.....			do		
Vacancies.....	{ Jacksonville.....	Wayne.....	do.....	do		

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.	100	275
James Irvine.....	New York 2d.....	New York.....	New York.....	do	70	180
James Martin.....	Albany.....	Albany.....	Albany.....	do	70	153
Peter Campbell.....	Florida.....	Schenectady.....	Schenectady.....	do	42	140
John G. Smart.....	Johnstown.....	Johnstown.....	Montgomery.....	do	19	40
John Graham.....	Bovina.....	Bovina.....	Delaware.....	do	62	168
Vacancies.....	{ Troy.....	Troy.....	Rensselaer.....	N. Y.		39
Vacancies.....	{ Newark.....	Newark.....	do.....	N. J.		
Without charge.						
Robert Laing.....						
P. Bullions.....						
Thomas Ferrier.....						

STATISTICAL TABLE OF THE PRESBYTERY OF STAMFORD.

Ministers.	Congregations.	Nearest P. O.	Counties.	States.	Fam.	Com.
John Russell.....	Stamford.....	Queenston.....	do.....	U. C.	35	70
James Strang.....	Dumfries.....	Galt.....	do.....	do		170
Vacancies.....	{ York.....	York.....	Livingston.....	N. Y.		46
Vacancies.....	{ Esquising.....	do.....	do.....	U. C.		
Vacancies.....	{ London.....	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 Dickie.....	Rich-Hill.....	Kittanning.....	Armstrong.....	do		
Joseph Scroggs.....	Fairfield.....	Ligonier.....	Westmoreland.....	do	100	150
David Blair.....	Indiana, &c.....	Indiana.....	Indiana.....	do		300
James M'Carrell.....	{ Cherry-Run.....	Glade Run.....	Indiana.....	do		350
	{ Upper Piney.....			do		
John Hindman.....	{ Mahoning.....	do.....	do.....	do		65
	{ Berachah.....			do		
Vacancies.....	{ Concord.....	do.....	do.....	do	25	60
	{ Lower Piney.....			do	8	30
Vacancies.....	{ Blairville.....	do.....	do.....	do	15	50
	{ Jefferson.....			do		
Vacancies.....	{ Bethel, &c.....	Freeport.....	Alleghany.....	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.	40	140
	{ Robison.....	do	Washington	do	42	150
Thomas Allison	{ Mt. Hope	W. Middletown	do	do	46	114
	{ Cross Creek	do	Brooke	Va.	26	61
James Ramsay	Chartiers	Cannonsburgh	Washington	Penn.	122	330
David French	{ N. & S. Buffaloe	Washington	do	do	110	240
Alex. Donnan	{ Mt. Pleasant	Hickory	do	do	105	220
	{ Burgetstown	do	do	do	85	190
Alex. Wilson	Peter's Creek	do	do	do		
Wm. M. McElwee,	{ Service & King's Creek	Frankfort.....	Beaver	do	116	264
	{ Noblestown	do	Alleghany	do	50	
J. Rodgers	{ Ohio	Economy,	do	do	70	
Bankhead Boyd,.....	Pigeon Creek	McCullough's	Washington	do		
T. Beveridge,	Washington	Washington	Washington	do		
Vacancy	Tumbleson's Run.....	do	do	do	31	63

STATISTICAL TABLE OF THE PRESBYTERY OF OHIO.

Ministers.	Congregations.	Nearest P. O.	Counties.	States.	Fam.	Com.
David Imbrie	{ Darlington	Darlington.....	Beaver	Penn.	60	140
	{ Bethel	do	do	do	70	150
Alex. Murray	{ Mountville	Portersville.....	Butler	do	70	140
	{ Slippery Rock	do	do	do	80	150
Elijah N. Scroggs.....	{ West Beaver	do	do	do		
	{ West Union	New Lisbon	Columbiana.....	Ohio.	75	150
Dav. Goodwillie.....	{ 4 Mile Square	do	do	do		
	{ Poland	Poland	Trumbull	do	67	139
Wm. Douthet.....	{ Liberty	do	do	do	79	115
	{ Milton	Warren	Trumbull.....	do		
Joseph Banks,.....	{ Palmyra,	do	Carrol,.....	do	8	
	{ Newton,	do	do	do	18	87
James P. Ramsay,.....	{ Northfield,	do	do	do		
	{ Stow	do	do	do		
Vacancies.....	{ Springfield	do	do	do		
	{ Deer Creek	New Bedford,	Mercer	Penn.	103	210
.....	{ Yellow Creek	do	do	do		
	{ Scroggsfield,	Scroggsfield,	Carroll,	Ohio.	70	160
.....	{ Glade Run,	do	do	do		

STATISTICAL TABLE OF THE PRESBYTERY OF THE CAROLINAS.

Ministers.	Congregations.	Nearest P. O.	Counties.	States.	Fam.	Com.
A. White, jr.....	{ Steel Creek	Charlotte	Mecklenburg.....	N. C.	27	60
	{ Bethany	do	do	do	28	68
Horatio Thompson,	{ Ebenezer	Lexington	Rockbridge... ..	Va.		
	{ Timber Ridge	do	do	do	62	
.....	{ Broad Creek	do	do	do		
	{ Nob Creek	Wilson's	Lincoln.....	N. C.		
.....	{ Pisgah	do	do	do		
	{ Bethany	Yorkville	York	S. C.		
.....	{ Sardis	do	Union	do		
	{ New Stirling	Staatsville	Iredel	N. C.		
.....	{ Cambridge	do	do	do		
	{ do	Morgantown	Burke	do		
Vacancies.....	{ Cochran's Vale	Old Fort	do	do		
	{ Piedmont.....	Franklin	Macon	do		
.....	{ New Lebanon	Union	Monroe	Va.		167
	{ Sharon	Yorkville	York	S. C.	23	102
.....	{ Tirzah	do	do	do	48	59
	{ Smyrna	Chester	Chester	S. C.		
.....	{ Little River	Youngs	Fairfield	do		
	{ Bethel	Winsborough	do	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	370
James P. Miller	Argyle	Lake P.O. N. Y	do	do	120	300
A. Gordon	Putnam	do	do	do	48	106
T. Goodwillie	Barnet	Barnet	Caledonia	Vt.	80	200
Wm. Pringle	Ryegate	do	do	do	46	89
D. Gordon	Salem	Salem	Washington	N. Y.	50	80
D. Stalker	North Argyle	Noth Argyle.....	do	do		110
A. Anderson	Hebron	West Hebron	do	do	72	157
<i>Without charge.</i>						
A. White, sen.						

STATISTICAL TABLE OF THE PRESBYTERY OF SHENANGO.

Ministers.	Congregations.	Nearest P. O.	Counties.	States.	Fam.	Com.
Daniel McLane,....	{ Venango,.....	Hart's x roads,...	Crawford,....	Penn.	200	500
	{ Salem,.....		do	do		
John France	{ Glade-Run,....	Bakerstown	Butler	do	60	200
	{ Mercer	Mercer,.....	Mercer,.....	do	26	83
Isaac Beggs,.....	{ Springfield,...		do	do	48	110
	{ Rocky Spring,...		do	do	56	126
	{ Coneaut,.....	Meadville,....	Crawford,....	do	25	50
Mathew Snodgrass,...	{ French Creek,...		do	do	32	30
	{ Cherry Rnn,....		Venango,....	do	20	80
	{ New Castle,....	New Castle,....	Mercer,.....	do	32	70
Alex. Boyd,.....	{ Neshannock,...		do	do	20	43
	{ Mount Prospect,...		do	do	25	45
William C. Pollock,...	{ Harmony	Harrisville,....	Butler,.....	do	80	120
	{ Unity,.....		do	do	56	100

STATISTICAL TABLE OF THE PRESBYTERY OF PHILADELPHIA.

Ministers.	Congregations.	Nearest P. O.	Counties.	States.	Fam.	Com.
F.W. McNaughton,...	{ Mercersburgh,	Mercersburgh,	Franklin,.....	Penn.	102
	{ McConnellsburgh,	do	do	do		
W. Easton,	{ Octorara,	Georgetown,	Lancaster,.....	do		
	{ Muddy Run,	do	do	do	50	150
	{ E. Nottingham,	N. Lond. x rds.	Chester,.....	do		
John Adams,.....	{ Guinston,		York,	do	42	113
	{ Lower Chanceford,		do	do	20	54
	{ Carlisle,	Carlisle,	Cumberland,	do		
A.T. McGill,.....	{ Wheatfield,		Perry,.....	do		
	{ Dickinson,					
Without charge,						
Tho. B. Clarkson, ...						
Vacancies,	{ Baltimore,	Baltimore,	Baltimore,	Md.		68
	{ Lewistown,	Lewistown,	Mifflin,	Penn.		
	{ Philadelphia,	Philadelphia,	Philadelphia,	do	86	173

SUMMARY OF THE PRECEDING TABLES.

PRESBYTERIES.	Ministers.	Congregations settled and vacant.	Families.	Communicants.
Cambridge	9	8	547	1481
Carolinav	2	20	193	436
Ohio	7	19	690	1431
Chartiers	10	15	843	1752
Miami	9	31	493	1164
Philadelphia	5	13	198	660
Alleghany	6	13	298	1325
Muskingum	9	30	665	1395
Albany	9	8	383	976
Shenango,	6	14	679	1557
Stamford,	2	5	85	285
Ministers itinerating	12			
Total.	86	176	5023	12412

There were two or three members of Synod present whose names are not given in the list of members in attendance; they must have been omitted in transcribing.

ART. II. Jubilee of the Reformation at Geneva.

We copy from the London Record the following speech, delivered by the Rev. John Hartley, of the church of England, in the assembly of deputies convened in Geneva on occasion of the Jubilee of the Reformation. Mr. Hartley, for the last three years, has officiated as chaplain to the English congregation in Geneva. "It was a noble spectacle," says the

Record, "to see the Rev. Mr. Hartley, an ordained clergyman of the church of England, stand up in the midst of such an assembly, and bear so clear, so unqualified, so bold, and so judicious a testimony to the fundamental truths of the gospel, which these unhappy men had forsaken and repudiated."—*N. Y. Observer.*

"Gentlemen—I am not a deputy from the Church of England, but I have no doubt but I shall express the sentiments of our church in general. I appeal to its future judgment for all that I shall advance. And if I occasion pain in any quarter, be assured I give much more pain to myself. If any one suffer, I suffer myself more acutely. But it is a crisis of the Protestant churches in which we ought to suffer. I should question if that man were a Christian who did not suffer at such a moment as this. What then is our faith in this nineteenth century? Gentlemen, we believe in England, 1st. That man is so corrupt and so fallen from divine favor, that he is condemned to everlasting death. 2d. We believe that Jesus Christ is God over all, blessed forever, in the most absolute sense of the term. 3d. We believe the personality and the divinity of the Holy Ghost. 4th. We believe in justification by faith; that man is justified by faith without any merit of works, by the merits of Jesus Christ. 5th. We believe, that if there be true faith, there will of necessity be good works; if there be no works there is no true faith. 6th. We believe in regeneration by the Holy Ghost, and that the true Christian is a man so renewed by the influence of the Holy Spirit; that it is his highest pleasure to live for the service of Jesus Christ in the world, that for him religion is not a disagreeable burden, but the charm and glory of his existence.

"Such is my faith! Such is my religion! This is the faith of the English! This is the religion of England!

"I must proceed. But, gentlemen, I intreat pardon for the boldness of my expressions. I am sincerely attached to Geneva. When I return from a journey, and find myself on this side of Jura, and catch a view of the Saleve and the Lake, "there," I exclaim, "is my country!" I respect you, also gentlemen. I have the honor to be acquainted with some amongst you, and I consider it a sign of honorable conduct on your part, that you allow me to express myself so freely. It is, in fact, well known how much the English are attached to Geneva. Judge then, of our sorrow, when we apprehend that Geneva is removing to a distance from us, on that subject, the most important in the world, religion! The majority of the pastors of Geneva have renounced these great truths which I have just rehearsed; we are now exceedingly distressed on this account. These doctrines are no longer taught in the University of Geneva; we are in consequence, deeply afflicted. The right hand of fellowship has been given during this jubilee to the Rationalists of Geneva, and to the Unitarians of England and America; we feel the most poignant sorrow at this event.

"To us, gentlemen, these truths appear of such high importance, that in renouncing them, the church seems to have plunged herself into an abyss deeper—or at least is plunging herself into an abyss deeper than that of the Church of Rome! The Church of Rome, 'tis true, has buried beneath a mass of abuses and errors, these great doctrines; still they exist in some form or other; but in taking away these truths, you take away the very foundation of Christianity, you leave us nothing but a doctrine of morals. It is no longer a religion of salvation; it is nothing but a system of ethics.

There is still a subject on which I must offer some remarks; I mean on Confessions of Faith. Gentlemen, I declare before you all, perish ten thousand times all the Confessions of Faith in the world, the instant they are made to occupy the place of the Bible. The question before us is not that of Confessions of Faith, but it is that of the faith itself. Differ-

ent opinions exist amongst the most orthodox persons on the method of making use of Confessions of Faith. It is a very inferior topic. But I protest in the face of Europe, it is the doctrines of the Bible, and nothing else, which are at stake! We believe that the Bible has a meaning, but of what use is the Bible if we dare not declare what it means?

"I concluded my speech by a prayer of this description:

"O my God! pour out thy Holy Spirit on this city of Geneva, on its pastors, and on all the Protestant churches in the world! May the Spirit enlighten our minds, renew our hearts, and advance the kingdom of Jesus Christ throughout the earth; that in this great day of religious revival, we may all arrive at the same faith, and at true charity, for the love of Jesus Christ our Lord! Amen."

Such was the substance of what I said; I cannot give the expression, as I spoke extempore. I felt it my duty to speak thus strongly on Confessions of Faith, as it has appeared evident to me that continual efforts have been made to darken the subject at issue. The orthodox are represented as contending for the old Roman Catholic principle of human authority in matters of faith, because they appreciate good confessions, whilst the others pretend to be standing up for the exclusive authority of the Bible. Hence it was of the utmost importance to show that the two subjects are perfectly distinct; and that momentous as may be the question, how we are to make use of creeds and formularies, even this inquiry can never enter into comparison with the most weighty of all considerations which can occupy the mind of a human being. What must I do to be saved?

With the most cordial wishes of God's blessing on your labors,

I remain, Sir, your's very sincerely,

JOHN HARTLEY.

Geneva, Sept. 1, 1835.

ART. III. *Luther's opinion of the Psalms.*

"Where do we find a sweeter voice of joy than in the Psalms of thanksgiving and praise? There you look all the saints in the heart, as in a beautiful garden, as into heaven itself; whose delicate, sweet, and lovely flowers are springing up there, of all manner of beautiful, joyous thought towards God and his goodness! And again, where do you find deeper, more mournful and weeping words of sorrow, than the plaintive Psalms contain? There again you look all the saints in the heart; but as into death, yea, as into hell, where it is all dark and gloomy, from all manner of melancholy apprehensions of God's displeasure? I hold that there never has appeared on earth, and never can appear, a more precious book of examples and legends of saints, than the Psalter is. For here we find not merely what one or two holy men have done, but what the head himself of all the saints has done, and what all the saints do still. How they feel towards God, towards friends and enemies; how they behave and sustain themselves in all dangers and sufferings. Besides, all manner of divine and statutory instructions and commands are contained therein. Hence, too, it comes, that the Psalter forms, as it were, *a little book of all saints*, in which every man, in whatever situation he may be placed, shall find Psalms and sentiments, which shall apply to his own case, and be the same to him as if they were for his own sake, so expressed, that he could not improve them himself, nor even wish them, better than they are.

THE

RELIGIOUS MONITOR,

AND

EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

DECEMBER, 1835.

ART. I. *The Enemies of the Cross.*

"Many walk, of whom I have told you often, and now tell you even weeping, that they are the enemies of the Cross of Christ; whose end is destruction, whose God is their belly, and whose glory is in their shame, who mind earthly things."—Philip iii. 18, 19.

"THE cross of Christ" is a common phrase, whereby the Spirit of inspiration expresses all that belongs, either in point of doctrine or in point of effect, to the extraordinary transaction of our Redeemer's death. To die was the immediate object of his incarnation, and the exhibition of his death, in its nature, design, and results, is the method by which the wisdom of Heaven accomplishes the salvation of innumerable multitudes of our race, and the triumphs of holiness throughout the earth at the same time. When we read, therefore, of the "preaching of the cross," of "preaching Christ crucified," of "suffering persecution for the cross of Christ," and of "glorying in the cross of Christ," the terms involve the whole of the Saviour's mediatorial work. And when men are pronounced "*enemies of the cross of Christ*," the meaning is, they are hostile to every purpose for which the Son of God came into our world, and suffered and died.

In this way, a charge is advanced of special emphasis and solemnity. The nature and aggravation of the guilt is not left to be inferred; it is made the subject of precise and striking affirmation. Nor is there ascribed to those who are thus accused a mere ordinary failure in complying with some of the precepts of religion, but a direct and daring enmity against every thing that conduces to the honour of Jehovah, in the eternal salvation of man. This is apparent from the most cursory glance at the statements of Scripture, concerning the practical effect which the propitiatory sufferings of the Messiah ought to produce on the human heart. Did he not die that we might "be buried with him, and that as he was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life?" Was he not "crucified, that our old man should be crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin?" Did he not die, "that they who live should not live unto themselves, but unto him, who died for them, and rose again?" Was it not a grand purpose of his rising again from the death which the cross inflicted, and of his ascending above all heavens, carrying there the memorials of his atonement, and enthroning himself in the majesty of the right hand of God, that men might follow him in the high aspiration of their affections and desires,—might "seek those things which are above, where he sitteth," and "look" and

live in "blessed hope of his glorious appearing?" Compare these statements, and they might be multiplied innumerable, with the conduct of men who, although they may affirm their belief of the plan of salvation, and may perhaps claim, with no little boldness, an interest in the merits of our Redeemer's death, yet exhibit in their passions and lives this direct contravention of its sanctifying influence, and indulge, without a check, every sensual propensity, every earthly desire—and say, are they not "the enemies of the cross of Christ?" Do they not refute the grand design for which alone it was exhibited? Do they not degrade it in the view of the world, and expose it to public reproach? Do they not disown and renounce all right to the redemption which it purchased? But let us consider a little more particularly the character of those persons to whom this description belongs. And we observe,

1. That *all who oppose or corrupt the humbling doctrines of the cross*, belong to this class, and are guilty of their crime. The persons whom the apostle, in the passage on which our remarks are founded, had in his eye, were not so much the openly profane and abandoned enemies of religion,—those who hated every thing like God and godliness,—as those who, under the mask of regard to Christianity, were the bitterest enemies of its humiliating doctrines, concerning the way of a sinner's acceptance with God, and the necessity of assimilation to the divine image. He elsewhere describes them as persons who, "being ignorant of the righteousness of God, went about to establish their own righteousness, not submitting themselves to the righteousness of God;" and in Philip iii. 2, "as dogs, and evil workers, and the concision,"—persons who "trusted in the flesh," and who could not endure the idea of being justified only through the righteousness of a crucified Saviour. These the apostle declares to be as decided enemies of the whole plan of salvation, and particularly of the holiness which characterizes it, as any profane person could possibly be. And such are *still* enemies of the cross. That astonishing method of saving the sinner was expressly designed to abase the pride and selfishness of his corrupt heart; it was intended to exhibit to him, in the most impressive manner, the infinite evil of sin, and to shew him the necessity of a righteousness infinitely more complete and perfect than human power could produce to satisfy the claims of the attributes and law of God against which he had sinned. In short, it was designed to teach him, that "without holiness"—holiness of heart and life,—holiness complete and spotless, "no man can see the Lord." And how impressively, how eloquently, does it hold forth these momentous but abasing truths! In the mediation and death of the Son of God there is a display of the glory of the divine majesty,—of the purity of his nature,—of the boundlessness of his love to man,—and of the sovereignty of his grace, which will for ever abase at his footstool even the holy spirits who never sinned, and will cause them to cover their faces and their feet with their wings, while they cry, "Holy, holy, holy is the Lord God Almighty." But the pride of the sinner rises at this exhibition; the corruption of his heart swells against it, and he goes about in search of another way of salvation, refusing to submit to the salvation of God! Sin, he maintains, is not that tremendous evil which the scriptures every where declare it to be; nor can the Mighty Being who rules the universe, be affected by it so much as to induce him to punish the creatures who commit it; or if, for the purpose of maintaining the moral order of the universe, it be necessary to punish some of the foulest transgressors, he will pass with impunity, if not with an affectionate indulgence, the venial infirmities, the unavoidable failings of those who have no evil intention, and who, by a death-bed repentance, the performance of some deeds of charity and mercy, and other amiable traits of character, deserve his favour, and have a claim upon his indulgent regard. No other righteousness is necessary for them

than this; and all that the Saviour has to do in their behalf, is to plead these things in their name, and claim their acceptance and reward. Is not this the language of multitudes who bear the Christian name,—of men who frequently handle the sacred symbols of the Saviour's death,—nay, of men who fill the place of the Saviour's ambassadors to the guilty, and pretend to preach the salvation which he died to accomplish? Nor is it their language only, it is the very sentiments of their inmost hearts; and by indulging them, they exhibit a deadlier enmity to the cross of the Redeemer, and give far less hope of future submission to its influence, than the most degraded sensualist or outrageous infidel that lives. "Verily," says Christ himself concerning such characters, "verily I say unto you, the publicans and harlots go into the kingdom of God before you."

2. Again, those are enemies of the cross of Christ *who cherish the lust of the flesh*. The phrase, "whose god is their belly," is a strong expression evidently intended to denote the gross and brutal indulgences to which many of the human race resort for pleasure. These indulgences were much practised in apostolic times; and what was most mournful, they prevailed among the professors of those times, and were freely followed under pretence of doing honour to the grace of God. Hence we find the Apostle Paul warning the believers at Rome against individuals, who taught the principles and followed the practices of licentious men among them. "Mark," said he, "them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned, and avoid them; for they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but *their own belly*, and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple." (Rom. xvi. 17, 18.)

Sensual indulgence is an evil to which our nature is universally and eminently prone. It is every man's natural disposition to pamper the appetites of his body, and to follow out the corrupt impulses of his animal passions, by the gratification of which the true dignity of the mind is prostrated. But it is a disposition, the prevalence and the power of which cannot be sufficiently mourned as a prominent result and characteristic of that depraved heart whence "proceed all the things that defile the man." "Out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, adulteries, fornications, murders, thefts, covetousness, wickedness, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, blasphemy, pride, foolishness." (Mark vii. 21.) "The works of the flesh are these, adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like." (Galat. v. 19—21.) Nor does the mere restraint upon our conduct which arises from civil institutions, from care of reputation, or from other conflicting and worldly motives, remove the evil: it may give another direction to its operations, or stimulate to greater care in indulging it; but it cannot eradicate the propensity. No, nothing but the faith of the Gospel can purify the sinner from this and every other exhibition of the innate corruption of his heart; and, blessed be God, to effect this purification is one of the principal objects which the Gospel is commissioned to accomplish. It is intended to exert such an influence on its subjects as shall effectually overcome the polluted propensities of their depraved nature, and turn them away from what so degrades their character and blasts their happiness, to what shall elevate, sanctify, and redeem them; leading them from what is gross and allies them to the brutes, to what is spiritual and unites them to their God. We say, it is the faith of the Gospel which effects this desirable change, not the mere profession of it. The persons referred to in the passage before us seem to have been professors, and some of them even teachers of Christianity, but under the cloak of their profession they still had "their conversation in the lusts of the flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and mind." They would submit to no re-

strictions, they would allow no ingredient to mingle with and qualify the draught of their greedy uncleanness. Notwithstanding all that they affected to teach, and all that they affected to believe, and in spite of the powerful motives which were furnished by a revelation which came from the bosom of the Eternal, it was still true of them, that "their belly was their god!"

There seems to have been in the apostolic times, as in subsequent periods, a systematic attempt to pervert the principles of the Gospel, and, by the most infamous of all sophistry, to shew that it was not intended to exercise that sanctifying influence of which we have spoken, but that men were permitted to "sin that grace might abound." Such were they whom Jude denounced, "ungodly men, turning the grace of God into lasciviousness;" and awful and abominable indeed is that heresy, which would thus attempt to poison the waters of purity at their very fountain, and educe the elements of hell from the immaculate gift heaven. To give the reins to the grovelling lusts of nature while professing a connexion with the redeeming principles of grace, and to make those principles of grace the mere pander to the desires of the flesh, is surely to form a monster in the moral creation, of which no abhorrence can be too strong, and no destiny too dreadful. And yet how often does this monster present itself before us among the professedly Christian population of our country! In every drunkard that staggers along our streets,—in every fornicator and in every adulterer who invades our domestic circles, and destroys for ever their purity and peace,—in every voluptuary or epicurist who makes the gratification of his fleshly appetites the great enjoyment of his life, we have a living exemplification of this creation of sin, of this monster of iniquity!

How striking and forcible is the phraseology which the Spirit of God employs to describe the abominable character, and to exhibit the horrible supremacy which lust thus obtains over such characters! "*Whose god is their belly.*" That is, those who regard the end of their existence as consisting in the gratification of their animal appetites, and who make banquetings, revellings, and such like, the chief home of their delights, are in truth *worshippers* of their own loathsome corruptions. Their god is their depravity. They have as much denied the God of heaven, and prostrated themselves at an idol shrine, as if they had acknowledged all the deifications of Greece and Rome, and chiselled out their images from the models of their Pantheon, that they might pour forth before them the incense of their impious adoration. And when we remember that these infatuated men are called Christians, and surrounded on every hand by the inspirations and the privileges of the Gospel, yet so drunken with sin as to make these very inspirations and privileges *their excuse* for their sin, is there not in such characters something too awful to dwell on,—in their future prospects a fate too horrifying to think of? O that we could arouse but one of these degraded and infatuated idolaters to meditate only for one hour on his character and destiny—that we could shew him but a thousandth part of the utter and inexpressible loathing with which he is regarded by him who "cannot look on sin!" Let us, at all events, beseech those who have received the counteracting influence of divine grace, to contemplate such wretched beings with an increasing hatred of all their abominations; and, remembering that they have the same evil heart within them, the same depraved propensities, the same polluted tendencies, let us entreat them to place a more powerful restraint than ever on their actions and desires, and to cultivate assiduously the solemn duties of self-denial, and crucifying the flesh. Let them look frequently into that world which is pure and unspotted as the Eternal Being who sits on its throne, and remember that their "life is hid with Christ in God."

3. In the third place, the *worldling* is "*an enemy of the cross of Christ.*" "Who mind earthly things." It may seem strange to some, that this disposition should be placed in connexion with the former, as of the same kind and degree of criminality; but a careful examination of the character will speedily satisfy us as to the propriety of the manner in which it is introduced. The terms used by the apostle express the fact, that those described by them are altogether absorbed by the concerns of the present world, without any reference to another, where they are to receive a retribution which shall endure for ever; or, at least, that they exclude from their minds such a serious view of another world as would exert a salutary influence on them in this. This neglect of futurity, this concentration of the anxieties and desires on the interests of time, arises from the same depravity as do the revellings of open lust, and it is necessary to give to earthliness all its force and freedom of operation. Worldliness, amounting as it does, according to the express declaration of the Spirit of God, to "*idolultry,*" is in no case to be viewed but as a grand development of our polluted nature; and he who may congratulate himself as free from habits of a more gross and infamous order, and carefully distinguish himself from the sinners who indulge them, may nevertheless rest assured, that in fixing the home of his affections amidst the honours, the business and the interests of earth, to the exclusion of eternity, exhibits the very same moral perversion, and outrages the appointment and design of the gospel as much as they do. Christianity is designed to impress our race with the high solemnities of the world to come; it directs all their hopes, and labours, and affections towards heaven; it teaches them "not to lay up treasures upon earth," but to secure them "in heaven; for where their treasure is, there will their hearts be also." It enjoins them to "set their affections on things above, not on things on earth;" "not to love the world, neither the things that are in the world, because if any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him." These exhortations, to which many more might be added of a similar import, sufficiently elucidate the essential character and object of the Christian religion; but when you are told of men, who, in utter disregard of them, "mind earthly things," in what light can you view them, but as men who dare to commit one sweeping act of blasphemy against the whole?

While the open excesses of debauchery are subject to various restraints which serve to check their perpetration, the guilt of worldliness, appearing less flagrant and disgusting, and admitting numerous pleas to excuse its indulgence, prevails to a vast extent. Many would shrink from the practice of the one who rank among the devoted slaves of the other. It possesses an influence even over the best, and has produced, in the present age particularly, a mournful degree of deterioration of character in the church of God. And how numerous are those who are following its full and unsubdued impulse! Can we pass along the path of life, without beholding multitudes innumerable, who are seeking their portion below? Who are they who rise early and sit up late, and eat the bread of carefulness; whose actions are a perpetual commentary on the words, "to-day, or to-morrow, we will go into such a city, and buy and sell and get gain;" who are intent only on calculations of profit, and busied incessantly in plans of aggrandizement and opulence? Who are they who circulate daily in the whirlpool of fashion, and are hurried on in the succession of amusements, where pride and vanity and the magic influence of softened voluptuousness blend and reign, to spoil the cheated soul, and seduce it from heaven? How crowded are the marts of traffic, and the temples of gaiety! How vast are the multitudes who rise upon the view, reckless of all but the things that perish in the using? The accurate observer of mankind, and particularly the faithful minister of the gospel, when he looks around on the scenes of human society, has again to copy the picture

drawn by the pencil of inspiration in the apostle's days; he has to proclaim its exact resemblance to the forms of living existence. Yes! Christian reader, even now under the empire of professed Christianity, and amidst all the warning disclosures of eternity, the man of God has to detect and expose, in the plenitude of their sin, the men "who mind earthly things." "O my soul, come not thou into their secret; unto their assembly, mine honour, be not thou united!"

4. In fine, those "*whose glory is in their shame,*" are the "enemies of the cross of Christ." Some expositors consider this clause as exegetical of the one that immediately precedes it, that is, as referring to the sensualist, and they understand it to intimate the almost irrecoverable wretchedness and vileness of the abandoned profligate. And it certainly applies to the victims of fleshly indulgence, with a fearful accuracy and emphasis. Under the sovereign influence of that debasing passion, with melancholy infatuation, they "glory in their shame." They make a virtue of their subjection, a boast of their idolatry. The drunkard boasts of his excess, the reveller, in his banquetings and scenes of dissipation, the seducer, in the disgrace and ruin into which he has plunged the hapless victims of his unbridled lusts. They trumpet forth they are "the servants of corruption," and claim admiration because they are the bondmen and vassals of that which operates only to debase and to destroy.

But the phraseology will bear, we think, a further application. It is equally descriptive of the hard-hearted and insensible worldling, who *boasts* of the industry, the sagacity, and the economy by which he has heaped together his precious pelf; and it particularly delineates that hateful part of his character which appears in his utter disregard of the heavenly injunction, "To do good, and to communicate forget not, for with such sacrifices the Lord is well pleased." His heart is steeled against the claims of the needy and the privations and afflictions of a Christian brother, but he dignifies its hardness with the name of a prudent regard to his own interests, and he silences any misgivings which he may feel by mercilessly condemning the conduct of the sufferer. His hardness of heart is "shameful," but he piques himself on it; heaven blushes at it, but he "glories." Oh! how far removed is such a man from the influence of that "cross where the world was crucified!" What an enemy is he to him who died on the cross! "Whoso hath this world's good, and seeth his brother have need, and shutteth up his bowels of compassion from him, how dwelleth the love of God in him?"

Nor is the man who rejects the righteousness of Christ, and boasts of his own,—who talks of the goodness of his heart, and the purity of his intentions, of his deeds of mercy, and labours of love, as a ground of hope before God, one whit less criminal than the worldling and the sensualist. In the eyes of men, his conduct may not be so grossly offensive as theirs, but it is equally hateful to God, and will as certainly cover himself with shame. "Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ." "There is not salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved." And what is the righteousness of the holiest saint in heaven in comparison of this name, but filthy rags,—what his highest praises, but a smoke in God's nostrils! How abominable then the pride and the selfishness of the legalist!

In what, then, readers, are you glorying? Is it in your own righteousness, or in your negative goodness? Is it in your sinful pleasures,—your worldly interests,—your crooked selfish policy? Is any reader so mad as to boast of his profligacy,—to glory in worshipping his own belly? Are you proud of your opposition to heaven's plan of salvation, and glorying in your own wisdom and carnal reason? Oh! let me tell you, you are "glorying in your shame." It is a shame to you, in the midst of so much

light, to be so ignorant of yourselves, and of him with whom you have to do. It is a shame to you to cover yourselves with rags which cannot hide your nakedness,—to refuse the grace which alone can save you, to cling to a world whose best enjoyments perish in the using. And should you persist, how fearfully will your shame be increased amid the insufferable glories of the day of retribution. Let me counsel you to renounce “the devil, the world, the flesh,” and to “glory only in the cross of Christ.” Let your language be, with the inspired penman of the passage we have been considering, “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 Jesus my Lord, for whom I have suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but dung, that I may win Christ, and be found in him not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith.”—*Presbyterian Magazine*.

ART. II *Meditation on the Religious Education of Children.*

Fatal are the mistakes men run into in this great and momentous affair, the education of their children. The common methods of education do not seem to have any thing of God and religion in them. O my soul! be upon thy guard here. “I know Abraham,” says God, “that he will command his children and household after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord,” Gen. xviii. 19. Let this be thy solicitous care, and constant faithful endeavour. It is true, I cannot give them grace, and secure their religion; but, as God has appointed me my duty, and laid his commands upon me, he has encouraged my expectation of success. A religious education, if it be truly and throughout such, and do not fail in any necessary branches of it, is often, and it may be ordinarily followed with a blessing, and made effectual: “Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old he will not depart from it,” Prov. xxii. 5. Lord, help me to attend to my duty and thy prescriptions, and leave the event in thy hand. In order to it, I would propose to myself the following rules.

1. I purpose and resolve to be serious and solemn in devoting my children to God in baptism. A great many seem to make baptism only a proper time of giving names to their children, or a season of feasting and merriment, or at least matter of form and compliance with an established custom, leaving out what is most essential to the ordinance, the concern they have with God therein. When parents offer their children to baptism, they are solemnizing a family-covenant, as it were; that is, the common Christian covenant, as made with them and their family, owning their relation to God the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; endeavouring to insert, as I may say, the name of this or that child into God’s covenant, and to continue the high privilege and honour of such a relation in their family. And how important a thing is this! and with how much seriousness should we go about it! O my soul! remember thy faults this day; be humbled for past remissness and neglects, and be more serious and devout in thy future transactions of this kind. I knew a family, all the branches of which seemed to have an early, and a more than common sense of religion, for which a judicious and grave man gave this reason, that next to the special favour and grace of God, he thought it owing to the religious solemnity and seriousness with which the head of the family devoted his children to God in baptism.

2. I purpose and resolve to be early and constant in the proper methods

of instruction, particularly to inculcate and labour to possess them with a conviction and sense of the worth and dignity of the soul, of the certainty of a future state of immortality, of the importance of eternal things; and set myself all I can to bring this world into a just neglect and contempt with them; to instil a high veneration for the holy scriptures, recommending and making the Bible their chief study and delight, if it may be. This has been the way of good people in all ages. "Timothy from a child knew the holy scripture," 2 Tim. iii. 15. The Jews were commanded diligently to teach the words of the law to their children, Deut. vi. 7.; and how defective soever they were in other things, their zeal in this particular was very commendable. Josephus tells us, their children were trained up in the knowledge of the law from their very infancy, and were so expert therein, that "they knew every thing as perfectly as their own names." Nor were the primitive Christians less careful in this respect; the Bible, especially the New Testament, was their institutes, the grammar of their religion, in which their catechumens and children were grounded. St. Jerom, in one of his epistles, giving directions for the education of a young lady of a noble Christian family, advises, "that as soon as she was capable, she should learn the Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes; next be taught the four gospels, and have them always in her hand; then get the Acts and Epistles by heart, and then pass to the reading of the prophets. How little of this is there in the present discipline of most families! Music, dancing, play-books, with a collection of novels, light poetry, &c. these are looked upon as the great accomplishments of young persons, and mainly attended to in their education; which, no doubt, is one great cause of that degeneracy we so much complain of in the profession of the Christian religion. Consider, O my soul! that in baptism thou enterest thy children into the school of Christ, and layest thyself under obligations to teach them his doctrine; endeavour to do this with constancy and care; put his book into their hands, and help them to take out of it the great and important lessons it contains.

3. I purpose and resolve to watch and guard their manners, and apply myself in all the methods I can, to cure the maladies and distempers of their minds. I would constantly recommend to them all social and divine virtues, love to God and man, in all the branches of it; sobriety, modesty, humility, the government of their passions and appetites; diffidence of themselves, esteem and reverence of superiors, especially their parents, ministers, and instructors; justice, truth, and charity in their words; and when any symptoms of evil, any immoral, vicious inclinations begin to appear, I would set myself, with great solicitude, to suppress them and root them out; to which purpose, I would carefully watch over them, and observe every thing of this kind. I would note down their more remarkable miscarriages from time to time, put them upon doing the like, and not only give suitable admonitions and cautions, but direct to such texts of scripture, where they may see themselves corrected and censured. And, to enforce all, I would add the sanction of mine authority, commanding my children and household after me to keep the way of the Lord; encouraging them by proper rewards in well-doing, and restraining them by threats and punishments from the contrary, Prov. xix. 18. and xiii. 24.

4. I purpose and resolve, at fit times, to address myself to them in a more solemn manner, treating with them about the affairs of their souls; warning them of the danger of such and such neglects, such and such practices and pursuits; recommending to them religion from all suitable topics; and particularly pressing them to a personal covenanting with God, especially at the Lord's table; for which purpose I would endeavour to afford them all proper helps.

5. I purpose and resolve to dispose of them in the world, to choose

their callings, employments, and masters, their relations, husbands, and wives, so far as I can, and the whole state of their affairs, with an entire reference and subserviency to the great ends of religion. Oh! that I may not, as is too commonly the case, by carelessness and treachery in these instances, destroy what I have been building; and after I have devoted my children to God, and engaged to bring them up according to the rules and laws of the Christian discipline, sacrifice them to Mammon, and barter away their souls for a little present advantage. What is this but to imitate those wretched idolaters the prophet speaks of, Jer. xxxii. 35. who "built high places to Baal, to cause their sons and their daughters to pass through the fire unto Moloch." Their souls, if not their bodies, hereby become a victim. Oh! may I never be guilty of this perfidiousness. I profess to take God as my covenant God; I have given up my children to him in covenant; I lie to him, and am an hypocrite, unless I choose him as my portion and theirs, esteeming his loving-kindness better than life.

6. I purpose and shall endeavour to enforce all my instructions by my example, and not to run down in practice what I recommend by precept; would take care, whilst I inculcate on them the necessity of religion, and of minding another world, preferring the interests of it to this world, not to neglect it myself, and thereby destroy the efficacy of my own doctrine; would take care, while I talk to them of moderation, humility, self-denial, &c. not to live in the contrary vices myself, and indulge myself in practices I am constantly representing to them the danger of. If, while I talk to them of governing their passions, I give a loose to my own, and against reviling and backbiting others, I daily take the liberty of doing so before them; if, while I talk to them of the duties of retirement, of diligence and constancy therein, I manifest I have no regard to these things myself; often read grave lectures of mortification and contempt of the world, and yet discover by my conduct, both of myself and them, that I have nothing so much at heart; this can have no other tendency but to undermine all my instructions, and make the young pupil despise them as words in course, and a sort of cant; or at least make him like myself, an hypocrite, and vain pretender to religion. Dread, O my soul! this trifling; if religion be necessary and good for others, it is good for thee; nor wilt thou ever teach to purpose, whilst an ill conscience and an ill example stare thee in the face. Parents should be able to say to their children, as the apostle doth to the Thessalonians, "Ye are witnesses, and God also, how holily, and justly, and unblameably we behaved ourselves among you," 1 Thess. ii. 10. "Those things which ye have both learned, and received, and heard, and seen in me, do; and the God of peace shall be with you," Phil. iv. 9.

7. I purpose and resolve to look up to God, in frequent fervent prayer, for his instruction to accompany and crown mine. This must be my daily work; and I would often set some time apart for more solemn intercession and supplication in behalf of my children; laying before him, and enlarging upon, their several cases, necessities, and wants, and recommending them particularly to God, and begging he would direct me in my methods of conduct towards them; and especially when I have any close reproof or admonition to give them, that he would assist me in that application, and bless it; prepare their hearts to receive it, and make it suitable and effectual. The more we depend on God in this, and all the great affairs of religion, the more success we are like to have; he has often prospered and owned such a dependence. Ambrose told Monica, the mother of Austin, who had been so importunate for his conversion, that 'a son of so many prayers could not miscarry;' not that prayer, though as fervent as Monica's, is always successful; but it is often so; often a means of enriching and blessing a family, and sometimes has

been answered in very glorious fruits, and proved the best inheritance to their children, after the pious supplicants have been laid in the dust.

Help me, O my God! with all suitable zeal and patience, to attend my duty in this particular of it; may I walk within my house with a perfect heart; not only instructing, but exhorting and charging, "as a father his children, that they walk worthy of God," 1 Thess. ii. 11-12. Whilst so many are seeking great things for themselves and theirs in this world, I would seek great things of a more excellent and durable nature: whilst they project how to make a *man* of this or that child, as they express it, I would be solicitous to make every one of mine a *Christian*, and constantly pursue such measures as have the most direct tendency to that purpose. Lord, grant me the desire and travail of my soul herein, and I have nothing greater, nothing farther to ask!—BENNET.

ART. III. *On the Investigation of Truth.**

Man being endowed with powers for the investigation of truth,—to maintain and exercise these aright is to him of the utmost importance; whether considered in a moral, political or religious point of view. God has given him a standard by which to regulate these in their exercise. This standard is the Bible. In it truth is exhibited full, clear, and perfect, to which nothing can be added without debasing its spirit; nothing subtracted without impairing its proportion. The Bible is, like all the works of God, perfect. Happy indeed would it be for man, if his principles and conduct were a practical application of its precepts. Our Saviour said to Pilate, "To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world that I should bear witness unto the truth. Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice." Truth shews us where we stand—what are our prospects for time—what for eternity—what are the dangers to be avoided—what the proper course of conduct to be pursued.

Wherever wrong conceptions of truth are entertained, it is impossible there should be right conceptions of duty. There appears to be a moral epidemic prevailing in the present age, analogous in many respects to that physical disease called dyspepsia, and equally destructive in the mental, as that in the bodily constitution. The symptoms of this disease are observable in the high estimation in which Novelists are held, and in that eagerness with which works of Fiction are perused by persons of every rank and condition in life. The two diseases are alike in this, that they both, with keen appetite, crave unwholesome food; but when indulgence has proceeded to an undue degree, the digestive organs refuse to perform their proper functions, even when the natural aliment is received with temperance. Thus the whole system becomes debilitated. So the mind is diseased when it rejects the bread and water of pure truth, and craves high seasoned Fiction. It is only when the heart receives truth, that the mind like the body is nerved with strength, and acts with decision and freedom. God, in making man a free agent, by no means authorized him to ruin his constitution by the indulgence of his passions. Although the analogy will hold good, as it respects the symptoms of the diseases, in each case the disease will prove fatal, if the causes which produced it continue to operate; and in cases where they prove fatal, the one will terminate in the death of the body, the other with the death of the soul,

* The young lady who has favored us with this article bids fair to become an accomplished writer. Her sentiments are very just, and on the whole happily expressed. May we not hope to hear from her again?—
ED. REL. MOR.

that second death which continues throughout eternity in the dominion of the father of lies.

Truth is the proper ally of virtue; falsehood, of vice. In these times, virtue herself has attempted to dissolve the union with her ancient companion, and to take fiction in her place; and let her beware of the consequences. The most current compositions of the day, are tales and novels, and perhaps not the least dangerous among these, are those called religious novels.

However good a writer's motives may be for publishing such works, let us not, in this enlightened age, adopt the false principle, that the end will sanctify the means. It is not works purely fictitious, and known to be so, that are most dangerous, but where fiction and truth are indiscriminately blended, that is, where facts are the ground work and principal materials of the story. When, instead of transient allusions to the characters and manners of an age, they are the professed objects of the author's illustrations. The person who voluntarily undertakes such a work, is bound by laws much stricter than those which bind the ordinary class of writers. To keep within bounds of probability, is not all that is expected, but conformity to historical truth. Where real characters are introduced, they must feel, act, and speak as in faithful history, the author not being at liberty to mould them into any form his diseased imagination may have pictured, in order to give effect to his story. The same regard must be paid to truth, when fictitious personages are so exhibited as to give the reader an opportunity of judging of the parties to which they respectively belong. In order to do this, the writer must have a minute acquaintance with the history of the period selected, as well as with the habits, opinions, and events of that period. It is not a sufficient apology when these are misrepresented, that the work displays great talents, that the author is in a mirthful mood, and allowance must be made for his desire to please his readers. It is not upon a sentiment transiently expressed, but the false impression that the whole work is calculated to make, that our judgments are to be founded. Every encroachment on the province of truth, should be regarded with abhorrence. Writers should not be tolerated, who give false notions of men and manners; let it proceed from ignorance, prejudice, or whatever cause, the interests of truth are too sacred to be sacrificed to the humour of a writer, or the amusement of his readers. However *much* talents command our respect, let us not allow our imagination to be so dazzled by their splendour, as to prevent our mental vision from discerning whether their fruits are nutritious or poisonous.

Has not Sir Walter Scott done great injustice to the Covenanters who died martyrs for the cause of truth? We rejoice that the times begin to show some evidence of disgust at works of fiction. Washington Irving, our most popular writer has published two volumes, in which he chooses truth rather than fiction, even as a vehicle for amusement. The real value of men in society, should invariably be considered as proportionate to their knowledge and practice of truth.

Beyond this, it is dangerous to follow them, to trust them, or to listen to them. When this is the standard of our affections and actions, all is safe. Honour will be paid to whom honour is due. But when this order is inverted and men are practically made the standard of public sentiments, not only danger may be apprehended, but inevitable ruin. In this case the scripture order is inverted; men are not esteemed for their works, but their works, for being theirs. "The tree is known by its fruit."

Let us take the advice of Chrysostom, "not to carry about the opinions of the multitude, but examine things. Is it not, says he, absurd? when you are about to receive money, you do not trust other men, but examine it yourself; and when you are to judge of things, to be carried

away by other men's opinions, is the worst fault in you; you have the scriptures which is an exact standard of things."

Much lately has been done to check intemperance, by persons taking the subject under serious consideration, meeting together, conversing on the subject—seeing it in all its bearings on individuals, and on communities—viewing societies groaning under its destructive and paralyzing hand—the church of the living God, sinking under its weight, wasting under its blighting influence. It had entered her door, sullied her beauty, and injured her purity. That certain degrees of intemperance had become popular, was the disgrace of society in general, and much more so of the church. The advocates for temperance have taken decisive measures to suppress this evil, and their measures have been crowned with abundant success. Total abstinence was the decisive blow. What a blessed discovery was this principle of entire abstinence. Temperance societies have done a work for which future generations will rise up and call them blessed. And now if a similar spirit was aroused in the public mind on the subject of truth, what happy results might be expected! The prevalence of falsehood, is not less destructive in the community, than was that of intemperance. It too, has entered the church; the effects are seriously felt by her members, in causing animosities to rise, and destroying, in a great measure, the love of truth and the love of brethren, thus giving occasion for her enemies to exult. The violation of truth, how fatal! "In contracts, affirmations, and promises, it has involved nations in destruction, undermined the foundations of public prosperity, blasted the good name and comfort of families, perplexed and agitated the mind of thousands, and thrown contempt upon the discoveries of science, and the revelations of God." Can nothing be done to raise the cause of truth? Let its advocates take courage to attack falsehood, by the victory already acquired. As total abstinence was the only cure in cases of intemperance; in this cause, let its friends adhere to truth in the strictest manner, and withhold their support and countenance from any who traffick in falsehood.

Let the promoters of truth consider the inventor of falsehood as on a level with the distiller of ardent spirits—the public presses where it is distributed, as on a par with the grog shops, or the haunts of counterfeiters; the slanderer, with the retailer of ardent spirits. Then might we not expect similar results? The time was, when a vender could deal out, day after day, liquid poison to the tottering drunkard, attend his funeral, return home, post his books, turn the widow and her helpless babes into the streets, to perish with hunger, or be supported by charity, and yet sustain a good character. How altered now! The eyes of all are turned towards such a person; their ears are open, they hear, as it were, the voice of his brother's blood crying from the ground for vengeance. May we not expect that the retailer of falsehoods will be viewed as equally abhorrent! He too, is a murderer, innocence is his prey, and ruin his sport.

To attack falsehood in every form, and under every cloak, is to attack the enemy of mankind in his strong hold; many have countenanced falsehood against their consciences, rather than meet his fury. But let the advocates for truth fear not! Falsehood meets no support in the Bible. Be firm then, be decided, be encouraged. Truth is the cause of God, it is the cause for which Immanuel died, the cause for which the apostles were witnesses, and martyrs.

Oh, that a spirit of investigation for the safety of our country, were aroused in the minds of our freemen, such as inspired Washington, its great father, of whom it is said, his habits of enquiry were so remarkable, that he was never satisfied with investigating, nor desisted from it, so long as he had less than all the light he could obtain upon a subject, and then

he made his decision without bias. This steady pursuit in the search of truth, may be assigned as the chief cause of his uniform course of right conduct in so many difficult scenes, where human actors seldom fail to err.

May this spirit operate and the result of its operations appear in the public press, which is the proper instrument by which to judge of the shape, and pressure of the times.

May our darkened understandings be illuminated, our eyes be so directed to this spiritual firmament, as to view each truth immoveably and permanently fixed in its proper sphere, and all revolving in harmony around the glorious sun of truth and righteousness. FINIS.

ART. IV. *Criticism on the Hebrew word Chasid.*

It is a great mercy that we have access to read the scriptures in our native language, and that our English translation is so just and accurate. It would therefore be improper to bring this translation into disrepute by idle and vain criticisms. But as it is very difficult, and in many instances impossible, to find in one language a word that will exactly convey the meaning of a word in another, translators are often obliged to take such words as come nearest to the meaning of the original; and on this account, the translation must be, in some measure, deficient. It cannot, therefore, be accounted a disparagement of the translation to suggest, by another word, by a paraphrase, or otherwise, any thing that may help to supply the deficiency.

The Hebrew word *chasid* is one of those to which our translation does not give an accurate, or at least an uniform signification. This word is generally translated *holy*. It is so when applied to God, Psal. cxlv. 17. "The Lord is righteous in all his ways, and (*chasid*) holy in all his works;" and it is so translated when applied to man, Psal. lxxxvi. 2. "Preserve my soul, for I am (*chasid*) holy." When applied to men, in some instances this word is translated *godly*, Psal. iv. 3. xii. 1. In the plural number, (*chasidim*), it is almost always rendered *saints*, of which there are many instances in the book of Psalms, Psal. xxx. 4. xxxi. 23. xxxvii. 28. lxxix. 3. lxxxv. 8. cxvi. 15. cxxxii. 9. 16. cxlviii. 14. cxlix. 1. 5. There is another Hebrew word (*kadosh*) which is commonly used to express what we call holiness, and is used to express either real holiness, or that which is only relative,—to express the holiness of God, of angels, or men, or to express the holiness of those things that were connected with the worship of God; but this word *chasid* seems to convey a different idea.

It is derived from the substantive *chesed*, which signifies benevolence, benignity, or such benefits and favours as are the fruit of it. It is most ordinarily translated *mercy*, the eternity of which is celebrated in every verse of the cxxxvi. Psalm. It is sometimes translated *loving-kindness*, Psal. xxxvi. 7. lxiii. 3. lxxxix. 49. It is also rendered by *goodness*, Exod. xxxiv. 6. Now, the adjective *chasid* must be understood as conveying an idea correspondent with this, and signifying one that is benevolent, bountiful, and merciful. Accordingly, we find it sometimes so translated, Jer. iii. 12. "I am merciful, (*chasid*), saith the Lord, and will not keep anger for ever." It is also sometimes so translated when applied to man, Micah, vii. 2. "The (*chasid*) good man is perished from the earth." The expression is similar to that in Isa. lvii. "The merciful men (the men of mercy or goodness) are taken away."

When this word is applied to God, it is always to be taken actively, as expressing the benevolence and mercy exercised by him; for he cannot be the object of the exercise of bounty by any. Our goodness extendeth not unto him. But when this word is applied unto men, it is most ordinarily to be understood passively and objectively. In the two texts last cited, it seems, indeed, to express a benevolent and merciful disposition; but most frequently, it seems to point out the privilege of those to whom it is applied, as being the special objects of God's benignity, loving-kindness, or mercy. Thus, when the Psalmist prays, Psal. lxxxvi. 2. "Preserve my soul, for I am holy," we are not to consider him as pleading the holiness of his character as a reason why the Lord should preserve him, but as pleading the mercy and favour already conferred on him as a reason for the continuance of it. And thus also, when God's people are so frequently in the book of Psalms called (*chasidim*) saints, we are to consider this as expressing their privilege as being the peculiar objects of God's love and mercy, and partakers of his special goodness. And it is observable, that when God's people are described by this designation, it is with a respect to God, of whose goodness and mercy they are the objects. They are not called (*chasidim*) saints in an abstract way, but *his* saints, God's *mercified* ones; and the goodness and mercy from which they are denominated, is God's covenanted and promised mercy, and so is distinguished from that common goodness of which all are partakers, Psal. cxlv. 9. "The Lord is good to all, but his tender mercies are over (or above) all his works;" hence we find, mercy (*chesed*) and truth so frequently joined together, mercy secured by the truth of the covenant-promise, Psal. xxv. 10. lvii. 3. lxi. 8, lxxxv. 10. lxxxix. 1.

It remains to consider the import of this term (*chasid*) as applied to Christ. It is applied to him, Psal. xvi. 10. "Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine holy one (*chasidecha*) to see corruption." Psal. lxxxix. 19. "Then thou spakest in vision to (or concerning) thy holy One, and saidst, I have laid help upon one that is mighty," &c. This name, taken actively, will doubtless apply to Christ in a very eminent degree. He is indeed full of grace, mercy, and good-will towards men. "Ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, in that he was rich, yet for our sakes he became poor." But it rather appears to be applied to him objectively in these texts cited, in the same manner as it is applied to God's covenant-people; and therefore he is called God's holy One by way of eminency—the grand object of God's covenant-mercy, and loving-kindness, and his people are the objects of it only in and through him. Hence these expressions, Psal. lxxxix. "But my faithfulness and my mercy (*chesed*) shall be with him." Verse 28. "My mercy, (*chesed*) will I keep for him for evermore, and my covenant shall stand fast with him." Verse 33. "Nevertheless my loving-kindness will I not utterly take (or break) from him, nor suffer my faithfulness to fail." Hence also the expostulation, verse 49. "Where are thy former loving-kindnesses which thou swearest unto David thy servant;" and that promise, Isa. lv. 3. "I will make an everlasting covenant with you, even the sure (the faithful and established) mercies of David." All these texts point out, that Christ, the head of the new covenant, is the prime object of all covenant-love and mercy. To him eternal life was promised before the world began. To him all the promises were confirmed by the oath of God; and it is of this love and mercy, as sworn and confirmed to Christ, that all believers in him are partakers. Now, this sets the character of Christ, and the privilege and security of his people, in a very comfortable point of view. They are, and shall ever remain, the objects of God's loving-kindness, because Christ is so.—*Edinburgh Ch. Mag.*

ART. V. *The Swearing of allegiance to Christ, a Scriptural and reasonable service.*

"Unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear."—Isaiah xlv. 23.

As allegiance is the great duty of subjects to their sovereign, so to that duty no loyal subject will hesitate to pledge himself; and, when called upon by competent authority, he will be ready to confirm it with all the formality of a solemn oath. The same decided expression of fealty may certainly be expected from the dutiful subjects of the King of Zion. This their relation to him most obviously demands, and their gracious Sovereign frequently requires and expects.

Such is the express assertion of the words prefixed to the present essay. That they are the language of Christ, both their matter and connexion plainly prove, even though they had not been quoted in application to him once and again by the apostle Paul. (Rom. xiv. 11. Phil. ii. 9; 10.) After exposing, in the preceding context, the folly of idolaters, who, "set up" as the object of their worship "a graven image, and pray unto a god that cannot save," he makes offer of himself as the only and almighty Saviour of a lost world, and invites all the ends of the earth to "look unto him and be saved." This invitation he declares shall not be given in vain, for he looks forward to future ages, and, in the spirit of prophecy he predicts, and seals the prediction with his own oath, that he should yet be generally acknowledged in the world, and that the most solemn attestations of their faith in him, and submission to him, would be given by the sons of men. "I have sworn by myself," says he, "the word is gone out of my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return. That unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear."

This prediction shall in one sense be fulfilled in that day when all shall bow, either in willing submission or forced subjection, before his judgment-seat. Accordingly, it is quoted in proof of this by the apostle in the passages referred to above; and, in the next verse, allusion is made to the subjugation under him of his implacable foes. But the principal accomplishment of the prediction is in the voluntary submission of men to the sceptre of his grace, and their pledges of allegiance to him as his willing subjects. Hence the oath of allegiance, which they are represented as swearing, is a formal profession of faith in him. "Surely in the Lord have I righteousness and strength."*

What the Most High has pledged his solemn oath that his people shall practise, it is plainly their duty to perform. What shall be the distinguishing characteristic of the church in her best days, is obviously competent to her in every period of her history. Especially what is promised in reference to ages yet to come, can never have passed away as a peculiarity of a former dispensation. Has the Lord then asserted, and confirmed the assertion by his oath, that in the New Testament times, and particularly in that portion of the present dispensation when it shall have attained its highest state of perfection, commonly called the latter days, his subjects shall not only be numerous, but most decided, shall not only make express declarations of their faith in him and adherence to him, but shall confirm these by solemn oath; then are we warranted to draw thence the obvious doctrinal proposition, '*That the formal swearing of allegiance to the great King of Zion is a duty incumbent upon his subjects, and to be practised in present times.*' This proposition we shall briefly illustrate and defend. Before, however, entering directly upon the argument, we request the reader's attention to the following introductory observations:—

1. It is the duty of the subjects of our Lord Jesus Christ *publicly to*

* The first clause of v. 24, appears plainly to be the form of the oath prescribed. See this fully established by Hervey in his *Aspasio Vindicated*, p. 66 and 66.

own their relation to him, and promise subjection to his authority. This proposition we presume will be questioned by few, and therefore we need spend no time in proving it. As no man can be a Christian without being a subject of Christ, so none can be an honest subject of his government without openly avowing it. This is the more necessary, as none of his subjects were, like those of other sovereigns, born such. They are all originally the slaves of sin and Satan, and become his servants by a change of masters, that change, therefore, it becomes them openly to declare. Hence profession of him and devotement to him are represented as occupying so prominent a place in Christian duty, and as natively flowing from a believing interest in him. "With the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation."

As this profession is required to entitle an individual to the name of a Christian, so, without it, no church can possibly exist. What is a visible church but a number of persons connected together by a joint profession of their faith in Christ and obedience to his authority? Churches vary, indeed, in the degree of formality which they are in the habit of giving to this profession; some contenting themselves with a very general and verbal statement of their faith; others embodying it in a formal and printed document, called a confession, or creed, to which every candidate is required to give his public and solemn accession; others requiring of every communicant the formal subscription of a written covenant, in which adherence to the substance of the church's profession is also accompanied with an express personal devotement to God;* but no church, either in former or later times, ever existed, or could exist, without some such acknowledgment as the formal ground of their association, and bond of their union. "Thou hast avouched the Lord to be thy God," &c., is therefore predicated of ancient Israel; his people are always spoken of as united to him in a similar public manner; and in the language of mutual devotement is the relation between them represented as formed; "I will say, 'It is my people,' and they shall say, 'The Lord is my God.'"

2. It is frequently the duty of the subjects of Christ to express their allegiance to him in a very explicit and formal manner. The formal swearing of allegiance to a sovereign is not indeed the duty of every day. The repeated exaction of such a pledge from the same individuals, without some important change of circumstances, must by lessening the solemnity of the transaction, defeat the end which it is intended to serve. It is seldom, indeed, imposed at all upon the great body of the subjects, whose simple submission to authority, and discharge of the duties of their station, is accepted as equivalent to their acknowledgment of the existing government. But circumstances not unfrequently occur which require them to come forward and testify their adherence to it in a much more explicit manner. At the formation, for example of the constitution of a country, nothing is more common than to ratify it by an oath. When subjects take up arms in their sovereign's defence, they give a similar pledge of fidelity to his standard; or when a spirit of disaffection has spread, and hostile factions have invaded the prerogatives of his throne, nothing can be a more efficient means of separating between the disaffected and the loyal. Such a solemn declaration of fidelity is always required of persons placed in responsible situations; and, in such circumstances as we have supposed, is often, with great propriety, applied as a test to the subjects at large.

And do not similar circumstances call for similar explicitness in the avouchment of the allegiance of the subjects of Christ? Formal vows

* In the Scottish Church of Rotterdam every communicant is required, on admission, to give explicit answers to a formula of questions, embodying, in addition to an assertion of the great doctrines of the gospel, a formal personal covenant with God; and subscribe the same in the books of session, upon which an extract is given him for his future use. The formula originally used was the National Covenant or Confession of Scotland.—See Steven's History of the Scottish Church of Rotterdam, p. 178, 9.

are, indeed, always required of such as are invested with office in the church; and when it is recollected that all were originally rebels, may not circumstances warrant the application of a similar test to the members of the church at large? At the formation of a church, for instance, or on occasion of her re-establishment, can any exercise be more seasonable, or more calculated to cement the spiritual fabric? When the progress of error and defection have shaken the fidelity of many, what can be more calculated to unite and strengthen the adherence of the rest? And when the "enemy comes in like a flood," what can be a more effectual means of "lifting up a standard against him?"

Upon this obvious dictate of common sense, therefore, have the subjects of Christ often acted; and when circumstanced as above, they have come cheerfully forward with explicit declarations of adherence to their Master; and by vowing, and swearing, and subscribing with the hand, have given all possible pledges of their sincerity. In this way, did Israel solemnly accept and ratify the ecclesiastical constitution which they received from God at Horeb; (Exod. xix. 7—8; xxiv. 3—8.) and their future returns to it, after repeated defections, were signalized by the renovation of the same solemn pledge. (Deut. xxix. 10—15. Josh. xxiv. 1—28. 2 Chron. xv. 12—14; xxiii. 16; xxix. 10; xxxiv. 29—33. Ez. x. 3—5. Nehem. ix. 38; x. 1—39.) By such explicit self-devotement to God was a distinction drawn between the faithful and the faithless, in times of general apostacy; (Josh. xxiv. 14—28. 2 Chron. xv. 13. Ez. x. 1—5. Nehem. ix. 1—2.) nor shall it fail to distinguish that restoration to which we still look forward; for it was not only their return from Babylon that is contemplated, but another and greater deliverance, in that interesting prediction, "Then shall the children of Israel return; they and the children of Judah together; going and weeping; they shall ask the way to Zion, with their faces thitherward, saying, Come and let us join ourselves unto the Lord in a perpetual covenant, that shall not be forgotten. (Jer. l. 3—4.)

What nature itself dictated to Israel, as a most dutiful and efficient mode of confirming their fidelity to their divine Master, it was surely to be expected, would be imitated by their brethren of the Gentiles, when they were incorporated into the same spiritual kingdom, and rallied around the same sacred standard. The church under the present dispensation, is the same substantially as under the old; and as similar circumstances must necessarily occur to try the fidelity of its members, an avouchment of it no less explicit is in such circumstances to be looked for. When, therefore, a general defection among the immediate followers of our Lord gave him occasion to test the sincerity of the rest, Peter, in the name of himself and his brethren, made this solemn avouchment, "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life; and we believe, and are sure, that thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God." (John vi. 69.) The same apostle, after he himself had failed in his fidelity to his Master, renews his declaration of attachment to him with a similar appeal to his omniscience, "Lord, thou knowest all things, thou knowest that I love thee." (John xxi. 17.) Paul hesitates not with all the solemnity of an oath, or what is equivalent to it, to declare his faith in the great leading doctrine of justification by imputed righteousness, at a time when it was questioned and undermined; "Yea doubtless, and I count all things but loss,—that I may be found in Christ, not having on mine own righteousness," &c' "God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ." (Phil. iii. 8—9. Gal. vi. 14.) And ecclesiastical history, both ancient and modern, has already borne ample testimony to the fulfilment of that prediction so expressive of the explicitness, and formality of the profession of gospel times. "I will pour water on him that is thirsty, and floods upon the dry ground;—and one shall say, *I am*

the Lord's,' and 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.*" (Isaiah xlv. 3—5.)

3. The oath of allegiance given to Christ often requires to be expressed in *particular and pointed terms*. General pledges of fidelity to a sovereign will seldom serve as a test of loyalty. The very circumstances which call for their administration point out some specific avouchment, which draws the precise line of distinction between the disaffected and the loyal. This, whatever it may be, whether the abjuration of a rival, an acknowledgment of some particular royal prerogative, or an engagement to the performance of some present duty to his sovereign, is entered into the body of the oath which the subject takes, or the address which he sends up to his throne. Similar particularity is required from the subjects of Christ. General professions of faith in him and engagements to him, in such circumstances, go for nothing, can form no line of demarcation between the faithful and the faithless. The assertion of some particular truth or truths which are presently contested, an engagement to some particular duty or duties which have been or are in danger of being neglected, can alone serve such a purpose. Accordingly, in this oath of allegiance here put into the mouths of New Testament saints, is embodied the assertion of the great leading doctrine of justification by faith in the imputed righteousness of Christ—a doctrine which occupies a prominent place in the system of divine truth, and which has frequently been the test of the genuine friends of the Saviour.

Upon this principle have the sincere followers of Christ always acted. In place of mocking him, and blinding others by vague professions of faith which had no meaning, they have pointed their profession against the varying forms of error and disaffection, and rendered it a plain and decisive test of their present soundness in the faith and fidelity to the cause of their divine Master. The oath of allegiance to him which Israel swore was short, indeed, but it was sufficiently pointed to draw a line of distinction between them and the heathen. "Thou shalt swear, '*the Lord liveth,*'" (Jer. iv. 2; comp. ch. v. 2; xii, 16; xvi. 14—15; xxiii. 7—8; xlv. 26.) or, '*Jehovah is the only living and true God:*' and even this they were directed to modify when it came to be abused by the ten tribes in their idol worship at Gilgal and Bethaven. (Hos. iv. 15; comp. Amos viii. 14.) So long as a general pledge of adherence to the laws of Moses was sufficiently expressive, it was all that they embodied into the letter of their covenants; but when circumstances called for greater particularity, they added, as in Ezra and Nehemiah's days, clauses pointed against prevailing evils, and express engagements to duties specially called for. (Nehem. x. 30—37.)

The same particularity has distinguished the profession of Christ's faithful adherents in later times. The confession of Peter, to which we formerly referred, was of this specific character, and avowed the great truth then in controversy, "We believe that *thou art that Christ.*" Paul's solemn asseverations are equally precise. They embody that great truth which he was so desirous to establish, which has been in all ages so much disputed, and which is here indeed represented as entering into the very marrow of the allegiance of the Christian. And it is worthy of remark, that not only does church history present us with many similar examples of specific, as well as solemn avouchment of "the present truth," but that the substance of those solemn oaths by which, at the reformation from popery, that remarkable period of separation between the true and false friends of Christ, the allegiance of protestants in various lands was formally given to the truth, was just the avouchment of the same great doctrine which Paul so solemnly attested, and which is here represented as the common form of an oath of allegiance for the subjects of Christ in

gospel times. Thus was then literally fulfilled the statement of the text prefixed, "They shall swear,—'Surely in the Lord have I righteousness and strength.'"

[To be continued.]

ART. VI. *Illustrations of Scripture.*

Matt. chap. xxvi. verse 26—30. "And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, take, eat; this is my body. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it: for this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins. But I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom."

Mark chap. xiv. verse 25. "Verily I say unto you, I will drink no more of the fruit of the vine, until that day that I drink it new in the kingdom of God."

When celebrating the last passover with his disciples, our Lord told them, as we are informed in the 22d of Luke, that next time he ate and drank with them would be in the kingdom of God, or in an ordinance pertaining to that kingdom, which would supersede the passover. This was the ordinance of the Lord's Supper, which he immediately instituted, and of which he partook with his disciples. In this new ordinance, he gave his disciples an eminent display of his divine and meditorial glory as the king and head of the church, by the setting aside of an ordinance of divine institution which had been long observed; and by establishing another in its room, he afforded them a clear exhibition of the nature and design of his sufferings and death, brought the kingdom of God near to them, unfolded it to their view, and let them see the passover fulfilled as he had told them.

After the institution of the Lord's Supper, he informed them in the words which form the subject of the present remarks, that the next time he partook of it with them in his Father's kingdom, to which this ordinance belonged, his fellowship with them would be, in many respects new. Verse 29. "But I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom."

That which Christ here calls his Father's kingdom, is denominated in the parallel passage in the 14th of Mark, 25th verse, "the kingdom of God." A little attention to the words will, we hope, serve to show us, that this kingdom does not mean heaven. First, the meaning cannot be that he would hold no more fellowship with them until he and they met together in heaven, for he held the most delightful fellowship with them again on earth after his resurrection, for the space of forty days, during which period he was employed in confirming their faith, and instructing them in the things pertaining to the *kingdom of God*. Again, the words contain a promise that he would again hold communion with them in this very ordinance of the Supper, or that he would again drink with them of *this fruit* of the vine, viz. this used in the ordinance which he had just instituted. Farther, the words intimate, that the next time that he did celebrate this ordinance with them, their fellowship would be in many respects new, or different from what it was then. But the next time that we read of the disciples celebrating this ordinance, was on earth, after their Lord's ascension, and their can be no doubt that, though deprived of his bodily presence, they enjoyed his gracious and sensible, or

spiritual presence, and had that new and delightful fellowship with him which he had promised them. His Father's kingdom, or the kingdom of God, must therefore be taken here to signify the New Testament dispensation, which was already introduced, but not fully come and set up until after our Lord's ascension.

His words at the first celebration of the Supper, according to the explanation which has just been given of them, intimate, that by this ordinance he would hold communion with his church for the time to come : that he would not, however, celebrate the ordinance with them again in such humbled circumstances; but that next time he partook of it with them, it would be in a manner new, both to him and to them, and that his circumstances and theirs would then be so greatly altered to the better, that their new fellowship with him in this ordinance would be like the drinking of new wine, and a prelude of that which his people shall have with him in the heavenly state. At the first dispensation of the Lord's Supper, the disciples were holding communion with their humbled and suffering Saviour, and the Holy Spirit was not then given, because that Jesus was not yet glorified; but the next time that this ordinance was dispensed, and ever since, his people have communion with him as their risen and exalted and glorified Saviour, which imparts a savour to the ordinance, resembling the sweetness and fragrance of new wine. "I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom," or in "the kingdom of God." These words are Christ's promise to hold new and excellent fellowship with his church in the ordinance of the Supper during the New Testament dispensation.

John chap. i. verse 31. "And I knew him not; but that he should be made manifest to Israel, therefore am I come baptizing with water." There is a very striking resemblance between these words of John and the words of Paul, 1 Cor. xi. 21, "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come." By comparing the two together, we learn that baptism and the Lord's Supper have one common end, *the manifestation of Christ to the visible church*. John baptized not only for the sake of the person who was the subject of his baptism, to whom it was a seal of the remission of sin, and of engrafting into Christ, but also for the sake of all who witnessed it, that it might be to them a sign of the cleansing virtue of the blood and spirit of him who was about to appear, "that HE should be manifest to Israel, therefore am I come baptizing with water." We may reasonably suppose that there was nothing in the mode of John's baptism which might hinder or defeat the great public end of it, but rather that the former was subservient to the latter. If John baptized by pouring or sprinkling, none could imagine that any corporeal benefit could result from it; all who witnessed this action must have been convinced that it was not the act of a physician who recommends bathing or dipping as beneficial in warm climates to the bodies of men, but the act of a minister, which was not intended for the advantage of the body, and which was the sign of something beneficial to the soul. Since it was that the Messiah should be made manifest to Israel, that John came baptizing with water, there was in the mode of his baptizing a sign "known and read of all men."

From these words of John, we may infer, 1st, the sinfulness of *private baptism*. When baptism is dispensed privately, the great design of the ordinance is lost, which is "to manifest Christ to Israel," or to the whole visible church. It must, therefore, be administered in the most public manner, in order that Christ and his benefits may be represented and exhibited to all. The same remarks are applicable to the Lord's Supper, the one being intended to *manifest* Christ to Israel, the other to *shew forth* his death till he come. 2d, That baptism is rightly administered by

pouring or sprinkling water on the person. It is calculated in this manner eminently to *manifest Christ*, for the smallness of the quantity of water used shews that it is designed for nothing else than a sign. In like manner, persons at the Lord's table do not take a full meal as if it was intended for the refreshment of the body, but only a morsel of bread and a taste of wine, which carry in them the very nature of a sign. When the whole body in baptism is immersed in water, it loses the nature of a sign, and approaches or becomes assimilated to an ordinary bodily refreshment; but when a small quantity of water is poured or sprinkled, all who witness the action perceive that it not designed for the health of the body, but to represent unseen blessings, viz. Christ and his benefits. Accordingly, in reference to baptism, God thus promised the influences of his holy Spirit, "I will *sprinkle* clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean," &c. And again, "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." Lastly, that the great end of baptism may be gained as well by the baptism of infants as of adults. When the Philippian jailer was baptized, he and all his, and when the household of Stephanas were baptized, Christ was as much manifested by the baptism of the children as of the parents. The silent but impressive language of the ordinance, when infants are the subjects of it, is, "that we are filthy and polluted by nature, and that there is cleansing virtue in the blood of Christ for us."—*Pres. Mag.* R. K. E.

ART. VII. *Moral Influence of Universalism.**

A man recently died in a town not a 100 miles from Salem, whose life was cut short in the midst of his days, by intemperance. He had, for several years, been habituated to excessive indulgence in intoxicating liquors, which were obviously undermining his constitution, till in the last period of his life his indulgence in his ruinous vice became more frequent and unrestrained, and finished the work of destruction which had been previously going on. He was a decided Universalist, or in other words his opinion was, that moral conduct in this life has no connexion with our condition after death, and that however vile and guilty a person may be in this world, he will, upon his entrance into the next, be immediately taken to the society of the saints in Heaven, and be rewarded equally with those who have been the most virtuous and holy of men. His conduct corresponded with these principles. He believed that drunkards and tipplers will inherit the kingdom of heaven, and he acted on the belief. At his funeral a Universalist preacher was called to preach a sermon. The text was from Romans xiv. 18; For whether we live, we live unto the Lord, or whether we die, we die unto the Lord; whether we live therefore, or die, we are the Lord's. The preacher, with the usual skill of his sect, applied it to all men, though the Apostle had exclusive reference to Christians. Whether the learned preacher thought that the Apostle addressed his remarks to all mankind, or that the word Romans meant all people, or that saints to whom he was speaking, Romans i. 7, included drunkards as well as sober and holy men, or whether, happening to light on some words which seemed to favor his doctrine, he dragged them into the support of his cause without enquiring on what occasion, or to whom they were uttered, I do not know: but he applied the passage to the deceased and made it the foundation of consolation to the surviving friends. The intemperate man had

* It is proper to state that the writer here does not allude to that sect who are denominated 'Restorationists,' but that which is called 'ultra Universalism.'

gone to heaven: he had not lived unto himself, but unto the Lord; and he had died unto the Lord. Upon this I offer the following remarks:

1. We see the demoralizing influence of Universalism. An immoral man embraces the opinion that there will be no punishment for sin in the future world: that all, without respect to character and conduct in this life, will be released from suffering at death, and taken immediately to heaven, or at the resurrection. Upon a comparison of the pleasure which he thinks he shall derive from the opposite courses of virtue and vice, he decides in favor of the former. And he has nothing to fear beyond death, for heaven is just as certain to him as to the man of piety and virtue. If he is told, as was the man whose death I have announced, that his habits will shorten his days, the reflection immediately arises, then I shall obtain heaven so much the sooner. After a debauch carried through the week, if his reflections happen to be made a little gloomy by the stillness and restraints of the Sabbath, he has only to repair to a Universalist house of worship, and hear the glad tidings of great joy, that drunkards and thieves, and all sorts of vile persons, shall inherit the kingdom of God, and his fears subside, his conscience is at ease, and he is braced up for another week's work of sin. If one of his companions in sin has life cut short, and dies a miserable victim to his vices, and some natural fears are awakened in his bosom by the awful providence, let him go to the funeral and hear a pretended minister of Christ thank God that another saint has gone to rest, and let him hear that the wretched sinner lived to the Lord, and died to the Lord, and is the Lord's, and will be made happy forever: and if his conscience and his fears are not pacified his faith must be weak indeed.

2. We see why drunkards and tipplers are generally friendly to Universalism; and haters to orthodoxy. The latter hold up to them the terrors of the Lord beyond the grave; it points the incorrigible drunkard to that hell where the fire will not be quenched and bids him break off his transgressions if he would escape the wrath to come. But Universalism tells him that this is all superstition, the dream of fanatic priests: that what he suffers here for his sins is all that he will experience or need to fear; and that if he can manage to get along with the present consequences of his vice; if the pleasure of his cup outweighs in his estimation the loss which he incurs, and the evil which he suffers in the body, he need give himself no further trouble. If in the delirium of a drunken debauch, he should come reeling home at night, as some have done, and murder his wife and family, and then cut his own throat to escape the gallows, what then—why they would all go to rest together: his children would no longer cry for bread; his wife would no longer weep and freeze over a scanty fire, and sit late at night dreading the approach of a wild beast from the grog shop, and ruminating in heart-broken agonies, over the joys of bygone days. Is it to be wondered at that Universalism is popular with drunkards?

3. We see the gross inconsistency of those Universalist preachers who advocate the cause of temperance. They in common with others, will expatiate on the guilt and mischiefs of intemperance,—point to poverty, ruin, and disgrace, to which it conducts its victims, and then promise the drunkard an eternity of happiness in heaven, although he might die in a fit of intoxication, yea, though he should die by his own hand, and should be found bathed in his own blood, and that of all his family. They threaten him with the loss of a little worldly property, but promise him everlasting riches; they threaten him with transient disgrace on earth, but hold out to him the eternal honour; they tell him he will cut short his natural life, but encourage with the assurance of immortal life of bliss beyond the grave; they will come to his funeral and sing a requiem over his grave, and thank God that he has escaped hell and gone to heaven. What inconsistency.

what absurdity. It is like attempting to deter a miser from an unwise course, by threatening him with the loss of a dollar, and promising him ten million in its stead. They betray as much ignorance of the law of the mind as of scriptural interpretation.

4. We see why Universalism does not reform.—Since the day it was first preached no man has been made better by it. It holds out a premium for all sorts of vice and ungodliness. For the drunkard, the thief, the murderer, it has no terrors beyond this life. Without any penitence, without any virtue, death is rest to him. He falls asleep in Christ: he breathes out his soul into the hands of God; and angels and glorified spirits welcome him to their society. Go and preach Universalism to gamblers, to thieves, to profane swearers, drunkards; tell them there is no judgment, no hell; but what they see and suffer here, or what the wicked Jews suffered eighteen hundred years ago; that if they die without penitence, with all their sins and guilt cleaving to them, they will be safe, happy forever; let them believe that a preacher will deliver a eulogy at their funerals, and number them among the saints—and when will they be reformed? You might as well expect to draw out the fangs of a rattlesnake by the music of a fiddle. Such a thing as a reform through such an influence never was accomplished; it never will; it never can be, till all the laws of the human mind are reversed.—*Landmark.*

ART. VIII. *Jenkyn on the Atonement.*

On the extent of the Atonement, in its relation to God and the Universe. By THOMAS W. JENKYN. With an introduction, by the Rev. DANIEL L. CARROLL, Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Brooklyn, N. Y. Boston, pp. 334. 1835.

This book is, in itself, a very trifling affair, and would not have been noticed at all, but for its "Introduction by the Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church at Brooklyn;" and, what has pained us still more, the publication of some of his most extravagant terms of praise, on the cover of the *Missionary Herald*. The most striking peculiarity of the book is its almost total disregard to Scriptural authority. Scriptural language is sometimes introduced, but it is only to improve the sound, or turn a period. Strange as it may seem, here is a professed and extended treatise on the Atonement, in which there is not the slightest allusion to any of those words by which the sacred writers have described it, nor even an attempt at a critical exegesis of any term or phrase whatever, in the Bible. Without any embarrassing diffidence or hesitation, the author launches out into the subject, as if gifted with a plenary inspiration to inform the church what is and what is not the atonement, untrammelled by the authority of Scripture, or the formalities of logic. And yet, like all writers of his class, he is forever harping upon "human systems," "departure from apostolical simplicity," and "the progress of the new *Scriptural* theology."

Another feather of the book is, its constant and wanton misrepresentations of the opinions of others. We had intended to give specimens, but cannot, for want of room. To quote every instance would be to republish a large part of the volume; and as to reference, we need only say, one cannot look amiss. In connexion with his misrepresentations, should be mentioned, his perpetual cant of a "commercial atonement." He rings his changes upon these terms, till the reader sickens with the pointless repetition.

The definiteness and precision of his ideas may be estimated from his observations on the nature of moral government.

"We keep our oxen to the plough by *physical force*, but we keep the

ploughman at his work by *moral government*; that is, by giving him sufficient motives and inducements." p. 127.

"Physical force can never become an element of a moral government. In proportion as force enters it, it ceases to be a moral government. *The more freedom there is in a government, the more purely moral it is.*" p. 127.

Ergo, whatever acts without physical constraint, whether man or dog, is under a moral government!

The following will serve the purpose of showing what Dr. Carroll calls "clear, cogent *argument*, absolutely irrefutable." We quote it precisely as it stands, italics, capitals, dashes, and all.

"Evil is not the product of mind. Sin is not the result of design and arrangement. Suppose I were to say that the annihilation of the world would be an act of Omnipotence; I should be speaking what is absurd; for I should make almighty power to act—for what? *to do nothing*. It is highly inconsistent to suppose Omnipotence, in effort or at work, to produce—*nothing*. And it is as inconsistent, though we may not perceive the incongruity so distinctly, to suppose evil to be the product of mind, and purpose, and decree in God. God does nothing but *good*. To purpose *not* to do good is to purpose to do NO-thing, and a purpose *to do* NO-thing is surely NO purpose, NO decree; that is, the absence, or the reverse of good, is not the product of design, evil is not the result of arrangement." p. 89.

"Gainsay it who can."

"As it is a general impression, that an event to be certain must be decreed, I crave the indulgence of a few lines, even at the charge of meta-physical prolixity, to show that *an event may be certain without being decreed*. The whole is greater than its part:" (this an *event*!) "two straight lines cannot enclose a space: one and two will not make four: if two mountains are created, there must be a valley between them. No decree can make these things otherwise." p. 98.

As a specimen of the Calvinism recommended by a Presbyterian minister to the Presbyterian church, we subjoin the following extracts.

"It should not be evaded nor blinked, that the divine plans are susceptible of failures. It is a morbid squeamishness that makes us afraid to avow what are daily matters of fact. This failure has taken place in creation. It takes place in Providence.—It takes place in the atonement, &c. p. 105. This assertion may sound startling, but try to evade it as you may, you cannot avoid the conclusion, that the moral government of free agents, in a state of trial, *must* be susceptible of failures. It is a **FACT** that such failures have taken place; and to attempt to wrest or alter this fact, is to try to change the universe." p. 92.

"The various dispensations of probation are various experiments in moral government, in which God submits his own plans and ways to the acceptance, and for the use of free agents. These dispensations, or experiments, are capable of failure. The Eden experiment failed—and the Sinai experiment failed. Such susceptibility of failure has been shown to be incidental to a moral government and a state of trial." p. 97.

The author's style is worthy of his logic and theology.

"Sin would have become the pilot of wrecks, without a shore to stand on—the Polyphemus of a valley of dry bones; the real Upas of the universe." p. 27.

"Nature, Providence, and Grace, are three immense wheels in our machinery, the cogs and revolutions of each catching and influencing those of the others, *and all put in motion by the blood of the great atonement.*" p. 135.

The blood of Christ has been often trampled on by reckless rhetoricians, but never more grossly than in this revolting metaphor. That Dr. Car-

roll should admire and imitate the style of such a writer, is not at all surprising; but it is surprising that he should have exposed himself to the charge of ignorance, by bringing such exploded errors forward as original, and extravagantly lauding, as unheard of and unanswerable, what has been repeatedly advanced and answered within fifteen-years. One might suppose, from the Doctor's language, that the church had but just discovered that the atoning death of Christ was an important doctrine, and that, for this discovery, we are indebted to the author of the present treatise. We have no right to prescribe what Dr. Carroll shall be startled and surprised at; *omne ignotum pro magnifico*—but we cannot sympathize with him, either in his lamentations over the ignorance of past ages, or his exultation at the discoveries of the present, respecting “the great wonders of the crucifixion.”

“It is matter of deep regret, that the time and thought, the patience and labour, the intellectual acumen and strength, which, in ages past, have been employed on trifles, or worse than wasted, had not been concentrated on those wonders of the crucifixion which ‘angels desire to look into.’” p. 9.

“But this illusion will not continue long.” God is “training his church to those views of truth befitting her era of coming glory.” p. 10.

“The whole intellect of the church must gather round Calvary and tax its gigantic energies in grasping the magnitude, and tracing the relations of that one offering for sin which the Son of God made of himself there.” p. 11.

“The intellect of the church shall be yet trained to see the atonement in a new and celestial light, and in new and mightier relations to earth and to the universe.” p. 11.

“There are yet reserved, glories of infinite mercy, which some mind, favoured of God, shall discover and disclose to the world.” p. 11.

The “gigantic intellect” which has opened the way to these brilliant discoveries, is that of T. W. Jenkyn, whose book is thus described.

“It is a book which may emphatically be said to contain the ‘seeds of things’; the elements of mightier and nobler combinations of thought, respecting the sacrifice of Christ, than any modern production.” p. 13.

“Characterized by highly original and dense trains of thought, which make the reader feel he is holding communion with a mind that can ‘mingle with the universe.’” p. 13.

“This volume will prove a star in the east to guide the ‘wise men’ again to the incarnate suffering Redeemer.” p. 15.

“The author has opened a vast and rich mine of thought connected with the atonement, where the *improved mental machinery of the age* may ply its powers with prodigious effect.” p. 15.

“The propositions of the author,” he says, “are confirmed by a train of clear, cogent argument, absolutely irrefutable.” He boldly challenges any body “to show the fallacy of the author’s reasoning.” “After a careful perusal, let any gainsay it who can.” “It will set the long and fiercely agitated question respecting the extent of the atonement, completely at rest”; a book, in short, “for which posterity will thank the author to the latest ages.”

These extracts need no comment. The samples which we have given, both of the book and Introduction, will illustrate one another. Nor do we think it necessary, in a case so plain, even to mention the discordance of the sentiments advanced in the one, and recommended in the other, with the standards of our church. Even he that runs may read it. We shall conclude by stating, that Mr. T. W. Jenkyn, in a note, refers to “four Sermons of Dr. Beman on the Atonement,” as a wonderful performance, containing what Lord Bacon calls the “seeds of things.” And well might he say so: for they contain the “seeds” of every thing in his

own treatise. What Dr. Beman put into four ordinary sermons, and Dr. Murdock into one, Mr. Jenkyn has contrived to dilute with words, till it has swelled to a volume of three hundred and thirty-four pages. This may explain what his American patron and admirer means by "highly original and dense-trains of thought, which make the reader feel he is holding communion with a mind that can mingle with the universe."

[The above Review is from the *Biblical Repertory*, for October, 1835. Having cursorily glanced at the work reviewed, we agree with the *Repertory* in calling it a trifling affair, and unworthy of notice. Mr. Jenkyn is an English divine of the new School. And it seems that his book has been naturalized by Dr. Carroll, of Brooklyn, a Presbyterian Minister in high standing, in the General Assembly. But should not Dr. Carroll be held responsible for the contents of a book which he has so highly recommended, and whose author he has praised in such a fulsome manner? He has virtually made the errors of the book in question; his own. In this light he must be viewed by all candid men. But is it not surprising to hear Presbyterians speak of one another as the *Repertory* speaks of this Dr. Carroll, and there allow the matter to rest? Has discipline in the General Assembly given up the ghost? How nugatory to attempt a reformation in that church, while such audacious heretics are suffered to pass with impunity! And how partial, if not invidious, must it not appear in the eyes of other denominations, when they see an attempt made to exercise discipline in a certain place, on Albert Barnes, while Beman and Finney and Carroll and others, still greater heretics, are allowed to remain in the same church unmolested! "The legs of the lame are not equal."] ED. R. L. MON.

ART. IX. *Ecclesiastical Proceedings.*

SYNOD OF PHILADELPHIA; case of Mr. Barnes, and the Af-finity Presbytery.

"The committee appointed to bring in a minute in the case of appeal from the (As-sembly's) 2d Presbytery of Philadelphia, wherein George Junkin is Appellant and Albert Barnes Appellee, submit the following report and resolutions.

This case has been brought up regularly by appeal, as reported by the Judicial Com-mittee of Synod, and unanimously resolved by the Synod itself.

The original parties, namely, Dr. Junkin and Mr. Barnes being called on, answered that they were ready personally to proceed with the cause.

Subsequently the (Assembly's) 2d Presbytery being called on for their records of this case, when tried by it, refused to produce them; and upon being formally ordered to lay them on the table, still refused to allow the Synod the possession of their records. Upon this, the Appellee (Mr. Barnes) put in a paper pleading to the jurisdiction of Synod, and declining the trial, and withdrew from the Synod.

Thereupon the Synod passed orders that the Presbytery had acted disorderly, &c. and censuring them therefor; that the Synod still found itself in circumstances to pro-ceed to trial; and that Mr. Barnes' paper and the plea contained therein, was no bar to the regular issuing of the case.

Then the Appellant was fully heard. The Appellee was called and did not appear. The members of the (Assembly's) 2d Presbytery of Philadelphia, being called on for explanations of their decision; put in a formal refusal. The roll of members was called, and this committee directed to prepare a minute.

1. That the appeal was orderly and regular, and ought to have been brought to this Synod, and issued by it, is apparent, from the reasoning and references in the minute censuring the Presbytery, and from the VII. Chap. 3, Sec. and 6 sub. sec. Discipline; and Chap. XI. Sec. 4, Form of Government. The duty thus regularly laid upon this Synod, by the Appellant, with the approval, as appears to us, in the first instance, both of the Appellee and the lower court, we seemed called on to perform by the voice of the whole church, by the just expectation of the General Assembly, by faithfulness to the parties, to the world, to our own souls, and to God!

2. The refusal of the Presbytery to produce the records, could not operate to arrest the trial. 1st, Because, as is evident from the records of this body in this case, there was laid before Synod all the proof offered by the Appellant in the court below, as also copies of the charges and sentence. 2d. It is not believed that the Appellee offered any proof, technically so called, in the lower court. 3d. It is certain, that if he did offer any proof, it was only what is printed in his "Notes on the Epistle to the Romans," out of which also, every word of proof offered by the Appellant in the lower court, and this also, was taken. But 4th. this refusal of the Presbytery to send up its records, is contrary to its clear duty, defined in Chap. X. Sec. 3. Form of Govern-ment, and Chap. VII. Sec. 3, and Sub. Sec. 16 of Discipline; and to the spirit and in- tent of the act of the General Assembly of 1835, relative to the dissolution of the Sy-

nod of Delaware. 5th. The conduct of the stated Clerk of that Presbytery, in refusing the Appellant an attested copy of the record in this case, expressly violated the general command laid on him by Chap. XX. of Form of Government, and the equally express personal right secured to the Appellant by Chap. IV. Sec. 16. of Discipline. And the conduct of both the Presbytery and its stated Clerk, is contrary to Chap. VII. Sec. 1. Sub. Sec. 1, of Discipline; by all which references under this (5th) head, the conduct of the Presbytery and Clerk, are proven to be foreseen and provided for, as treated by this body. See also Chap. IV. Sec. 10, 15 and 16, of Discipline.

3. Upon the refusal of the Presbytery and Clerk, to send the records in the orderly way, or to furnish the appellant with a copy on application, it was the part of the appellant, not of Synod, to decline the trial. Any defect of regular proof would tend directly, to his defeat, and possible condemnation. (See chap. v. sec. 7 Discipline, and chap. vii. sec. 3. sub section 14.) Besides, the principles of *additional proof*, are settled in chap. ix. Discipline *passim*. And in chap. vii. sec. 1. sub sec. 1, 5 and 5 of discipline the principles are clearly laid down, how this body should in cases of imperfect, or fraudulent records, or the total absence of all records, get at the truth of the case. And further, it is well settled that in the absence of the best proof, even admitting that case to be ours, that which is next best shall be admitted. Especially when this Synod and the appellant used every proper means to obtain the supposed better proof, which is suppressed contumaciously by the co-Presbyters of the appellee, not only without regular complaint, but according to his own statements to the Synod, without any disapproval by him of the principles, or the particular act, of that Presbytery.

4. When the appellee put in his plea to the jurisdiction of this Synod, and that plea was overruled, he ought regularly to have submitted and tried the appeal. And by so doing would have retained not only the right of appeal, which by refusal to submit to trial he has lost (chap. vii. sec. 3. sub sec. 2 Discipline;) but after the conclusion of the trial here, might have appealed from the whole, or any part of the doings of Synod in the case; (chap. vii. sec. 3. sub. sec 4, Discipline.) That the refusal of the Appellee to proceed with the case, should not have arrested the cause, is apparent; *first*, because the Appellant proceeded at his peril, and had a right to insist on proceeding; *second*, the Appellee was safe undefended, unless the Appellant could fully make out his cause, which the Appellee and the court below, declared he could not do, without the record suppressed by that court; *third*, this conduct of the Appellee was highly contumacious, and he could have no right to take advantage of his own wrong; and *lastly*, the case is fully provided for, and the principles on which our ecclesiastical courts shall proceed, in the contumacious, or voluntary absence of parties, laid down in our standards, (see chap. vii. sec. 3 and sub sec. 3 and 4. Discipline, for the *real* grounds of appeals; and same chapter and section and sub sections 15, for the real effect of appeals; and as to refusal of parties, chap. iv. sec. 10, 11. 13. Discipline.)

5. That this Synod has full power and authority finally to determine this case is manifest. The powers of a Presbytery as compared with the powers of a Synod, and the duties of each will appear by comparing chap. x. sec. 3, with chap. xi. sec. 1. and 4, of the Form of Government. The duties of this Synod as to appeals, are to *receive and issue them* (chap. xi, sec. 4, Form of Government.) What is meant by *issuing*, is obvious from the last clause of chap. vii. sec. 3, sub sec. 15, Discipline. That the authority of Synod covers the whole case, is apparent from chap. vii. sec. 3, sub 10, and chap. iv. sec. 17, Discipline. Therefore,

Resolved, 1. That in view of the proof presented to Synod, and of the whole case, the decision of the (Assembly's) 2d Presbytery of Philadelphia, in the case of the charges of the said Geo. Junkin against the said Albert Barnes, be and the same hereby is *reversed*, as contrary to truth and righteousness, and the appeal declared to be sustained.

2. That some of the errors alleged in the charges to be held by the said Albert Barnes are fundamental; and all of them contrary to the standards of the Presbyterian church, in the United States; and that they do contravene the system of truth therein taught, and set forth in the word of God.

3. That the said Albert Barnes be, and he hereby is, suspended from the exercise of all the functions proper to the gospel ministry, until he shall retract the errors hereby condemned, and give satisfactory evidence of repentance."

After some discussion of this minute the Synod adjourned till 8½ o'clock to-morrow morning—concluded with prayer.

Wednesday morning, 8½ o'clock.

Synod according to adjournment met and was opened with prayer. The minutes of yesterday were read and corrected.—The Synod resumed the unfinished business of last evening, that is the final minute in the case of Mr. Barnes.—The paper was taken up by paragraphs and on motion, the first two resolutions were adopted.

Dr. Breckinridge moved to strike out the third resolution of the paper, for the purpose of substituting the following, viz :

Resolved, However, that from a desire to avoid even the *appearance of injustice or rashness*, on the part of this Synod, that in this state of the business, we refer it to the next General Assembly, to decide what judgment shall be rendered in this case; and respectfully petition them to pass such sentence as they may deem most conducive to the glory of God, and the purity and peace of the Church.

The division of the question was called for, and the ayes and noes being taken on the motion for striking out, were as follows:

Ayes—14.—*Noes*—115.—*Non Liquet*—1.

So the motion for striking out the 3d resolution was lost. The 3d resolution was then adopted. The question on the whole minute in the case of Mr. Barnes being taken, was decided in the affirmative.

Ayes—116.—*Noes*—31.—*Non Liquets*—2.—*Excused from voting*—8.

The following paper was presented by the subscribers, and ordered to go on the minutes, viz:

“The undersigned, who were excused from voting, and those who voted against the adoption of the resolution suspending the Rev. A. Barnes, beg permission to have the following explanation entered on the minutes of Synod, to wit, that their object was to procure the adoption of the following resolution which was offered as a substitute, viz:

Resolved, However, that from a desire to avoid even the *appearance of injustice or rashness*, on the part of this Synod, that in this state of the business we refer it to the next General Assembly, to decide what judgment should be rendered in this case, and respectfully petition them to pass such sentence as they may deem most conducive to the glory of God, and the purity and peace of the Church.

John McDowell, P. F. Phelps, William Neill, Robert B. Belville, J. M. Olmstead, G. W. Musgrave, John Breckinridge, J. C. Watson, J. L. Dinwiddie, Henry R. Wilson, Joseph Barr.

At the request of Dr. Laurie the Synod agreed to permit the following note in explanation of his vote on the minute in the case of Mr. Barnes, viz: That he had intimated after the minute was handed in by him as the Chairman of the Committee, that he did not entirely agree with the Committee in the 3d Resolution: that he doubted the right of the Synod to act as proposed by the resolution, and did not recollect any precedents for so acting, and that he would have preferred sending down the case to the Presbytery to which Mr. Barnes might belong, with instructions to suspend him from the functions of the Christian ministry, if he should not renounce his errors—he therefore declined voting on the final question.

The Synod at 2 P. M. agreed to have recess for one hour.

3 o'clock, P. M.

The Synod after recess met, and resumed business.

Ordered that the Stated Clerk deliver to Mr. Barnes an authenticated copy of the minute in his case.

The following paper was presented by Mr. Barnes, viz.
To the Moderator of the Synod of Philadelphia.

The undersigned begs leave respectfully to inform you, and through you, the Synod over which you preside, that he does hereby appeal from your decision passed this day, whereby you have suspended him from the exercise of the functions of a Gospel minister; and that he will complain of the same to the next General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States. The reasons of the complaint and appeal he will submit to you within ten days from the rising of the Synod. ALBERT BARNES.

The Synod then proceeded to take up the subject of a reorganization of the Presbyteries of Philadelphia, when the Assembly's 2d Presbytery presented the following paper, viz:

“Whereas this Presbytery have no desire to oppose the wishes of their brethren and to excite uneasiness by continuing to operate without geographical limits; and whereas it is manifest that as long as no such limits are distinctly defined for us we shall be suspected and accused of overlapping the territory of other Presbyteries, and thus give occasion for jealousies and suspicion, therefore,

“*Resolved*, That this Presbytery pray Synod to continue them in existence agreeably to the following regulations, viz.

“1. All the ministers and churches now connected with us to remain in their present relation till they signify their desire to withdraw from it.

“2. The boundaries of the Presbytery to be as follows, viz. East, a line running from the Delaware along Tenth street as far as Coates' street, and thence to the township line road where it intersects Broad street, and along said road to the southern boundary of Montgomery county, including all between said lines and the river Schuylkill; and also the whole of the counties of Berks and Schuylkill, and as much of Chester and Philadelphia counties as lies north of the Conestoga turnpike road from Morgantown to the Lancaster turnpike road, and along this latter road to the Schuylkill permanent bridge.

A true extract,

GEORGE DUFFIELD, Clerk of Presbytery.

A motion was made to grant the above petition, when it was resolved to introduce the following as a substitute, viz :

Resolved, 1st. That the Assembly's 2d Presbytery be, and it hereby is dissolved, and that all the Churches, Ministers, Licentiates and Candidates belonging to it are hereby directed to make application as soon as possible, for admission into the Presbyteries, within the bounds of which, each of said Churches, Ministers, Licentiates, and Candidates, may reside or be situated.

Resolved, 2d. That the stated Clerk of the Assembly's 2d Presbytery is hereby directed to cause all the papers and records of and belonging to said Presbytery, to be placed without delay in the hands of the stated Clerk of the Presbytery of Philadelphia; who is hereby directed to cause an attested copy of said records to be made out and placed in the hands of the stated Clerk of the Synodical 2d Presbytery at the expense of the last named Presbytery.

Resolved, 3d. That every Church, Minister, Licentiate, and Candidate who shall not apply for admission to the Presbytery, within whose bounds each may reside or be situated, at or before the next semi annual meeting of said Presbyteries in the spring of 1836, every such Church, Minister, Licentiate, and Candidate is hereby declared to be, *de facto*, cut off from the communion of the Presbyterian Church, unless prevented from so doing by some providential or other insurmountable obstacle.

The above resolutions were adopted.

SYNOD OF CINCINNATI; case of Dr. Beecher.

"Tuesday afternoon, the appeal of J. L. Wilson, D. D., in the case of Lyman Beecher, D. D., was called up. After recess, Dr. Wilson commenced his speech, and continued until adjournment. He also occupied all of Wednesday, until about 7 P. M., when Dr. Beecher began his reply. Dr. Beecher closed his defence the next day, at 3 P. M. Dr. Wilson responded, and then the case was submitted without argument from the Presbytery. The following minute was finally adopted by a large majority.

Resolved, That the appeal of Dr. Wilson be sustained :

1st. Because the Synod see nothing in the conduct of Dr. Wilson, in preferring and prosecuting the charges against Dr. Beecher, which ought to infer censure.

2d. Because, although the charges of slander and hypocrisy are not proved; and although Synod see nothing in his views as explained by himself, to justify any suspicion of unsoundness in the faith, yet on the subject of the depraved nature of man, and of total depravity, and the work of the Holy Spirit in effectual calling, and the subject of ability, they are of opinion that Dr. Beecher has indulged a disposition to philosophize, instead of exhibiting in simplicity and plainness the doctrines as taught in the Scriptures, and has employed terms and phrases, and modes of illustration, calculated to convey ideas inconsistent with the word of God and our Confession of Faith, and that he ought to be, and hereby is, admonished to be more guarded in future.

When the decision was announced, Dr. Beecher said, that the discourse chiefly objected to was written in Connecticut some ten years ago, before the present controversy had arisen in the church, and with reference to a local exigency, and that both the sermons were written before he was a member of the Presbyterian church, and that he penned it with reference to the aspect of the Arminian and Unitarian controversy, as it existed in New England at the time, and that generally, the language of the sermons was familiar to that part of the church, and not liable to be misunderstood: and so far as he knew, the sermons were never misunderstood or complained of, but generally approved. That had the same subjects been discussed at the West, they would doubtless have been written with reference to their being understood and adapted to the exigencies of the church at the West, and at the present time. And that in his official instructions in preparing young men for the ministry, nothing lay nearer his heart, before the advice of the Synod, than to eradicate the offensive technics of any school or party, and secure the preaching of the gospel in this day of strife, in language that does not offend and cannot be easily misunderstood; and that the energy of his purpose would now be doubled in the execution of work in which he hoped he might have the prayers and earn the confidence of his ministerial brethren, and the officers and members of the churches.

The parties being called in, Dr. Beecher declared his ready acquiescence in the decision of the Synod, and his determination conformably to their admonition; whereupon it was resolved,

1st. That the Synod express their entire satisfaction with the aforementioned acquiescence and determination of Dr. Beecher, and are happy in believing that nothing insuperable remains to prevent his usefulness, or impair confidence in him as a minister of the gospel, in the Presbyterian church.

2d. That Dr. Beecher be, and he is hereby requested, to have published, at as early a day as possible, in pamphlet form, a concise statement of the argument and design of his sermon on native depravity, and of his views of total depravity, original sin, and regeneration, agreeably to his declaration and explanation made before Synod.

Dr. Wilson gave notice of appeal to the General Assembly, but said, in certain contingencies, he should not prosecute it.—*Cincinnati Journal*.

SYNOD OF KENTUCKY ; Huber's case.

"This case occupied a considerable share of the attention of Synod. It came up by complaint of a minority of the Louisville Presbytery and others, against the decision of said Presbytery, in the case of brother Joseph Huber, pastor of the church at Shelbyville. After considerable discussion, the subject was disposed of by the adoption of the following : "The Synod having carefully considered the case of brother Huber, who has married his deceased wife's sister, do give it as their solemn judgment, that such marriages are clearly contrary to our Confession of Faith, as well as the principles laid down in God's word—are altogether improper and unlawful, and demand the strongest discouragement and censure from all who regard the purity of families, as well as the peace and purity of the church. The Synod cannot but regard these marriages as displeasing in the sight of God, and calculated to call down his punishment on the parties engaged in them.

The Synod do therefore *Resolve*, That brother Huber be solemnly rebuked for the sin which he committed in marrying his deceased wife's sister; and that our churches be solemnly warned against the sin of such marriages."—*Cincinnati Journal*.

[*Quere?* After brother Huber was solemnly rebuked for his sin, was he permitted, by the Rev. Synod, to continue to live on in the bed of incestuous uncleanness?]

ED. REL. MON.

ASSOCIATE REFORMED SYNOD OF NEW-YORK. This body met at Broadalbin, Sept. 4, 1835 ; and among their published proceedings we find the following :

"The Synod entered upon the resolutions offered by Dr. McJimsey, respecting an improved version of the Psalms.

After amendments, the preamble and resolutions were adopted and are as follows :

The Synod, taking into consideration the actual state and prospects of the church, in relation to the psalmody to be used in the social and public worship of God, in singing his praises, deem it to be their duty to declare, and by this act do declare, to the churches under their care, their unshaken attachment and adherence to the principle of a scriptural psalmody, as recognized in the constitution and standards of the Associate Reformed church. (p. 406,7.) But to prevent mistaken or erroneous views on this important subject, the Synod deem it no less a duty which they owe to the church, and the purity of divine worship, in singing the praise of God, to declare, that adherence to a scriptural psalmody, is, by no means, inconsistent with efforts, on the part of the church, to procure an enlarged and improved metrical version of the Book of Psalms, so as to embrace a greater extent and variety of metre. While the metrical version now in use in our churches, is justly held in high estimation by the Synod ; and it is by no means their design or wish to lay it aside in singing the praises of God in his social or public worship ; yet it is believed that, in some respects, it is capable of improvement ; as no person, in consistence with truth, can maintain that the mere versification of the Psalms into metre is of divine inspiration. But the improvement referred to, and which seems desirable in the present circumstances of the church, relates to greater variety of metre, and the change of a few obsolete words and phrases, in our present version, so as to render the sense of the inspired Psalms, more intelligible, and the poetical version, in some instances, more smooth and harmonious : and for the attainment of so desirable an object, the following resolutions are submitted to the consideration of Synod :

Resolved, That a committee be appointed to procure a version of the inspired Book of Psalms, so as to embrace a greater variety of metres, retaining our present version, with such amendments as, in a few instances, will render the metre more harmonious, and the sense equally near the original.

Resolved, That those sister churches which are now in the use of our present version, be requested to co-operate with this Synod, in preparing the contemplated version ; and, if they deem it proper, to appoint a committee to co-operate with a committee of this Synod on this subject, so that, by means of our united counsels and exertions, a scripture system of Psalmody may be prepared, which, with the blessing of the Head of the church, may promote the edification and comfort of the church at large.

Drs. McCarroll, McJimsey, A. Proudfit, and Rev. J. F. McLaren, were appointed the committee, in accordance with these resolutions, with directions to report at next meeting, of Synod.

Ordered, That the Clerk transmit copies of the foregoing resolutions, to the Associate Reformed Synods of the West and South ; to the Associate Synod ; and to the Reformed Presbyterian Synod.

ART. X. Notices.

TO THE PATRONS OF THE RELIGIOUS MONITOR.

It is with no ordinary feelings that the subscriber is now called upon in the orderings of divine providence, to take leave of the Patrons of the Religious Monitor, after an acquaintance of nearly twelve years. The connection which he has hitherto sustained to this work has been dissolved, and its sole management entrusted to the hands of the Rev. James Martin. While it is painful to part with friends, whose confidence, and generous support has been so long enjoyed, it is also gratifying to know that the work is still to be continued under more encouraging circumstances than ever. It is now placed in the hands of a gentleman possessing the fullest confidence of the church, as a faithful minister, already favourably known to the public as an author, and whose attachment to the Secession cause will not be questioned.

The subscriber is confident that no man, if all the circumstances be duly weighed, ever enjoyed a more cordial and disinterested support, than has been awarded to him for the last twelve years. And this circumstance has left an impression on his mind, which cannot be effaced; and which will furnish matter for consoling reflection in the darkest times of trial and adversity. And that which renders this circumstance doubly cheering is the fact, as is believed, that the support which has been awarded to the Religious Monitor, has been a manifestation of unquenchable attachment to the despised and persecuted, yet glorious cause of a Covenanted Reformation.

In thus taking farewell of Christian brethren, it is hoped that all who may consider themselves as having received cause of offence by any thing said in the pages of the Monitor, will remember that "to err is human; to forgive divine." It is probable that many things in the heat of controversy may have been said, which had been better omitted; and the subscriber wishes to be understood as expressing his regret for any thing of that character. Only one thing of the character alluded to, is at present particularly recollected, viz, a note appended to page 113, of the 11th volume, which relates to the Rev. Dr. Bruce, of Pittsburgh. The reflection upon the Dr. contained in that note, is believed to be unjust and unmerited. And although Dr. Bruce has made no complaint to the subscriber, yet he regards himself as in duty bound, to make this correction, which is now done with a desire to make the *amende honourable*, which it is believed, will be received in the same spirit, by which it is dictated.

But while the subscriber is anxious to part with his patrons in a spirit of brotherly kindness, yet if any have been offended on account of his efforts made through the pages of the Monitor, to maintain the peculiar principles of the Secession church, he can only say that it is matter for sorrow, but not for explanation. And all such would do well to review their own principles, lest unhappily they should at last be found "false with God, and perfidious in his covenant;" displaying to the world a banner for truth, and directing all their movements against the spread of that truth, or perhaps secretly stabbing it in the dark. Alas, we live in a day when the hedges, which our fathers erected with the expense of much blood and treasure, around the reformation cause, have been taken away, and ravening wolves have entered the sacred enclosure, who, instead of feeding, devour the lambs of Christ.

If any of the readers of the Monitor have at any time been influenced by the perusal of its pages, or if they have found their attachment to sound principles increased or confirmed, it is only necessary to remind such, that they need all the support which may be within their reach, to keep themselves in the love of God. And especially let such remember that innumerable enemies are constantly conspiring to rob them of their profession; and that professed friends, who have no real love to the cause, are of all enemies the most dangerous, because they are the best enabled to obtain you confidence, that they may mislead your judgment. But in such circumstances, it should for ever be borne in mind, that *men may, and often do change, but principles are eternal and immutable.*

In this connection, it should be noticed that the Secession cause appears at present to be more exposed to its enemies by the trimming course of our Associate Reformed brethren, than from any other cause. Professing to adhere to Secession principles, while in practice she denies those principles; maintaining a constitution separate from the General Assembly, while holding occasional communion with that church; and enjoining upon her own people the use of an inspired Psalmody, while her ministers are constantly in the habit of singing Psalms of human composure, whenever they have an opportunity of conducting the public worship in those congregations where a human Psalmody is habitually used; they ought not, and cannot rightly be regarded in any other light than that of a backsliding church. And these facts cause the proposition recently made by the Associate Reformed Synod for a new version of the Psalms to look exceedingly suspicious. That proposal comes from the wrong quarter. Of course no allusion is here made to individuals. That church is here spoken of as a public body, professing to be a witness for Jesus Christ. And in that respect let *Seceders* beware of her pernicious influence, remembering that a little leaven, leaveneth the whole lump.

Finally, as you value peace of conscience in this life, support in death, and glory in heaven, hold fast your profession. Let no man take the crown from you. And may the God of peace that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that Great Shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant, make us all perfect in every good work to do his will, working in us that which is well pleasing in his sight, through Jesus Christ; to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen.

C. WEBSTER.

Albany, Nov. 24, 1835.

The subscriber having become the Proprietor of the **RELIGIOUS MONITOR**, solicits the continued patronage of its former friends. The utility of this work in the Associate Church has been sufficiently tested. As heretofore, it will continue to be devoted to the great interests of truth and holiness, as exhibited in the public profession of that Church. But while there will be no change as to the principles, on which it has hitherto been conducted, some improvement will be aimed at in the intelligence department; and also a more strict attention will be paid to the nature and character of the communications inserted in its pages.

The former Correspondents of the Monitor, are respectfully requested to continue their favours; and it is earnestly hoped, that other Correspondents will lend their aid, by appearing as contributors to its pages. Short, pithy articles, are in general found to be most for the reader's edification. Valuable extracts from printed works, together with interesting items of intelligence, will be thankfully received.

The subscriber flatters himself, that through the assistance of his friends, and that attention which he intends to devote to the Monitor, he will render it worthy the patronage of the religious public, especially the members of the Associate Church; and he confidently expects that such an exertion will be made by those, who feel an interest in having it sustained, as will greatly increase the list of subscribers. It is believed that if any thing like the same exertions were made in behalf of the Monitor, that are made in other religious communities to sustain their respective Periodicals, its number of subscribers would soon be more than doubled.

It is proposed, after the present volume is completed, (should a sufficient number of new subscribers be obtained to warrant it,) to give sixteen additional pages every month, that is, to make each No. contain forty-eight, instead of thirty-two pages; the size of the page to remain as at present. This can be done without any increase of postage, by enlarging the sheet and having it worked off on a *Napier press*. Should this arrangement take place, the Monitor would be one of the cheapest periodicals published in the country. Besides, in such case, there would be an opportunity for giving the work a more miscellaneous character, especially in the intelligence department.

For other particulars connected with the present change in the affairs of the Monitor, the reader is referred to the COVER.

JAMES MARTIN.

Albany, Nov. 24, 1835.

P. S. A few communications are found remaining on hand, concerning which it is proper to state, that from circumstances they are rendered inadmissible. "One of the people," writes sensibly and with force, but as the Synod has disposed of his *subject*, he will see the propriety of suppressing the publication of his communication. The paper signed W. A. though exhibiting marks of a strong mind, and abounding in pithy and excellent remarks, is, nevertheless, from its miscellaneous character, unfit for insertion in its present shape. The long article in answer to *Aspasio*, it is thought, would not be for edification, though it contains much precious matter, against which few could except. Another article from the same pen, in relation to a subject connected with *Covenanting*, will be inserted as soon as it is deemed practicable. J. M.

OBITUARY.—DIED, on the 25th ult. Rev. JAMES IRVINE, Pastor of the 2d Associate Presbyterian Church, in the city of New-York. In the death of this brother the church has sustained a severe loss. He was an eloquent and faithful preacher of Christ's gospel. His success as a minister was unusually great. Though he exercised his sacred office but comparatively a short period, few have had more souls to their ministry. Besides the abundant fruits of his labors while minister in Hebron, he built up in the space of four years, and in the face of much opposition, that numerous and respectable congregation of which he died pastor. His attachment to the principles of the Secession Church was judicious, strong and unwavering. Like other good and faithful ministers he had his enemies, but having forgiven them, he is now and forever beyond the reach of their ineffectual weapons. He has left few his equals behind him in the ministry of reconciliation. We have been intimately acquainted with him for nearly twenty years, and can truly say, that, in his death we have lost a friend and brother. We cannot but mourn his loss. The Church of God, whose servant he was mourns his loss. And above all his amiable and deeply afflicted family mourns his loss. We sincerely sympathize with them, and pray the God of Jacob not to forget the widow and the fatherless in their affliction. Jehovah's language is "Be still and know that I am God." Let us all acquiesce in the wisdom and rectitude of his dispensations; and study to be ourselves prepared for putting off the earthly house of this tabernacle. "What I say unto you, I say unto all, Watch."

THE
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,

AND

EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

JANUARY, 1836.

ART. I. *On hearing the Word—A Sermon.*

“Take heed how ye hear.” LUKE viii. 18.

The parabolical mode of conveying instruction was often resorted to, in antient times. It was thought to possess peculiar advantages, inasmuch as, by it, the most important lessons could be imparted, in a very short, striking and impressive manner. On this account it appeared remarkably suited to the genius of a divine revelation, where comprehensiveness and memorable impression formed a desirable object. Hence, a considerable portion of the oracles of God is found in parables. Our blessed Lord took a peculiar delight in teaching according to this mode, if we may judge from the frequency of his so doing. In the foregoing part of this chapter, the evangelist furnishes us with one of his divine parables, which is exceedingly interesting and highly instructive. By it our Lord designed to represent the preaching of the word in its various effects upon different kinds of gospel hearers. As he informs us himself, the sower sowing his seed represents a preacher of the gospel dispensing the word of life, or sowing the incorruptible seed of the word; and the different kinds of ground on which the seed fell, together with the consequences, represent different classes of individuals in relation to the hearing of the word and the effects which it produces upon them. The parable, then, relating to such a deeply interesting subject, warranted our Lord in giving by way of application this short, but highly sententious exhortation, *Take heed, therefore, how ye hear.*

There are, in general, two things, in the text, which demand attention—

- I. The manner of hearing the word: and
- II. The obligations of the duty.

I. The *manner* of hearing the word first claims our attention. “Take heed *how* ye hear.” On this branch of the subject, I offer the following remarks—

1. *The word is to be heard with due preparation.* The hearers, represented by the good ground in the foregoing parable, are such, says the Saviour, as receive the word in “an honest and good heart.” Hence, we learn that the heart should be prepared beforehand for receiving the seed of the word; and ordinarily speaking it is to those, who diligently attend to such preparation, that the word preached becomes profitable. The heart should be carefully purged of all unreasonable and sinful prejudices.

When this has not been attended to, little benefit need be expected. If any undue bias be allowed to exist, either against the truth of God, the preacher, the people, or the profession, the hearer, although favored with a message of mercy from God, is in danger of rejecting it, yea, of trampling the pearls under his feet. It was owing to the inveterate prejudices of the Jews, that they obtained so little good from the ministry of our Lord, although "he spake as never man spake." Let hearers, then, divest themselves of prejudice, before they attempt the great duty of hearing the word.—And let them also engage in the removal of ignorance. Many people are so wretchedly ignorant, that they can derive but little benefit from the ordinance of preaching. They neglect to improve their minds in a knowledge of the scriptures; they do not read them and meditate upon them; nor converse with others more intelligent than themselves respecting them; neither do they employ such helps as are furnished them for a better understanding of these holy oracles; therefore, when they come to the preaching of the word, being thus enveloped in the gross darkness of wilful ignorance, the preacher is to them a *barbarian*; they understand not what he says, nor whereof he affirms. "The seed of the word is lost upon such ground; it is scattered by the *way side*, and is therefore, picked up by "Satan, the prince of the power of the air." Says Matthew, "when any one heareth the word of the kingdom and understandeth it not, then cometh the wicked one and catcheth away that which was sown in his heart. This is he, who received seed by the *way side*." Great care, then, should be exercised in order to relieve the mind of that ignorance, which hinders the reception of the word and prevents its taking root in the soul.—And a similar care should be used in guarding against the blasting effects of worldly-mindedness. When persons draw near to God, to hear what he will speak by his messengers, it becomes them to shut the world from their hearts. There is surely no room in that heart for the divine seed to vegetate and grow, where the world is lodged. All worldly cares, and worldly schemes, and worldly thoughts, and worldly desires must first be banished from the mind, before God's word can be listened to with pleasure and with profit. If this be not done the seed falls among thorns. Verse 14th, "and that which fell among thorns are they, who, when they have heard go forth, and are choked with cares, and riches, and pleasures of this life, and bring no fruit to perfection."

Again, the heart should be prepared for hearing the word by solemn meditation on the nature and importance of the duty; that it is not an ordinance of man but of the Supreme Lord of heaven and earth; that there is much of divine goodness and condescension manifested in it; that it is an excellent and important means of grace; that it is one of the ways in which God meets, converses and holds communion with his people. And by such meditation the mind should be awakened to a serious and all-absorbing concern respecting the interests of the immortal soul, the salvation of which is deeply involved in the rightful hearing of the word. Indeed there should be a strong love for the word reigning in the heart, and a disposition or willingness of mind to receive it. This appears to have been the case with the noble Bereans; for we are told, that "they received the word with all readiness of mind." Their example in this respect teaches all to go and do likewise.

But further, as a preparatory matter, due attention is to be paid to the motives. Many come to the preaching of the word influenced by base and highly improper motives—to be seen of men; to gratify a vain curiosity; to criticise the performance of the preacher; to make remarks on the appearance of the congregation; to silence the rebukes of a guilty conscience; or to retain privileges in the christian church. But such are likely to be sent empty away. They may indeed find gratification corresponding to the motives by which they are influenced; but their souls

will be little benefitted, and in going away they will have abundant reason for saying with the prophet, "My leanness, my leanness, wo is unto me!" No motives should be allowed to possess the mind and induce to engage in this service, but such as are drawn from the authority of God in appointing this ordinance, his glory as manifested therein, and the welfare of the precious soul, for the sake of which the ordinance was instituted. Hence let hearers of the word look well to their motives.

In addition to all the preparation that has been mentioned there is yet another thing of vast importance, and which ought by no means to be neglected—I mean prayer. This is a necessary preparatory exercise in order to hear the word with profit. Intending hearers should invoke a blessing on *themselves*, that they may have the hearing ear and the understanding heart, and may see God's power and glory in the sanctuary—on the *preacher*, that he may "preach the gospel with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven," and that "the word of the Lord may have free course and be glorified"—and on the *whole assembly*, that God's gracious presence may be in the midst of them, that the gospel may prove to them the "ministration of the Spirit," and that they may all be "taught of God" and be "filled with joy and peace in believing."

Now were persons to prepare themselves for hearing the word, in the manner which has been stated, is there not reason to believe, that instead of that unfruitfulness, which now so generally prevails, the seed of the word would take deep root, spring up and "bear fruit, in some thirty, in some sixty and in some an hundred fold?" And true it is, that to such preparation the word of God obliges all. Says James, "Lay apart all filthiness and superfluity of naughtiness, and receive with meekness the ingrafted word." Says Habakkuk, "I will stand upon my watch, and set me upon the tower, and will watch to see what he will say unto me, and what I shall answer when I am reproved." And says David, "My soul thirsteth for God. for the living God; when shall I come and appear before God!" and again, "My soul thirsteth for thee, my flesh longeth for thee, to see thy power and thy glory, so as I have seen thee in the sanctuary." The Greeks said to Philip, "Sir, we would see Jesus." And the Spouse prays, "Awake, O north wind, and come thou south; blow upon my garden, that the spices thereof may flow out. Let my beloved come into his garden and eat his pleasant fruits."

2. *The word is to be heard with discrimination.*—On the same occasion to which our text refers, the Evangelist Mark represents our Lord as saying, "Take heed **WHAT** ye hear." Attention, therefore, is due to the *matter* which we are called upon to hear, as well as to the *manner* of hearing. And putting these two texts together, the remark is obviously warranted, that, in relation to the article of hearing, discrimination should be employed. And this discrimination should extend both to *preachers* and to the *matter preached*.—To *preachers*: It was a heavy charge, that was brought of old against the people of Israel, that they preferred the prophets of Baal to those of the living God—that they went after the false and neglected the true prophets, whom Jehovah himself had sent. Instead of so doing, they should have dealt with the former according to their demerits, and have hearkened to the latter as the messengers of the God of Hosts, as they were solemnly enjoined by the law of Moses. Under the present dispensation of grace the same discrimination is to be used, in regard to those, who appear in the character and capacity of public teachers of religion. The words of our Saviour are explicit, "Beware of false prophets who come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves," (Matt. vii. 15.) Paul inculcates the same doctrine, when he says to the Ephesians, "Be no more children tossed to and fro and carried about by every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness whereby they lie in wait to deceive," (Eph. iv. 14.) And he prophesies that the great papal apostacy would

have its rise in a "giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils," (1 Tim. iv. 1.) Moreover if it be the duty of preachers "to shun profane and vain babbling," (2 Tim. ii. 16) it is surely the duty of hearers to shun *profane and vain babblers*. That is a *moral maxim*, or rather *precept* which Solomon gives us, and is equally binding in all ages, "Cease to hear the instruction that causeth to err from the words of knowledge." Hence, it is totally at variance with the requirements of God's word to hear indiscriminately all, who assume to themselves, or are regarded by others as sustaining, the office of ministers of Jesus. And for not attending to their duty in this particular, we find two of the once celebrated churches of Asia falling under the severe censure of their Lord and becoming exposed to his divine threatenings, viz: the church of Pergamos, who tolerated those among them, who held "the doctrine of Balaam and the doctrine of the Nicolaitanes"—and the church of Thyatira, who suffered "that woman Jezebel, who called herself a prophetess, to teach and to seduce" the professed servants of the Lord. Indeed, the practice of indiscriminate hearing is utterly inconsistent with a sound profession of religion, and with the scriptural duty of bearing a decided and unequivocal testimony against the errors and defections of the times. And when we consider the extent to which it is carried, in the present day, it is difficult to avoid the conviction, that the very time foretold by the apostle has fully come; "For the time will come," says he, "when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; and they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables," (2 Tim. iv. 3.) I know that the sentiment I am now advancing is likely to make but a slight impression upon the minds of some of you, because it does not tally with the popular cry of the day—"free enquiry"—"liberty of opinion"—"freedom of thought"—but what is better, it does tally with the word of God; and therefore to reject the sentiment is to resist the word of truth.

But discrimination is also to be used in relation to the *matter preached*. The most orthodox ministers are not infallible. They may, through inadvertence or through ignorance, advance ideas, which the scriptures by no means warrant. Hence discrimination on the part of the hearer is necessary. He must not regard every thing that is spoken, even by those who are esteemed sound in the faith, as unerring truth; such do not require of him an implicit faith; they ask him to believe nothing which is not founded in the word of God, or clearly deducible from it on principles of right reason; they only ask him to search the scriptures like the Bereans, to examine and judge for himself, whether the things spoken be agreeable to "the law and the testimony," or not. And they urge him to this, in order that he may possess a divine faith, a faith founded on the testimony of God, and not on the testimony of man. And this surely is a sufficient reason why the sermons of preachers should be carefully examined and compared with the oracles of God. For if the hearer's faith rests on the doctrines preached, irrespective of their foundation in the word of God, his faith is merely *human*—it rests not on the testimony of God, but on the testimony of the preacher. Hence, an understanding of the scriptures is necessary, in order to make the discrimination in question. He that nurses ignorance in his bosom is incapable of doing it. He is as likely to take error as truth for the word of God. And this satisfactorily accounts for the conduct of many, whose piety is not to be called in question, in listening year after year to the perversions of truth. They are both ignorant and unsuspecting. They think that every thing that comes from the mouth of their preacher must be right—must be gospel—and so they receive it; and they go away well pleased and contented. Thus they exercise no discrimination or judgment of their own in the matter. And how can they? for they are ignorant of the doc-

trines of the Bible; and so far are they from comparing with this standard what they have heard, that they possess neither inclination nor leisure for such a painful drudgery.

3. *The word preached is to be heard with suitable feelings.*—With reverence: If the preacher fulfil the character of his station, he is an ambassador of God, and is sent to proclaim the words of God. It is not the man that speaks, but God that speaks by the man. "He that heareth you," says Christ to his disciples, "heareth me." "For this cause," says Paul to the Thessalonians, "thank we God without ceasing, because when ye received the word of God which ye heard of us, ye received it, not as the word of man, but, as it is in truth, the word of God." Such then being the case; and considering moreover, the greatness and majesty of that Being, whose word it is that is spoken, surely it is meet that profound reverence should possess the minds of those that hear; and that, laying the mere instrument, the earthen vessel out of the question, they should feel disposed to say with David, "I will hear what God the Lord will speak;" or with the devout Centurian, "We are all here present before God to hear all things commanded thee of God."

Connected with reverence there must be love. *The truth ought to be received in the love of it.* It should be heard with love, because it is God's truth; and as it is precious in his sight, so it should be in ours. "O how I love thy law," exclaims the Psalmist—"It is better unto me than thousands of gold and silver"—"It is sweeter than honey and the honey-comb."

The word is also to be heard with joy. We read of some that "received the word gladly;" and well they might, for it contains glad tidings of joy and salvation, and heralds forth the gracious proclamation of "liberty to the captives and the opening of the prison to them that are bound." "I rejoice at thy word as one that findeth great spoil."

But at the same time that the gracious declarations and promises of the gospel are to be heard with joy, the threatenings of God against sin and the denunciations of his wrath should be listened to with fear. "To that man," says Jehovah, "will I look that trembleth at my word."

Again, the word is to be heard with meekness. "Receive with meekness the ingrafted word which is able to save your souls." (James i. 21.) This meekness stands opposed, both, to that proud pharasaical disposition, which leads some to fancy themselves wise enough already—as possessing all knowledge, and understanding all mysteries, and as being wiser than all their teachers; and also to that other disposition of soul, which leads many to quarrel with the word of God, or to become enraged at the preacher, when the truth comes home to them, exposing their sins and cutting up their lusts. This temper has often been manifested. On a certain occasion, when he, "who spake as never man spake," was the preacher, we read, that "they in the synagogue, when they heard these things, were filled with wrath." On another occasion, when the apostles were the preachers, we are told, that when the Jews "heard that, they were cut to the heart and took counsel to slay them." And once when Paul was the preacher, we read, that "when the Jews saw the multitudes they were filled with envy, and spake against those things, which were spoken by Paul, contradicting and blaspheming." Now instead of hearing the word, either in a pharasaical, or wrathful manner, it ought to be heard with meekness—with a humble and teachable spirit, and with a disposition to receive, with thankfulness, the truth, whether it comes in the way of "doctrine, reproof, correction, or instruction in righteousness."

Another feeling, which hearers should possess, is that of candor. Where a censorious spirit exists, the preaching is likely to prove a "savour of death" to the soul. "Hearers possessing such a spirit," says a divine,

“are wanton with their food and play with the worship of God. They are not satisfied with sound and wholesome food, if it be not nice and exact: they are quick to spy faults, and ready to aggravate the smallest slip and mistake, which mere civility would cover and a little candor excuse. But where, in the meantime is a regard to the divine appointment, or sense of the presence of God? where is the wisdom of trifling with sacred things, or the wit of being profane? Shall it be counted reasonable to criticise upon an act of grace, to which we owe our lives; or turn that into a trial of skill, which is designed to save our souls?” In opposition, then, to such a censorious and cavilling disposition, every hearer should study to possess a candor worthy the immortal interests, which are involved in the great duty of hearing the word of the Lord.

4. *The word should be heard with attention.* A very little reflection must convince all, that without attention on the part of the hearers, the preaching of the word can produce no salutary effect. They might as well be in the uttermost parts of the earth, as in the house of God, if their attention be abstracted to other matters. What advantage can that hearer expect to derive from the ministration of the word, whose thoughts are wholly absorbed with the cares, riches, vanities and pleasures of life? whose body only is within the sound of the messenger's voice, his soul being at a distance, chasing the phantoms of folly? Says God to the prophet Ezekiel concerning the scheming and worldly minded Jews; “They come unto thee as the people cometh, and they sit before thee as my people—but the irheart goeth after their covetousness.” What advantage can that hearer expect from the preaching of the gospel, who betrays a carelessness, an utter indifference concerning it? who spends the precious season in gazing around upon his neighbors and in taking notes of the looks, posture and dress of others, as if he felt a greater concern to be able afterwards to tell what he had seen, than what he had heard? and who, to avoid the appearance of seriousness, affects an air of unconcern, and shows his sincerity in this by an indecorous levity and smiles of mirth, as if it were *criminal* to appear *devout* in the house of God, and *intolerable* to be even suspected of becoming *religious*? And what advantage can that hearer possibly derive from the word preached, whose senses in the meantime are locked in sleep? who converts his pew into a bed-chamber, and reposes as sweetly, as if he were stretched upon a bed of down; and that at the very time the ambassador of Christ may be “persuading men by the terrors of the Lord!” Oh, there is something exceedingly criminal in this! Offence is surely given to the majesty of Him, whose word is spoken: “Offence is given to the holy angels who are present in christian assemblies, and who themselves burn with zeal and are active as flames of fire: offence is also given to fellow-worshippers who are fervent in spirit, serving the Lord.” And a stumbling-block is hereby thrown in the way of unbelievers, leading them to suppose, that there can be but little reality in religion, if a professor can quietly “sleep on and take his rest,” at the very time, when, according to his own profession, he is solemnly addressed by the voice of the Lord God Omnipotent. In opposition, then, to a carnal and worldly frame of mind, and in opposition to all carelessness and drowsiness, the word must be heard with due attention—with close application of mind. And this is enjoined in many passages—“My son, attend to my words; incline thine ear unto my sayings.” “Give ear, O my people, to my law; incline your ears to the words of my mouth.” “We ought to give the more earnest heed to the things, which we have heard, lest at any time we should let them slip.” The same is also enforced by example. We read concerning the Samaritans, that “they gave heed to the things, which Philip spake;” and concerning Lydia, that “the Lord opened her heart, so that she attended to the things, which were spoken of Paul.”

5. *The word should be heard with a believing application.* Every word of truth should meet with a cordial reception; should be embraced in the arms of a living faith; should be applied to the hearer's own individual case. You are not to hear for others, but for yourselves. It is to *you*, that "the word of this salvation is sent," "Thou art the man." Christ is offered to you; the promises are delivered to you; the precepts, the threatenings and exhortations are all addressed to you. Hence, every hearer should be saying, That word of reproof is directed against my sins; that word of promise is for my comfort and hope; that word of threatening is to teach me, that God is holy and just, and that I am guilty and hell-deserving; that word of precept is to remind me of my duty; and that word of exhortation is to stir me up to greater diligence and activity in the service of God. Hence, faith takes no offence in hearing any of the truths of God, but receives, applies and studies to improve them all. And be assured, where there is not this believing application, the preaching of the word is labor lost. "The word preached did not profit them, not being mixed with faith in them that heard it," (Heb. iv. 2.)

6. *The word is to be heard with an exertion of mind to remember it.* This particular requires special attention. For of what use can the word be, if it be forgotten? In that case, it becomes like "characters drawn on the sand, or lines traced on water." The apostle's words are full of meaning—"By the gospel ye are saved, if ye keep in memory what I preached unto you, unless ye have believed in vain," (1 Cor. xv. 2.) That would be a vain faith, indeed, which rested on a *forgotten gospel*; and how is it to be supposed, that persons can be saved by that word of life, which is entirely lost from their minds? Hence, how incumbent is it upon all, who are favored with a dispensation of the gospel, that they be not *forgetful hearers* of the word! And strict attention to this direction is the more necessary, as the Devil is represented, in the parable, to be like the fowls, that follow the sower, watching that he may catch and take away the seed of the word out of the hearts of hearers, lest they should believe and be saved. In hearing, then, you are to let the words of Christ sink deep into your hearts. You are to imitate David, who said, "Thy word have I hid in my heart." And in order to this remembrance of the word, close attention is necessary, both to the word itself and also to the method in which it is preached. "We ought to give the more earnest heed to the things which we have heard, lest at any time, we should let them slip." Meditation is also necessary. You should "meditate on these things;" you should "meditate on God's law" when preached, as well as read, "day and night;" you should imitate the conduct of Mary, "who kept all these things, and pondered them in her heart." Prayer is also necessary, in order to a beneficial remembrance of the word. This exercise, we have said, formed a part of the requisite preparation for the duty of hearing, but it is also to be attended to during the performance of that duty—not indeed in a formal, but in an ejaculatory manner—the silent hearer should be breathing out the desire of the Psalmist, "open thou mine eyes that I may behold wondrous things out of thy law;" and it is also necessary, after the duty of hearing is over, with a view to the remembrance of what has been heard;—then you are to pray, that God, by his spirit, "would bring all things to your remembrance whatsoever he hath said unto you." Exercise then your memories in the hearing of the word. It is the grief of good people, when they cannot remember as they would. But on the other hand, how comforting and refreshing is it to be able to "remember the words of the Lord Jesus?" It filled the hearts of the disciples with joy and gladness, long after the death of their Lord, when they remembered that he had spoken certain things unto them.

7. *The word is to be heard with a view to the practice of it.* It is a fatal

mistake to suppose that the ordinance of hearing was intended for amusement, or for the purpose of killing an idle hour. The Jews of old seemed to view it in this light; for, the prophet of the Lord was unto them as a very lovely song of one that had a pleasant voice and could play well on an instrument; for they heard his words, but did them not, (Ezek. xxxiii. 32,) and on account of their thus mistaking or perverting the ordinance, and not improving it according to its great design, a severe threatening was pronounced against them, "and when this cometh to pass (lo it will come) then shall they know, that a prophet has been among them." The design of this institution, is that you may "exercise yourselves unto godliness." The gospel is preached to give employment to your faith; and the law is preached for the regulation of your moral conduct. You are therefore, to hear with the view, and with the fixed determination to practice what you do hear. "But be ye doers of the word and not hearers only, deceiving your own selves: For if any man be a hearer of the word and not a doer, he is like unto a man beholding his natural face in a glass; for he beholdeth himself, and goeth his way, and straightway forgetteth what manner of man he was. But whoso looketh into the perfect law of liberty, and continueth therein, he being not a forgetful hearer, but a doer of the work, this man shall be blessed in his deed," (James i. 22—25.) With this agree the words of our Lord, "If ye know these things, happy are ye if you do them." "Ye are my friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you." "If any man do his will, he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God." And again, "whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, who built his house upon a rock: And the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house, and it fell not: for it was founded upon a rock. And every one that heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man, who built his house upon the sand: And the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell: and great was the fall of it," (Matt. vii. 24—27.)

Lastly, *The word is to be heard with constancy.* Paul thus charges Titus in relation to the subject of preaching, "these things I will that thou affirm constantly"—and Timothy, "preach the word; be instant in season and out of season." If, then, the word is to be *preached* constantly, it is also to be *heard* constantly; that is, regularly and perseveringly even to the end of life, as God in his Providence gives the opportunity. "Forsake not the assembling of yourselves together, as the manner of some is." Now, there are two classes of hearers, whose practice contradicts this divinely authorised mode of hearing. The former, indeed, in a certain sense, may be called *regular hearers*; for they hear regularly once a month, or once in two months, or at communion seasons. Such are emphatically *occasional hearers*; or keeping the parable in view, they are the *way-side* hearers; they keep themselves without the sacred enclosure; it is seldom they get a cast of the divine seed, and when they do, the ground is so trodden and hard, that it cannot receive it, and it lies exposed to the rapacity of the wicked one, who is certain to catch it away. But even this class are not without their excuses—they have toiled hard all the week, and therefore, they must rest (at home in their beds) on the sabbath; or they have not been very well during the week, and they must, therefore, take a little medicine on the sabbath, that no time be lost, and that they may be prepared for the labors of the coming week; or they may have some other excuse of a similar nature; for such people are never at a loss in conjuring up excuses, to keep them from rendering a hateful service to the Lord their Maker. The other class are *temporary* hearers. They hear for a time, and then abandon the duty entirely. These are the *stony-ground* hearers, in the parable. For a

while they seem to be greatly delighted and deeply affected with the word. They resemble Herod, who heard John gladly, and the Jews, who for a season rejoiced in his light—and Felix, who trembled when Paul preached to him of “righteousness temperance and judgment to come.” But as soon as these excited affections die away, their attendance upon the ministry of the word also dies. Bye and bye they become offended—the word proves hateful to them—they hear hard sayings, which they cannot bear—aye, they find they must deny themselves, forsake all and follow Christ, and even suffer reproach and persecution for his name sake. These things will never do! Away goes their profession, and away goes their attendance on the preaching of the gospel! “They drop like leaves in autumn, or like blasted figs in a shaking wind.” According to Matthew, “he that received the seed in stony places, the same is he that heareth the word, and anon with joy receiveth it. Yet hath he not root in himself, but dureth for a while: for when tribulation, or persecution ariseth because of the word, bye and bye he is offended.”—Be it your concern, my friends, to belong to neither of these classes that we have been describing; for their conduct is an abhorrence both in the eyes of God, and in the eyes of all his saints and angels. On the other hand, be constant and regular in your attendance on the preaching of the everlasting gospel. Aim at having the experience of the royal Psalmist, “I was glad when they said unto me, let us go up to the house of the Lord”—“A day in thy courts is better than a thousand; I had rather be a door-keeper in the house of my God, than to dwell in the tents of wickedness.” Remember, that the exhortation of the apostle applies to the duty of hearing as well as to any other of the duties of religion—“Be ye steadfast, unmovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labor is not in vain in the Lord.”

We will now proceed to consider very briefly the other branch of the subject, viz:

II. The obligation of the duty of hearing the word. We have informed you, brethren, *how* you should hear. Now, many are the obligations which bind you to do so—obligations arising from a great variety of considerations. We will notice, however, but a few, and with them will conclude the present discourse—

1. You are bound to hear the word preached from a consideration of the divine appointment of the duty. After the many texts, that have been quoted in the course of the former part of the discourse, in some of which, the duty of hearing is recognised, and in others expressly enjoined, it becomes unnecessary to adduce any more at present, to show that the duty in question rests on a divine appointment. The text itself should be viewed by all as sufficient authority. Indeed, the same arguments, which prove the *preaching* of the word to be a divine institution, equally prove the *hearing* of it to be an incumbent duty. For preaching and hearing mutually suppose one another. Is it so, then, that the hearing of the word preached is a duty or ordinance appointed by the sovereign Lord of heaven and earth? How criminal must it be to neglect it! Is not this violating the strongest obligation that can possibly rest on man, the positive authority, the express will of God his Maker! This consideration, therefore, should weigh down all objections and banish into oblivion all frivolous excuses. No other duty can supercede this—no good work can cancel the binding authority of heaven. Reading your bibles or sermon books, catechising your children, and engaging in other devotional exercises, at home, on the sabbath, can never compromise the authority of God; they are mere will-worship when they occupy the place of *hearing* in the sanctuary, and are, therefore, rejected by God as a foul abomination. Yes, when God commands you to go up to the house of the

Lord to hear his word, the whole creation cannot nullify or cancel the command. And if you are shocked at the thought of lying, swearing, stealing, or murdering, you should also be shocked at the thought of neglecting every favorable opportunity of hearing the word. For the same law, the same supreme will, that makes those crimes, also makes this a crime, equally heinous in the sight of Jehovah, and particularly as it involves the additional guilt of sinning against the greatest goodness and condescension. Hence—

2. You are bound to hear the word of God from a consideration of his goodness in appointing this duty. Here we find the High and Holy One condescending to speak, in words of mercy and love, with his guilty and rebellious creatures. Was Solomon so astonished at the divine condescension on a certain occasion as caused him to exclaim, "will God in very deed dwell with men upon the earth?" With equal propriety may we exclaim, "will God in very deed speak with men upon the earth?" And his goodness shines forth in the manner, in which he is graciously pleased to speak and make known his will to the children of men. This he does not immediately by himself, for who could stand before this holy Lord God, and hear him speak in the awful majesty of his eternal and spotless nature? but by the instrumentality of men like yourselves, subject to the same passions, surrounded with the same infirmities, and who are capable of having "compassion on the ignorant and them that are out of the way." And for what purpose does he speak to you in this manner? Is it not for your good, that you may "know him, whom to know is life eternal and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent?" Should not a consideration, then, of condescension so astonishing—of goodness so divine, draw you into the diligent and careful performance of the duty in question? But—

3. You are bound to hear the word from a consideration of the benefits, which, under the blessing of God, result from the performance of this duty. Is regeneration indispensable to our happiness? We are told that persons "are born again by the incorruptible seed of the word." Is conversion a necessary blessing? Remember the case of the Ethiopian eunuch; the hearing of the word accomplished in his happy experience, what the reading of it had not done. Is faith a blessing, the bestowment of which is essential to salvation? Then, "faith cometh by hearing and hearing by the word of God." Is repentance an essential blessing? Behold the whole assembly of the Jews weeping, when they heard the words of the law expounded by Ezra and the Levites. Indeed there is no spiritual blessing but may be obtained through the believing performance of this duty. For the ministry has been appointed "for the perfecting of the saints, for the edifying of the body of Christ." In a particular manner, this is a distinguished way of getting doubts resolved, darkness removed, and temptations overcome, as you will perceive in the case of Asaph as given in the seventy-third Psalm—"When I thought to know this, it was too painful for me, until I went unto the sanctuary of God; then understood I their end." In view then, of such great, precious and lasting benefits resulting from the right performance of this duty, do you not feel yourselves bound by a most powerful obligation to engage in the constant discharge of it? an obligation no less than a respect to your own happiness—a regard for the salvation of your own immortal souls. The force of the obligation arising from this consideration should constrain you to give the most close and diligent attention to a duty, concerning which the Redeemer himself says, "Blessed is the man that heareth me, watching daily at my gates, waiting at the posts of my doors."—Passing other considerations I remark,

Finally, That you are bound to hear the word from a consideration of the danger of neglecting it. Here I will remain silent and let the word of

Lord speak—"He that turneth away his ear from hearing the law, even his prayer shall be abomination," (Prov. xxviii. 9.) "Lest thou mourn at the last, when thy flesh and thy body are consumed, and say, How have I hated instruction, and my heart despised reproof; and have not obeyed the voice of my teachers, nor inclined mine ear to them that instructed me!" (Prov. v. 11—13.) "And whosoever shall not receive you nor hear your words, when ye depart out of that house or city, shake off the dust of your feet. Verily I say unto you, it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrah, in the day judgment, than for that city," (Matt. x. 14, 15.) "See that ye refuse not him that speaketh; for if they escaped not who refused him that spake on earth, much more shall not we escape if we turn away from him that speaketh from heaven," (Heb. xii. 25.) "Because I have called, and ye refused; I have stretched out my hand, and no man regarded; but ye have set at nought all my counsel, and would none of my reproof: I also will laugh at your calamity, I will mock when your fear cometh; when your fear cometh as desolation, and your destruction cometh as a whirlwind; when distress and anguish cometh upon you. Then shall they call upon me, but I will not answer; they shall seek me early, but they shall not find me: for that they hated knowledge, and did not choose the fear of the Lord: they would none of my counsel: they despised all my reproof. Therefore shall they eat of the fruit of their own way, and be filled with their own devices," (Prov. i. 24—31.) Hence, from this and the other considerations mentioned, how solemn, how interesting, how truly incumbent is the duty of hearing the word! Let every one seriously meditate on these things and lay them to heart. "O earth, earth, earth, hear the word of the Lord!"

ART. II. *The Swearing of allegiance to Christ, a Scriptural and reasonable service.*

"Unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear."—Isaiah xlv. 23.

(Concluded from page 211.)

4. An oath of allegiance to Christ may be taken, *not only by individuals for themselves, but also by societies, either civil or ecclesiastic.* The solemn swearing of allegiance to a sovereign may be the insulated act of an individual, but it is more commonly the joint act of a nation, by which they bind themselves in their corporate capacity to uphold his throne, and assist each other in maintaining the constitution and laws of his kingdom. Accordingly, not only is one common bond administered to all the subjects, but it is often taken by collective bodies of them at once, as by a legislative assembly at a sitting, or an army in the field.—Whole nations also, who have been subdued by a prince or have voluntarily placed themselves under his authority, may, in their joint and national capacity, by the mouth of their representatives, solemnly swear fealty to him, and do him homage. In like manner may the great King of Zion receive similar solemn pledges of fidelity from his subjects, not only individually but jointly, and in whatever lawful associations they are organized.

That churches may thus jointly pledge their faith to their great head, few reasonable men will be inclined to question. But it is not in their capacity of church members only that men are subject to his authority; nor is that sacred society the only one that is bound, in their social actings, to advance his interest. No society of any kind can exist within the limits of his government, but what is obligated collectively, though it may be

indirectly, to seek the same object. No society can be lawfully formed within an earthly kingdom, the members of which are not prepared, in their collective capacity to pledge and to yield allegiance to the sovereign. He is therefore accustomed to receive, in times of common danger, or other occasions which call for the expression of public opinion, addresses of loyalty and promises of support from corporations,—from churches,—from universities,—from societies lay and clerical,—secular and ecclesiastic; and any association, which in such circumstances would refuse to do so, would deserve to be suppressed. And shall it be incompetent for the great King of kings to receive like promises of fidelity from the various associations which exist within his wide dominion, whether they be civil or sacred; or has any society a right to expect toleration in his kingdom which refuses to do so? No doubt when secular associations promise fealty to the King of Zion, the pledge is to be fulfilled by their keeping within their own sphere, and regulating for his glory the secular affairs with which they are intrusted, just as when churches send addresses of loyalty to an earthly sovereign, they engage not to wield in his behalf the civil sword, but so to manage their ecclesiastical affairs, as to render them subservient to the interests of his kingdom and stability of his government. But if it be competent to the latter to make such professions, to enter into such engagements to those temporal sovereigns under whose protection they are erected; (and who doubts it? even voluntary churches practise it,) then as little question can there be of the propriety of public engagements to him who is King of kings and Lord of lords, by those various secular associations that exist within the bounds of his spiritual kingdom, and are receiving the benefit which these never fail to reap from his administration.

Of such public vows we have therefore examples, not only by churches, but by families, cities, tribes, and nations. It was not in his own name only that Joshua acted, when he set the example to Israel of renewed devotement to God; but he took the engagement in the name of of all his household. "As for me and for *my house*, we will serve the Lord." The vows of Israel were national, and the person who would not in his sphere implement them, was cut off from all interest in the national privileges. And as common sense, we have seen, teaches us that such national oaths may still be sworn, so the swearing of them is also the fulfilment of the letter of divine prediction. "Thou shalt swear, The Lord liveth, in truth, in righteousness, and in judgment: and the *nations* shall bless themselves in him, and in him shall they glory."—"Five cities in the land of Egypt shall swear to the Lord of Hosts. They shall also vow a vow unto the Lord, and they shall perform it." Jer. iv. 2.; Isaiah xix. 18, 21.

5. Oaths of allegiance to the King of Zion, whether taken by individuals or by societies, continue to be *obligatory upon them*. No truth is more plain than this, that a contract or promissory engagement, binds the party contracting, whether an individual or a public body, *aye and until the contract be fulfilled, or the contracting party becomes defunct*. This is at once admitted and acted upon in civil contracts, as the dictate of the common sense of mankind. When Lycurgus, for example, had given to Sparta his celebrated code of laws, in order to secure their permanent adherence to them, he adopted the following method. He took his fellow-citizens bound by an oath to adhere to them, till he should return from a journey for which he was preparing. He then departed into voluntary exile, and never returned; and, in consequence of this obligation so solemnly contracted, that state considered themselves as ever afterwards under a solemn bond to adhere to these laws, a determination which proved the great means of establishing and perpetuating their national prosperity. When Mr. Canning some years ago, as the head of

the British administration, sent British troops to the defence of Portugal, when threatened with invasion, what was the great argument he so eloquently urged in behalf of the measure, and which was universally responded to by the voice of the legislature; was it not the *national faith and national honour pledged in the Methuen treaty to that nation centuries before?* The national debt of Britain is a similar public contract, which is felt as obligatory upon the community from generation to generation, so long as it remains undischarged: and the secular transactions of ecclesiastical societies, (as their obligations in reference to property,) are universally acknowledged to be equally binding.

Is there any thing then in the engagements taken to discharge *religious duties* which can render them less permanent, while the parties which have contracted them continue in being? On the contrary, from the very nature of religious duties to which such contracts pledge the engagers, they must be of a much more permanent kind. Money may be paid, and then contracts in reference to it cease to bind. Civil constitutions and international treaties being framed on principles of general utility, may require alterations corresponding with the altered circumstances of society; and no promise of allegiance to them, or engagements concerning them, ought to be construed as forbidding future improvements. Had Lycurgus returned to his country, his citizens would have been released from their oath: and, even as it happened, that oath was not understood as preventing such additions to his laws as were not inconsistent with their general spirit. But the duties that either individuals or societies owe to the great Head of the church are founded not upon utility, but unalterable rectitude, and therefore in themselves unchangeable; and, as it would be a mockery of God to engage to them only for a limited period, such engagements cannot be *exhausted*, and their obligation can terminate only with the existence of the individual or society that contracts them.

Hence has God considered all vows of allegiance made to him as binding to this extent. A man's promise of fidelity to him terminates its obligation only with his life, or rather will continue to bind him through eternity. Israel's vows to him are viewed as ceasing to be obligatory only with the existence of the people of Israel; and, as God has pledged his word that their separate national existence shall not terminate so long as the world lasts, so to the end of time will they be dealt with as a people under special engagements to the Most High,—a people in covenant with God. For the breach of that covenant are they now suffering; in the future renovation of it shall they be restored.

The same rule must apply to every other society of men which follows their example. When they "vow a vow unto the Lord," they are certainly expected to "perform it." When they pledge their public faith to him, they are required to redeem it: and redeem it they can only by the full discharge of all the duties involved in the pledge. And as these duties can never cease to be such, and the obligation therefore contracted to them by an indefinite promise continues to *run on without ever being exhausted*, no circumstance can ever dissolve the contract while the world stands, but one, an alternative which is far from desirable, viz. *the political death or total dissolution* of the society by which the obligation was contracted. This conclusion, as it is the plain dictate of reason, is also in accordance with the whole of Scripture testimony. The many acknowledgments found there of the identity of society through various generations, the contracting and transmission of national guilt, and the infliction of national judgments, proceed upon the principle involved in it; and accordingly at that time when, not Israel alone, but the nations of the world at large, are represented as pledging their allegiance to the King of Zion, the felt permanency of their engagements will contribute

to keep them steady in their adherence to him, and will be one great mean of maintaining the stability of his throne. "The kingdoms of the world are become the kingdom of our Lord, and of his Christ, and *he shall reign for ever and ever.*"

We ought now to proceed to the more direct proof of our proposition, viz. "That the swearing of allegiance to the King of Zion is a duty incumbent on his subjects, and to be practiced in present times:" but, before entering upon this, we would apply the general observations already made to the elucidation and vindication of the national oaths, vows, and covenants of our own country.

Let the reader then look back to these five propositions, which we trust we have shewn to be founded on reason and Scripture: and applying them to our covenants, National and Solemn League, he will at once perceive the light in which these deeds are to be regarded. They are oaths of allegiance to Christ, containing a profession of faith in him, and promise of obedience to him, and that of a very formal and solemn kind. They are, besides, not general pledges of fidelity to him, which could have served no useful purpose; but so pointed and particular as to distinguish very decidedly, especially at the time when they were framed, between his friends and his foes. The first, the *National Covenant, or Confession of Faith of Scotland*, contains accordingly a *particular renunciation of the errors of Popery*, and thus gives "a certain sound" on the great controversy of the day when it was framed. When it was renewed at the commencement of the Second Reformation, it was, with equal fidelity, pointed against the corruptions of *prelacy*, the great evil which then oppressed the church; a clause being added, containing *an express abjuration of the prelatie innovations* which had been so shamelessly and perfidiously introduced. No sooner had the people of Scotland, at that interesting period, recovered their religious rights and privileges, and renewed in this decided form their national engagements to adhere to them, than England, which had become wearied of the oppression of prelacy, from the yoke of which she had not formerly been released, applied for their aid in securing to them a participation in the same blessings; and accordingly the *Solemn League and Covenant* was next framed and sworn, which in addition to a *pledge of support to the reformed Church of Scotland and of the extension of religious uniformity to the three kingdoms*, contained a very particular engagement to all these *present civil duties*, without the faithful discharge of which, in the then disordered state of public affairs, that pledge could not be redeemed. Thus while the substance of these various engagements was the same, viz. the maintenance of the true Protestant religion, they were faithfully applied to existing circumstances, and that particularity, especially in reference to civil duties most imperative at the time, which has by many been turned to their reproach, in reality constituted their glory, inasmuch as they could not otherwise have served the purpose for which they were framed, viz. to be *tests of present fidelity to the church's Head, and to the interests of true religion and liberty within the kingdoms.*

They were besides not the mere engagement of individuals, but the *joint public pledges of the community at large*, to support, in the enjoyment of all its rights, the kingdom of Christ, which had been erected among them. No form, in which the will of a nation ever was expressed, could give more formality or *nationality* to deeds than were given to them. They were not only drawn up, sanctioned, and sworn by those *representatives*, which in all ordinary cases are authorized to express the national will, and to form national contracts; but *their deed* was confirmed and ratified by the solemn and ready adherence of the great body of those *whom they represented*. These deeds, therefore, contain what no sophistry ever can extract from them, *the*

sworn fealty of the lands whose names they bear to the great King of Zion.

In short, they are contracts which are binding on the contracting parties. Even their greatest enemies, by their present conduct, practically admit, in the most decided manner, the principle upon which this statement rests. They clamour for the repeal of all laws relative to religion. They thus acknowledge these laws to be in force upon the community at least till they be repealed. What is a law in behalf of any object but a public engagement to maintain it; and if that engagement be put into the formal shape of a covenant with God, and sealed with an oath, will it be less obligatory than in the form of a common-statute? We are not at present speaking to the question as to the propriety of nations thus pledging themselves in behalf of religion; we merely speak of the admission thus made, that in fact they have done so by every law they have made on the subject. Much more must those who admit this acknowledge that their formal oaths and covenants, solemnly entered into with God and one another, are national pledges of a similar and stronger character. It is true they seek to repeal the laws, and thus think to loose their obligation by the same authority that made them; and it is long since a profligate court pretended in a similar way to declare null and void our National Covenants: but God, we are to remember, is also a party to the transaction, and, scriptural as the matter of the contract is, and therefore founded on eternal rectitude, in his sight it can be dissolved only in one of two ways, either by its complete fulfilment, and the consequent exhaustion of the obligation, or by the dissolution of our social state. The first, from the nature of the duties to which we are pledged, is impossible; the last alternative is far from eligible. God in righteous judgment may be provoked to inflict it; but surely no friend of his country can ever desire it.—*Presbyterian Magazine.*

ART. III. Errors of Dr. Dwight and the Hopkinsian School.

It requires no small degree of fortitude in these times, to venture on the topic proposed at the head of this article. In an age of political excitement, when even the religious feelings of the public find vent chiefly in the form of extraneous exertion, or in controversies affecting the civil interests of the community, it is all but hopeless to expect to excite general interest in a discussion which merely affects the purity of divine truth, and which requires a close application of the mind to theological distinctions. It is still more disheartening to find that even writers who claim the character of theologians, and profess to be "guides of the blind and instructors of the foolish," have declared their aversion to enter on this controversy, and consider it nothing better than *logomachy*, a war of words, a tissue of scholastic jargon. Undismayed, however, by these discouraging symptoms of the public taste, and viewing it as the duty of a religious periodical to direct, instead of submitting to be directed by, the spirit of the age, we have no hesitation in claiming an audience from our readers on what we conceive to be an important branch of revealed truth. The controversy to which we refer, has been long agitated in America, and it is from no desire to transplant it to this country that we propose engaging in it, but from a solemn persuasion that the errors of the Hopkinsian school have already sprung up among us, and that the interests of truth demand an investigation, lest the leaven of heresy, which has begun to taint our evangelical creed, should leaven

the whole lump. If, interpreting the subject, we require to make nice distinctions, let it be remembered that these are rendered necessary by the attempts of error to perplex and pervert the simple truths of the gospel.

The talents of Dr. Dwight as a theologian are too well known to require commendation. The boldness, the vigor and originality of his thoughts, delight the scholar, while the popular form of his *System of Theology* has made him a favorite among general readers; so that, from the demand for this sort of reading among the well-informed of our Scottish population, which was met by a peculiar mode of supply, it so happens that there is not a corner of the land, and hardly even a cottage shelf, in which that work is not to be found. These very circumstances, however, must render his sentiments, so far as they are erroneous, the more dangerous. That he should have fallen into numerous errors, and adopted, almost unconsciously, many dangerous and untenable positions, will not occasion much surprise to those who consider the mode of study which he was obliged to pursue. Having lost the use of his eyes, at the early age of twenty-three, a period of life when a man is hardly entitled to consider himself independent of books, he was precluded the benefit of reading, and obliged to content himself with the scanty information gleaned from occasionally listening to others. His biographer, who almost idolizes him, mentions it in the way of commendation, that deriving no assistance from the efforts of others, he was compelled to depend exclusively on the resources of his own intellect." This piece of praise, though it no doubt enhances our ideas of his talents as a writer, tends considerably to shake our confidence in him as a divine. The man of genius may act the part of an able *advocate*, may strike out original thoughts, delight us with the sparkling of his wit, and astonish us with the novelty and power of his reasoning; but the theologian must be prepared to act the part of a *judge*, and from him we expect, not so much the dazzling talents of the pleader, as plain good sense, sterling honesty, and a thorough acquaintance, not merely with the general laws of the kingdom, but with the various cases in which the particular meaning of these laws has been settled by previous decisions of the courts of the land. All who know any thing of theology will see the absurdity of regarding Dr. Dwight as *an authority* in the science; his sentiments, as being those of a man of talent, are entitled to respect; but they can have but small weight, when it is plainly seen that they have been formed without consulting those controversial works in which the questions at issue have been fully discussed, and every possible objection anticipated. What decisions the Doctor might have come to, after examining these discussions, it is hard to say; meanwhile it can only excite a smile of regret to see a great mind endeavoring to flounder its way through the mazes of error, and propounding, with an air of originality, difficulties and objections to the commonly received doctrines, as if they had never been thought of before, when in truth they had been long before executed, anatomized, and quietly disposed of in "the tomb of all the Capulets."

The errors of Dr. Dwight are generally supposed to have been of a mild type, not fatally affecting the vitals of Christianity. There is error even in the supposition. Physicians tell us that there is no disease but *may* prove fatal to the human frame. Of Dr. Dwight's personal Christianity, indeed, the holiness of his life, and the triumphant serenity of his death, leave us no room to doubt. But we are equally certain, that it could not be to the erroneous parts of his creed, that he owed either the purity of the one or the peace of the other. If we may be allowed the distinction, Dr. Dwight was an errorist, rather than a heretic. He had not the vicious habits of a confirmed opposer of truth; he erred ra-

ther by misplacing the truths of the Christian system, than from malicious antipathy to any one of them. But the errors into which he fell by this process of misarrangement are not the less hurtful in their own nature, because adopted by a mind which was, in the main, in love with truth. The most noxious heresies that ever vexed the church have been ushered into the world under the patronage of men otherwise great and good. Arminius himself was far from being so Arminian as his followers; and Doddridge little dreamt how much his pupils would improve upon the laxness of his system. As to Dr. Dwight's system, it reminds us of one of those dissected maps made to exercise the ingenuity of children; all the parts are there, tacked together in some way or other, but by some unfortunate mistake, some of them have been put out of their proper place, and, in consequence, the whole presents a somewhat disjointed aspect, and unseemly gaps appear, which prove that a blunder has been committed. As it is, the system has been adopted, and its errors carried forward to their most dangerous, but still legitimate, results, by many in America, where the Hopkinsians, as they are called, form a numerous and rising sect.

To give our readers some idea of these errors, we may merely mention that Dr. Dwight, to whom we shall confine our observations, maintains, among other things, that God is *not absolutely independent* of his creatures, and that he is a proper object of their *benevolence*; he reduces all the attributes of Deity to that of benevolence, denying that vindictory justice is essential to his nature; he denies the imputation of Adam's guilt to his posterity, and the imputation of Christ's righteousness to his people; he asserts the doctrine of universal redemption; he denies that, properly speaking, Christ purchased any blessings for mankind, or that he satisfied divine justice for any one sin, and maintains that the atonement was nothing more than something done by Christ to make it *possible* for God to forgive sin, if he was willing to do so, but that this depends upon the fulfilment of certain conditions on the part of the sinner. These errors cannot be called trifling; diverse as they seem they are closely connected; they give a coloring to the whole system of ministerial tuition, and lead to other errors still more directly prejudicial to the souls of men. And yet because Dwight has contradicted himself in other places, and professes to hold the great doctrines of the atonement, using sometimes the very phraseology which he elsewhere condemns or explains away, it is hastily inferred that the difference is merely one of words and names.

Some of these errors, as they affect the doctrine of the atonement, have been exposed, in a very able and convincing manner, by Dr. Stevenson, in his late work "On the Offices of Christ." It may be of importance, however, to open up the controversy a little further, by advertent to some topics which could not be so fully brought out within the compass of that valuable work: We refer particularly to the views of Dr. Dwight on the "Purchase of Christ." That learned author, having adopted the doctrine of universal redemption, or, in other words, that Christ died for all men, had sufficient acuteness to perceive that this doctrine could never be reconciled with the idea that Christ *purchased* the blessings of eternal life in the sense usually attached to that term. He maintains, therefore, that "we are not, in the literal sense, *bought*, or *purchased* at all. Nor has Christ, in the literal sense, paid any price, to purchase mankind from slavery and death." The following is his argument, which we give in his own words, that the reader may have the whole case before him.

"These (*i. e.* many Christians who hold the doctrine of the atonement) have supposed the satisfaction for sin made by the Redeemer, essentially to resemble the satisfaction made for a debtor by paying the debt

which he owed. In this case, it is evident that if the creditor accept the payment from a third person, he is bound in justice to release the debtor. As the two cases have been supposed to be similar, it has been concluded that, since Christ has made such a satisfaction for sinners, God is in justice also bound to release them. This, however, is an unfounded and unscriptural view of the subject. There is no substantial resemblance between the payment of a debt for an insolvent debtor, and the satisfaction rendered to distributive justice for a criminal. The debtor owes money: and this is all he owes. If, then, all the money which he owes is paid, and accepted, justice is completely satisfied, and the creditor can demand nothing more. To demand more, either from the debtor or from any other person, would be plainly unjust. When, therefore, the debt is paid by a third person, the debtor is discharged by justice merely. But when a criminal has failed of doing his duty, as a subject to lawful government, and violated laws, which he was bound to obey, he has committed a *fault*, for which he has merited punishment. In this case, justice, not in the *commutative* but in the *distributive sense*, the only sense in which it can be concerned with this subject, demands, not the future obedience, nor an equivalent for the omitted obedience, but merely the punishment of the offender. The only reparation for the wrong which he has done, required by strict justice, is this punishment; a reparation necessarily and always required. There are cases, however, in which an atonement, such as was described in the first of these discourses, may be accepted, an atonement by which the honor and efficacy of the government may be preserved, and yet the offender pardoned. In such a case, however, the personal character of the offender is unaltered. Before the atonement was made, he was a criminal. After the atonement is made, he is not less a criminal. As a criminal, he before merited punishment. As a criminal, he no less merits it now. The turpitude of his character remains the same, and while it remains, he cannot fail to deserve exactly the same punishment. After the atonement is made, it cannot be truly said, therefore, any more than before, that he does not deserve punishment. But, if the atonement be accepted, it may be truly said, that, consistently with the honor of the government, and the public good he *may* be pardoned. This act of grace is all that he can hope for, and this he can hope for; and this he cannot *claim*, on account of any thing in himself, or any thing to which he is entitled, but only may *hope*, from the mere grace or free gift of the ruler. Before the atonement was made, the ruler, however benevolently inclined, could not pardon him, consistently with his own character, the honor of his government, or the public good. After it is made, he can pardon him, in consistency with them all; and, if the offender discover a penitent and becoming disposition, undoubtedly will, if he be a benevolent ruler." (Sermon 57.)

Similar sentiments, still more strongly expressed, occur in other places; from all which it is evident that Dr. Dwight considers that satisfaction for sin, in the ordinary sense attached to that term, is inconsistent with the gratuitous character of gospel forgiveness; in other words, that satisfaction and remission are contradictory and subversive of each other. This is precisely the doctrine of the Socinians, and is the grand argument which they, in common with infidels, have adduced to overturn the Scripture doctrine of the atonement. It might have staggered the doctor and a criminal, has been employed for this very purpose both by Socinus and Tom Paine, but he does not seem to have been aware that the distinction has been closely attended to by those theologians who hold that Christ made a true and proper satisfaction for sin, and really purchased all spiritual blessings for his people with the price of his blood. We shall try to exhibit, as briefly and plainly as we can, the distinctions

which have been made, and the conclusions which have been come to on this subject.

Our sins are frequently called, in Scripture, our debts, and God is represented as our creditor. The expressions are metaphorical, and clearly imply that, in consequence of sin, we are lying under an obligation to make a payment of some kind to God, which he has a claim to enforce. The application of this metaphor to moral obligations, is not peculiar to Scripture: nothing is more common than to speak of the debt of obedience and gratitude which a son owes to his father; a criminal is said to owe his life to the justice of his country, and, when he suffers, he "pays the awful debt." The metaphor, however, even in the case of human justice, and much more in that of the divine, does not strictly or literally apply in all points, though it fails, not in expressing too much, but too little. In the *first* place, the creditor is absolute lord and master of his own property, and may remit the debt which is owing to him, without requiring any payment or satisfaction; our sin, however, is committed against God, not as an *absolute lord*, but as a *moral ruler*; it is a crime against the government of heaven, and therefore cannot be passed over without a satisfaction. Viewed as an absolute lord, we are debtors to his *goodness*; viewed as a moral governor, we are debtors to his *justice*. Sin is not even to be considered merely in the light of a *personal offence* done to an individual, which, in ordinary cases, he may forgive without any reparation on the part of the offender: it is a *legal offence* committed against the law of God, and involving the honor of the divine government. Accordingly, to the reasoning of Socinus, who attempts, by confounding this distinction, to explain away the necessity of a satisfaction, Dr. Owen, in his "Dissertation on Divine Justice," judiciously replies, by distinguishing between right as it respects debts, and as it respects government.

In the *second* place, there is certainly a difference between the remission of a pecuniary and of a criminal debt. It is quite true, as Dr. Dwight notices, that, in the case of the former, if the money is paid, either by the debtor or by his surety, there is no room for *remission*, there can only be a *discharge*, granted by the creditor, and which he is bound in justice to grant: whereas, in the latter, the debt is *the personal punishment* of the offender, which he still deserves to suffer himself. But we might have supposed the Doctor would have perceived that it follows, from the very distinction which he lays down, that, if this personal punishment, which was due by the offender, is not actually executed upon him, there must have been a *gracious remission of that debt to him*, whether God received satisfaction for it or not. If the sinner owed his life to the violated law of God, then he might, according to the strictest rules of justice, have been left to perish in his sins; God was not bound to accept of payment or satisfaction from a surety; he might have allowed the law to take its course, and none durst question the justice of his procedure. In the case of a pecuniary debt, the creditor *must* accept the money offered him, whether by the debtor himself or by his surety; and provided the surety pays it in the name of the debtor, justice must grant a discharge. But, in the case of our criminal debt, God was not bound, in justice, either to provide a surety or to accept of the payment of a surety, even though that had been offered him; because the debt, strictly speaking, was *the personal suffering* of the delinquent himself, which might still be required at his hand. "The soul that sinneth, it shall die." So far, therefore, from a vicarious satisfaction for sin being inconsistent with the gratuitous pardon of the sinner, it must follow that the mere acceptance of such a satisfaction was an act of pure *grace* on the part of God, and amounted to a complete *remission* of the debt to the sinner.

ART. IV. *The Christian World Unmasked.*

It has been somewhat fashionable of late to republish, in numbers, old works, which are now rare, and which are supposed to be particularly excellent and useful. We have lately become possessed of a book entitled "*The Christian World Unmasked,*" which we propose to present by *piece-meal* to the readers of the Monitor, being persuaded that it will both instruct and amuse them. The author of this *singular* and very excellent book was the Rev. John Berridge, of the Church of England. From a short biographical sketch prefixed to the book we learn that he was born A. D. 1716, and died 1798, in the 76th year of his age. "At the age of fourteen, God was pleased to convince him that he was a sinner, and must be born again." But shortly after he went to college he "drank into the Socinian scheme to such a degree as to lose all serious impressions and discontinue private prayer, for the space of ten years, a few intervals excepted." After he was recovered from this snare he fell into another nearly as dangerous, viz: Arminianism. And it appears that he continued a rigid Arminian for several years after he entered upon his ministerial course; but eventually, through means of a severe fit of sickness, he was recovered from the errors of this fascinating and destructive system, and brought to embrace the truth as it is in Jesus. Henceforth he continued an unwavering friend and advocate of the Calvinistic system, till he finished his course on earth.

To complete the publication of this book will take nearly a year, provided we insert monthly in our pages about the same quantity of it, as that which appears in the present number. And we would now apprise the reader that we do not vouch for the accuracy of every sentiment advanced by the author; though we must confess that we have found but little in his work to which we do not cordially assent. Perhaps some of our readers may consider that he displays too much *wit* in treating of serious matters. In some instances he may be faulty in this respect, owing partly to his natural turn of mind, and partly to the *ridiculous* nature of the *religious* sentiments which he combats; but at the same time he appears to have been a person of great humility and fervent piety. The following additional particulars concerning him may prepare the reader for entertaining his remarks with a better relish.

"His *mental powers* were far from contemptible. He possessed a strength of understanding, a quickness of perception, a depth of penetration, a brilliancy of fancy, and a fund of prompt wit, beyond most men. A vein of innocent humor ran through all his public and private discourses. This softened, what some might call, the austerity of religion, and rendered his company pleasant to people of a less serious habit; but what is very singular, it never overcame his gravity.

In *learning*, he was inferior to very few of the most celebrated sons of science and literature at the University. His masculine ability, his uniform sobriety, and long residence at college, were favorable to improvement; and so insatiable was his thirst for knowledge, that from his entrance at Clare Hall, to his acceptance of the Vicarage of Everton, he regularly studied fifteen hours a day.

Having so good a Master, he entered upon his work with cheerful steps, and pursued it with the greatest *industry*—He preached upon an average from *ten to twelve sermons a week*, and frequently rode an hundred miles. Nor were these extraordinary exertions the hasty fruit of intermitting zeal, but were regularly continued during the long succession of more than twenty years, exemplifying through the whole of his ministerial career, the motto of a late celebrated dissenting clergyman, *Dum vivimus vivamus*.

Never man entered upon the work of his Master with more disinterested views. His purse was as open as his heart, though not so large. At *home*, his tables were served with a cold collation for his numerous hearers, who came from far on *Sabbath-days*, and his field and stable open for their horses. *Abroad*, houses and barns were rented, lay preachers maintained, and his own travelling expenses disbursed by himself. Cottagers were always gainers by his company. He invariably left an *half-crown* for the homely provision of the day, and during his itineracy it actually cost him *five hundred pounds* in this single article of expenditure. Nor was his liberality confined to these channels. His ear was ever attentive to the tale of woe, his eye was keen to observe the miseries of the poor, the law of kindness was written upon his heart, and

his hand was always ready to administer relief. The gains of his vicarage, of his fellowship, and of his patrimonial income (for his father died very rich,) were appropriated to support his liberality; and even his family plate was converted into clothes for his itinerant preachers.

But the most prominent feature in his character was his *unaffected humility*, nor do we ever recollect, in all our extensive acquaintance, a man so conscientious, so uniformly, and yet so pleasantly spiritual: In a word, in his parish he was a kind benefactor, and in his family a father rather than a master; in his ministry *he was a burning and a shining light*; in his promises he was scrupulously exact; in his devotion invariably regular; in his friendship inviolably faithful; and as in his life he was much beloved, so in his death he will be long lamented."

THE CHRISTIAN WORLD UNMASKED.

Gentle Reader,

Lend me a chair, and I will sit down and talk a little with you. If my company proves unseasonable, or my discourse unsavory, you may be relieved from both by a single cast of your eye. No longer I continue talking, than whilst you continue looking upon me. My visit will be long or short, just as you please; only while it lasts it should be friendly. I have no flattering words to give you, nor any alms to ask of you. I am come to enquire of your health, and would ask a few questions about it.

Indeed, Sir, I am a physician, was regularly bred to the business, have served more than three apprenticeships at a noted *hull* of physic, and consumed a deal of candle in lighting up a little understanding; yet am reviled as a mountebank, because I have been seen upon a stage. The Prince of physic set the fashion; and his example satisfies me, though it may not content another.

However, Sir, my business does not lay with the walls of your house, but with the tenant within. I bring no advice to strengthen your clay, but wish to see your spirit healed, and to set the heavenly lamp a burning. Give me leave to feel your pulse—sick indeed, Sir; very sick; and of a mortal disease, received from your parents; and which infects your whole mass of blood. *There is no health in you*; and since you seem not sensible of the malady, I must pronounce you delirious.

Why, you frighten me, Doctor. Sure you was bred at Sion-College, along with Doctor Whitefield and his brethren. A very hard mouthed race truly? Who have dealt so much in pukes and blisters, no genteel people will employ them. Their practice layeth chiefly among the poor, who can bear banging.

However, since your are come upon a friendly visit, I will tell you honestly what I think of myself. I have my faults, as well as my neighbours; but my appetites are pretty well bridled. My heart is honest, quite willing to pay all men their due; my hands too are sometimes disposed to relieve a neighbour's want; and my feet go orderly to church on a Sunday, when the bells chime, except it proves a rainy day; and then I read the weekly paper, or a Bible chapter at home. just as suits my fancy. This I call a regular life, and it is the ground of my hope; not forgetting Jesus Christ, to help out some defects. For I am choleric, no doubt; but it quickly bloweth over: and a little apt to fib in a market, but who can help it? All my neighbors do the same; and my landlord, who talks much of his honor, will tell a fib upon occasion, as well as myself. Besides, I often bring the parish into good temper, when they are out of sorts, by talking to them in a kind and humorous way, so that I am really a peace-maker. Now from these circumstances it should seem, that I am not mortally sick as you suppose, but enjoy good Christian health. Yet I do not like your countenance, it looks so very cloudy.—Have you got the gripes, Doctor?

No, Sir; but I am grieved at the weak account you have given of yourself. It convinces me your are not sick, but dead: dead to God, and

to his spiritual service. I expected some account of a *true Christian*, and you put me off with the state of a *poor heathen*, who is somewhat sober and honest and charitable, and worships his God when the weather suits or his inclination serves. I find no trace of a spiritual mind, no taste of a gospel blessing, no earnestness of a future inheritance. God's word, I see, is not your sweet companion; his service not your true delight; his glory not your noble aim. Your religion floats upon the surface, like froth upon the water, and is a mere vanity.—God has yet no hold of your heart, and you cannot give it him.

If you were a *child of God*, his Spirit would instruct you to love and reverence him with the affections of a child; and by prayer to converse with him daily, as children converse with their parents.

If God were your *Father*, you would love his house. It would be dear unto you; and a little rain would no more keep you from his courts, than from a fair or market. Where should a child go, but to his *Father's* house? And if a child of God, you would say, as David did, *How lovely is thy dwelling-place, O Lord! a day in thy courts, is better than a thousand spent elsewhere.*

If you were a *real subject* of Christ, the kingdom, which you ask for, in his short prayer, would come, and be set up within you; a kingdom of *righteousness peace and joy in the Holy Ghost*. He would enable you, not only to profess him, but to love and serve him, and fix your *whole* dependence upon him. Your bosom would become his presence-chamber, where he would *manifest himself to you, as he does not to the world*: and your heart would be his throne, where he would sit, to sanctify your affections, to regulate your tempers, and subdue you to himself.

Jesus Christ is not a pasteboard king, with royal titles but without authority. He sits upon his holy hill, invested with all power, to captivate the hearts of his subjects, and execute his threatened vengeance on his adversaries. And where he brings men under the sway of his sceptre, he bestows the blessings of his kingdom. The Holy Spirit, as a *comforter*, is granted: *the peace, passing all understanding, is given*: and *God's love is shed abroad in the heart by the Holy Ghost*. These jewels are only dug out of gospel mines, and only set in the breast of gospel subjects. And where they are well set, Jesus Christ becomes exceeding dear to such. They know the purchase-price he paid, and having tasted of the blessings, they love his person and adore his grace. Paul and they are now agreed, to *know only Jesus Christ, and him crucified*. He is their song and boast, their peace and hope, their all in all.

Let me draw my chair a little closer, Sir: plain dealing is exceeding needful here. If you are not a *real subject* of Jesus Christ, you must be a stranger to the blessings of his kingdom. The jewels I have mentioned are not locked up in your cabinet; they are not bestowed upon the outward-court worshippers. You must come within the veil, which is now rent open for access, before you can view a reconciled Father, and feast upon his grace.

A decent walk will keep you from mistrusting your condition; and these heavenly comforts may be thought too rich for a state of pilgrimage; and the remnant, who possess them, may be deemed a little brain-sick, quite unworthy of your notice. Perhaps the first Christians may have tasted of these blessings, but you think the gospel wine, which was broached at first, is now run out, and nothing left for us to sip but the lees. Thus you are fortified in Satan's castle of security; your conscience, when it cries, is rocked fast asleep; and with a mask of a decent profession, you live a stranger to Christ's kingdom, and perish in your sins.

Nay, Sir, do not start away, but keep your seat, and give my words a little chewing. Let conscience speak: it has an honest voice, though

a coarse one; and if you cannot bear handling, it is a sign that you have ugly sores within, which are not less dangerous for being skinned over. I must probe again, to make you feel the sores; and if my master guide my hand, I shall reach the quick, and hear you cry, as a perfect man of old did, *Behold I am vile!* Job xl. 4.

Whilst you remain a stranger to Christ's inward kingdom, you are with all your outward decency but a painted tomb, full of all uncleanness. And because the walls of your house have had a white-wash, and hide its inward filth and keep its horrid stench from your fellow-creatures, you care not much about that eye of God, which views your heart, and views it with abhorrence. Your bosom is a *cage of unclean birds*, and you dearly love their chirping, and feed them with your own hand. In this retired chamber you riot in uncleanness; and if your filthy thoughts were all exposed to the world, you would almost die with shame. And yet perhaps so void of shame, as to think yourself a chaste person, if no outward acts of uncleanness are committed, Oh, Sir, how can your heart, your filthy heart, appear before God, an holy God? Do you read the Bible? There I find it written, *Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God.* You are satisfied with *clean hands*, a decent profession; but God requires a *clean heart*, and none shall see his face without it.

But, Sir, your breast is a *den of thieves* too. A dark and dirty den, where self-will and self-sufficiency, the *head* of the gang, are up in arms against God, rejecting his authority, breaking down his fences, and laying his enclosures common. A den, where anger, envy, pride, railing, lying, discontent and worldliness, the *tail* of the gang, have stripped your bosom of its heavenly furniture, and turned God's ancient house into a market, worse than Billingsgate. What was God's court is now a den, where distraction lifts her clamorous voice, and violence deals her heavy hand. So that a man's worst foes are they of his own house, the thieves that lodge within his breast.

Sir, if Jesus Christ kept his court in your bosom, he would make peace there; for he is the Prince of peace. Where he reigns, he does command peace, for the honor of his name as Saviour, and for the glory of his government as King. But how can you suppose that Christ is your King, when he lets your house be daily rifled by a gang of thieves? A gracious prince will not endure to see his subjects ravaged daily, when he has sufficient power to protect them.

And with what conscience can you call yourself a *subject* of Christ Jesus, when your bosom is a sturdy rebel, and content to be so? You might as well call me your prince, as Jesus Christ your King, if he does not rule within your breast; and might as properly call me your maker, as Christ your Saviour, if he does not save you from your sins. Where he rules as King, and shews himself a Saviour, he will purge the conscience by his blood from guilt, and hallow well the heart by his Spirit. He will cleanse the *cage*, and scour the *den*; and when a wanton bird presumes to chirp, he will wring its neck off; or if a rogue assault your house, his palace, he will apprehend the thief, and sentence him to Tyburn. Nay, it is a fixed rule with him, that whosoever harbors thieves, shall have his house pulled down, and a dreadful fire set to it, which burns and never will be quenched.

If my expressions wear an air of pleasantry, it is because I would tempt you by a smile to hear me out. My subject is weighty, but may seem too grave, as the modern 'taste goes, without a little seasoning. Well, Sir, what think you of yourself? Are you a real subject of Jesus Christ, or an alien?

Indeed, *Doctor*, more is lacking in me than I thought. I have been resting on a decent conduct and my Sunday prayers; but something still,

I find, is wanting; and the main thing too. The house which I have built seemed a creditable house, and was thought to be as good as the vicar's; for we built it with exactly the same materials. But I perceive at length there are no windows in the house, nor any furniture in the chambers. And no wonder, if a dark house become a den of thieves, for they love the night, and dwell in darkness. However, I am now provided with some light for the windows, and must seek out furniture for the chambers. I would not willingly miscarry in this matter, because it is of moment. And it would be sad indeed, after building and repairing all my days, to have the house upon my head at last. But I trust by the help of a *good will* and a *lustly arm* of my own, to fray the birds away, dislodge the gang, and furnish well my house. What think you now, Doctor? Do I not talk like a man?

Yes, Sir, very much like an heathen man and a publican. You swagger like a Canaanite, but Canaanites, though giants, were overcome and slain. If you find no better help than your *own will* and your *own arm*, your house will be down at last, and bury you in its ruins.

Men are strangers to the spiritual nature of God's law, and to the woful depravity of the human heart, and therefore entertain a meagre notion of religion, and a lofty thought of their own ability. If Christian faith is nothing but a mere assent to the gospel-word, every man may make himself a true believer when he pleases. And if Christian duty only does consist in Sunday-service, with a pittance of sobriety and honesty and charity, we might expect that men would vaunt of will and power to make themselves religious. And yet the generality are much defective here. They often talk of turning over *new leaves*, but their future life proves such talk is empty boast, and that they want a will and power for this slender reformation. All allow that nothing is more needful to be done; and nothing can account for its being left undone, but a want of human will and strength to do it.

Let me step into your closet, Sir, and peep upon its furniture. My hands are pretty honest, you may trust me; and nothing will be found, I fear, to tempt a man to be a thief. Well to be sure, what a filthy closet is here! Never swept for certain, since you was christened! And what a fat idol stands skulking in the corner! A sweet heart-sin, I warrant it! How it simpers! and seems as pleasant as a right eye! Can you find a *will* to part with it, or *strength* to pluck it out? And supposing you a match for this self-denial; can you so command your heart, as to *hate* the sin you do forsake? This is certainly required: truth is called for in the inward parts: God will have sin not only cast aside, but cast away with abhorrence. So he speaks, *Ye that love the Lord, see that ye hate evil.*

It is easy to affirm, we have ability for this, and then dispute about it eagerly; yet who makes the trial? I have made it many times, and find I can do nothing to good purpose. Others seem well satisfied with supposing they have the power, but make no thorough trial. Else they would find, and would confess, they can effectually do nothing.

If the wanton nightingale is put out of your *cage* on a Sunday morning, she will be taken in again at night. Your heart will pine for her midnight whistle, and cannot hate her note, or think it half so horrid as the hissing of a serpent, or the croaking of a toad, though far more loathsome than them both.

Can you find a pleasant heart to *love your enemies, and pray for them, and do them good*? Perhaps you may compel yourself to shew them kindness; and this is sooner said than done. Yet *shewing kindness to an enemy* is one thing, and *feeling kindness for him* is another; and both are *equally* required. Pray make a trial here of your boasted *will and power*; and see if they do not prove of brittle metal, and snap between your fingers.

You own yourself a mortal man, notwithstanding all your mighty strength; and expect a mansion in the skies, when you quit this house of clay. But, Sir, you must be taught the work of heaven, before you can be settled there. An earthly heart could no more live in heaven, than a fish upon dry land. The element is too fine for both; it makes them sick; they cannot breathe in such an atmosphere.

Grace is the *blossom-bud* of glory; and a work of grace upon the heart is a needful preparation for glory. By grace men are brought into the school of Christ, and bound apprentices for Heaven. In this school they learn to *walk with God, to love him, and to serve him—to be strangers upon earth, and seek a better country; looking for the coming of the Son of God.* These are some scripture marks of the heirs of glory. Do you find them in your breast; or can you stamp them there? Indeed you cannot. None but he who turned water into wine, can change your earthly nature to an heavenly. You must be born from above, before you learn to crave and truly seek the things above. You may peruse the word of God; but can you say with David, *Lord, how love I thy law! it is my meditation all the day?*

When a Bible and newspaper are found upon your table, I can guess which your hand will take up first; and you know the heart directs the hands. The worldly magazine is sweeter to your taste than the heavenly leaves. You may force and drive your thoughts on heavenly things; but can you set your heart upon them? If so, your thoughts and talk would glide on heavenly things, most pleasantly; for out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh.

But, is this your case, or the case of others who are reckoned decent people? You know it is not. They have no *liking* for religious subjects, and find no *power* to introduce them. Conversation turns upon the earth, because the heart is earthly. Religious talk is unfashionable, because it is unsuitable to our fallen nature. We do not care to think or talk of God, our daily benefactor, because we are not born of God, and have no filial kindness for him. His blessings are received daily, and the author most politely is forgotten. No mention must be made of him who gave us all we have, and keeps us what we are. To talk of God upon a visit, would turn the hearers sick or sour, and brand the speaker for a rude man and a methodist. All ingratitude is reckoned infamous, except ingratitude to God. Such is human nature; and such the *kind* religion of it.

What makes the curate give a scanty sermon, just the fag end of a subject? And what makes the people love to have it so? The reason, Sir, is plain. A Sunday dinner is more savoury than the word of God.

But, Sir, if your house is furnished, as you threaten, then your parlor, shop, and closet must be lined with devotion; this is Christian furniture. Can you pray, and find sweet fellowship with God in prayer? You talk of will and power: if they are at hand, why are they not in exercise? I call that man a boaster, and suspect his poverty, who talketh of his riches, yet never pays his debts. No work is more needful, more profitable, or more honorable than prayer; and when rightly performed, none is more delightful; why then is it not more followed? Indeed, Sir, you have no ability to pray, till *God poureth out a spirit of grace and supplication on you.* Zech. xii. 10. You may force your lips to say a prayer, and say it often, but cannot force your heart to like it. The work is irksome, mighty irksome: it drags on heavily, like a jaded mill-horse, who is whipped round and round, but longs to be released from his gears. A manger suits him better than a collar.

And can God be pleased with that service which your own heart loatheth? No, Sir, he requires a cheerful service, the obedience of sons and

not of slaves. He says, *Give me thy heart*; and his people are a *willing* people, made willing by his grace. Ps. cx. 3.

But supposing that a little *will* for prayer might be squeezed from a flinty heart; you have no *power* still to compass fellowship with God. And what is prayer without divine communion? A mere prating to a dead wall or blue sky. It is babbling to an unknown God, as four hundred and fifty prophets did to Baal, a jolly company, from morning until evening, but *found no answer*. 1 Kings, xviii. 26. Baal kept no fellowship with his votaries then, and never has done since.

Praying unto God without communion, is like talking to a man who neither gives an answer, nor a smile, nor yet a look. You would soon be weary of such converse, and avoid such company. And no people find an heart to pray who feel no fellowship with God.

You often hear at church St. Paul's parting prayer, "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the *fellowship of the Holy Ghost*, be with you." By nature we are far from God; sin has made the separation. And till brought nigh to him, we cannot say with them of old, *We have fellowship with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ*. 1 John i. 3. It is one office of the Holy Spirit to draw our spirit near to God, and give us fellowship with him.

This fellowship is not obtained by a mere *profession* of the gospel, however decent that profession is, but by *regeneration*, or a spiritual birth. Where the Holy Spirit has imparted spiritual life, he instructs a sinner how to pray, helps his infirmities in praying, draws the human spirit nigh to God, and gives communion with him. Thus the heart is strengthened and refreshed by prayer, and finds it both a pleasure and a profitable service. But where communion is not felt, nor truly sought, no comfort can be found in prayer, nor profit. And this is much the case of modern Christianity, a dull insipid thing, void of *spiritual life*, and therefore void of *spiritual feeling*. Professors do not make pretence unto it, but disclaim it. So far indeed they are honest; but being destitute of spiritual life and feeling, they must be called gospel puppets, danced with devotional wires. A church is fitted up for their stage, with boxes, pit and gallery: and Sunday is the day of acting. During the performance, some are mighty *decent* characters, like a king and queen of France; others rude and racketty, like cobbler Punch and his wife.

Yet further; men have no heart to pray, because they have no *feeling* of their wants. If I am, or fancy that I am, endowed with will and power to help myself, it seems a needless thing to beg of God to give me grace; as needless as to ask his help to light my candle. And where men boast of native strength, I do suppose they act consistently, and seldom chafe a knee in prayer. Common decency requires a little outward homage, and a little will suffice.

Now, Sir, be pleased to hear what my dispensatory says concerning will and power. *It is God who worketh in you, both to will and to do*; and he works the will and power, not for our desert, but merely of *his own good pleasure*. Phil. ii. 13. God stands in debt to none; and his works are not designed to reward man's merit, but to manifest his glorious grace. When your will is turned from evil, or inclined to good, it is the Lord's doing. He over-rules the will, though not asked of him, nor perceived by you. This may be gathered from the text above cited, and is confirmed by the following story:

Abraham comes to Gerar, and through fear denies his wife. Gen. xx. 1, &c. Abimelech sends for Sarah to his house, purposing to take her to his bed: but when she comes, he is somehow overruled. God appears to Abimelech in a dream, and says, *Thou art a dead man, for the woman thou hast taken is a man's wife*. Abimelech protests *his heart is upright and his hands are innocent*. God allows it, and says, *I know thou hast*

done this in the integrity of thine heart; but then he shows the cause of this integrity, *For I withheld thee from sinning against me, therefore I suffered thee not to touch her.* In Abimelech we behold the doctrine of nature. He vaunts of his integrity, as modern Christians do; and is just as ignorant of God's determining his will, and of course as unthankful for that determination, as modern Christians are. We need not wonder at it: nature is the same at all times, and in all dispensations; grace alone makes the difference.

Hence real Christians learn to seek for will and power from God; and give him hearty praise for all escapes from evil, and for every good desire wrought in them, and for all good works performed by them. As for you, Sir, and others, who can turn yourselves round by your own will and power, as nimbly as a floating weathercock, I wish the weeping prophet's prayer was much upon your lips, *Turn thou me, O Lord, and so shall I be turned.* Jer. xxxi. 18.—Lam. v. 21.

[To be continued.]

ART. V. *Miscellaneous Information.*

ATTACK ON BASSA COVE.—It is now between two and three months since the community were shocked at the intelligence received from Liberia respecting the massacre, by the natives, of a number of the colonists at Bassa Cove. The following extract from a letter lately received in this country, gives a more full and particular account of that melancholy affair than we have elsewhere seen. The colony at Bassa Cove, or Port Cresson, was lately planted by the Young Men's Colonization Society of Philadelphia, on the Quaker principle of non-resistance. The natives became soon apprized of the fact, that their new neighbors were destitute of the means of self-defence, and accordingly they were not long in giving to the world a practical demonstration of the unsoundness of the principle on which the colony was founded. But King Joe Harris and his tribe were severely punished for this act of treachery and bloodshed. A number of volunteers from Monrovia (the oldest of the colonies) drove him and his savage adherents from their territories, and demolished their towns and places of defence.

“Scarcely had twilight faded away into the shady indistinctness of a moonlight night, ere dusky wreaths of smoke could be distinctly perceived arising from the situation of the emigrant's houses, proclaiming that the work of revenge and destruction had commenced. House after house was fired, throwing up for a time a distinct and appalling glare into the midnight sky. The direction in which the Agency House stood was watched with intense anxiety, in the momentary expectation that a brighter and fiercer light would announce its consummation. It was, however, unmolested. A boat was despatched up Benson's River, in the anticipation that the emigrants would retreat towards Edina. In two hours they returned, having with them one man and a boy, who informed us, that the natives were burning their houses, and killing all that came in their way. It was painful thus to witness the evidences of destruction within their view, and to be made aware that the blood of the innocent and the defenceless was fast flowing a sacrifice to savage cruelty and revenge, without being able to render any assistance, or snatch the unhappy victims from the altar, inasmuch as, in this uncertain and perplexing state of affairs, Edina might be endangered by an attempt of the kind. Picquet guards were stationed at the different outposts of the settlement, and in a state of distressing anxiety and suspense, we waited the return of daylight.

Next morning, at 6 A. M. we discovered persons making their way to, and assembling on the opposite side of the river, whom, by the glass, we perceived to be emigrants. The boats of the Ruth, of Philadelphia, and the St. Lucia of Liverpool, were kindly given to convey them across to Edina. The scene of suffering and misery, which this miserable group of beings presented on arrival, is beyond description. Entire families had been cut off, remnants of others, naked and wounded. There came the aged and the infirm tottering from the bed of sickness. The husband lamenting the loss of wife, and the mother bewailing, in heart-rending sobs the bereavement of her children, whom she had seen murdered before her eyes, mingled with the unfeigned ejaculations of others, as they uttered their short prayer of thanks to God for the safety of them and theirs; which, with the deep cuts of the wounded, and blood-stained clothes of the weeping children, formed a picture that is painful to dwell upon, and superfluous to attempt to heighten. Such distressing circumstances need but the bare, unvarnished recital to awaken our deepest sympathies, and enlist all our commiseration.

tions. There are details too, connected with the perpetration of this horrid transaction, of the most hardened cold-blooded cruelty, over which humanity shudders and bids us draw the curtain of oblivion.

I have taken an account of the loss of each family, and such as have never been heard of, and find the number to be twenty persons in all. Three of these were men, and four women, the rest children, from two years of age and upwards to ten.

We were very anxious to know the fate of Mr. Hankinson and his lady, but heard nothing concerning them until news came from the Cape, that they had arrived there in the *St. Lucia*. The emigrants are thus thrown on my care. Amidst the multiplicity of their wants, we must endeavor to supply the most pressing, and hope arrangements will be made by their Agent at the Cape for their relief.

Such are the leading events of this dreadful catastrophe, and such the fate of an interesting moral experiment, setting out, as it purposed, on principles the most desirable that can guide human intercourse, or dignify human nature. But, although our reason may be convinced of the possibility, and our imagination fondly picture the happiness and the loveliness of the scene which the realization of such principles would produce, yet it does appear to me, viewing the native character in its most favorable light, and placed in contact with emigrants endued with a more than ordinary share of sound moral and religious feeling, under similar circumstances, that the trial would still be a doubtful, if not a dangerous one. Indeed it may well be questioned, whether such an experiment, even at this advanced stage of human improvement, would not be in danger of failing, even among many of the most civilized communities of this our globe. As yet, human passions and propensities act with too powerful an impulse to be regulated and controlled by the force of moral persuasion alone.

A few days before this event, an old slave-trading friend of King Joe's, anchored as usual in the Cove, and on finding an American settlement almost contiguous to the place where he always landed his goods and purchased slaves, he informed King Joe, that he could not think of buying slaves so close to the *Americans*, and that he intended to establish his factory at the river Bonney, and refused to land any goods whatever. King Joe became very exasperated at this, and was heard to say, he would drive the Americans away; and only waited for a specious pretext to put his threat in execution. That a deed of this kind, urged on by the love of plunder and slave-trading influences, has been in contemplation for some time back, information and occurrences, both antecedent and subsequent to its perpetration, leave no doubt about the matter.

Bob Gray, as soon as he was told that no arms were allowed to be taken to the settlement, asserted in the most positive terms, that as soon as all the goods were in the store-house, and the rainy season set in, the natives would rob both it and the emigrants, a prediction which was fast coming to a fulfilment, before this occurrence took place. It is a remarkable fact, that the houses and persons of two of the emigrants, Benjamin Johnson and Charles Gray, the former of which possessed a gun, and the other had the loan of it, for some time, were unmolested during the affray. A circumstance which has been clearly traced to that cause alone.

The failure in this instance cannot, however, be adduced as affording any thing like conclusive evidence against the practicability of the scheme. In the successful conducting of such an experiment, a mind endued with no ordinary powers, is indispensable, as well as a certain adaptability in the materials to be operated on. As far as my observations have led, since my acquaintance with the character and dispositions of the natives, and more particularly the ruling men amongst them, I perfectly agree with the opinion expressed by Dr. Blecher, in his eloquent and philosophic address, published in the *African Repository*, for November, 1834:—"That the influence of the slave-trade over the petty kings on the coast, and in the interior, is such as renders impossible the establishment of mere missionary settlements. Fast as they could be planted, they would be instigated to cut them off with moral certainty.

However, be that as it may, in the settlement of this affair the interests of the whole colony are connected. A war with King Joe and the colony is, I fear, inevitable; as he well knows, according to his own notions of justice, he has committed a crime, and got into a "*palaver*," which money cannot set. Edina is proclaimed to be under martial law. A committee of safety has been appointed, guards stationed every night, and every means possible taken to ensure the safety of the settlement. This is a dilemma requiring the immediate deliberation, decision and promptitude of your Council at Monrovia. That they may be enabled to adopt the best measures to obtain a satisfactory and speedy adjustment of this distressing occurrence, and that under the blessing of Providence good may arise out of it, is the sincere desire of

Sir, your most obedient servant,

R. M'DOWELL.

NEWS FROM MISSISSIPPI.—The following facts were stated at the last Monthly Concert at Park-street, Boston.

CAPE PALMAS, August 4.—Rev. Mr. Wilson and wife enjoyed good health, and have succoured Missionary labors. Mr. W. states that the colony is in a prosperous condition.

GREECE.—The Synod opposes the use of any other translation of the Testament than the Septuagint. Mr. King has distributed and sold very many copies of the New Testament, Tracts, and School-books, he has written home for 10,000 copies of the New Testament. He was never before so encouraged in this work as at present.

CONSTANTINOPLE.—The Missionaries have hope of the conversion of five young men of promising talents: all priests or literary men, and in situations to exert much influence. The Armenian Theological Seminary under the care of Peshtimaljean, is exerting a decidedly evangelical influence.

JERUSALEM.—Mr. Whiting has begun to distribute books among the Pilgrims, who annually resort thither from all parts of Western Asia, and neighboring parts of Europe and Africa. He sold some hundreds. They daily resorted to him for tracts in various languages, many of which he gave away. It is intended to establish an extensive tract-distributing office at Jerusalem, as soon as the books can be prepared.

BOMBAY.—The Missionaries enjoyed general health. One Hindoe had been admitted to the church, who is active in promoting christianity, and promises to be useful. One, who had been suspended has been restored.

SINGAPORE.—About the middle of July, Dr. Bradley left, on his way to Bankok. Mr. Tracy was giving instruction to ten or more Chinese, who professed to be believers in Christianity, and desired to be considered as candidates for Baptism. The object of a meeting of candidates being misunderstood by some, nearly 20 attended. It seemed very much like an "inquiry meeting" in America. Some of the ten appear truly pious. One of them gained his knowledge at a distance from a book.

CHINA.—Mr. Stevens, Gutzlaff, and servants, attempted to penetrate the country by ascending the river Ming, in a boat. After ascending 70 miles they were fired upon by the natives from both sides of the river and two of the servants slightly wounded. It was evident they would not be permitted to proceed, and they returned. It is evident that China cannot be penetrated openly by missionaries at present. Gutzlaff and another gentleman on a former occasion, penetrated about forty miles; but it was through less settled parts, and they met with no man in office. The common people are not averse to intercourse with foreigners. The distribution of books can be carried on along the coast; but under great disadvantages, on account of the opium trade, which is carried on in the same vessels. Ships trading on the coast, and yet free from that abomination are needed.

The missionaries who received their instructions at the Odeon sailed on Friday last, in the brig Massachusetts, Capt. Fletcher, for Smyrna; having been commended to God in prayer by Rev. D. Greene, Secretary of the Board.—*Recorder.*

MISSION TO THE ROCKY MOUNTAINS.—A letter has been received at the Missionary Rooms, from Dr. M. Whitman, who has been on an exploring tour among the Western Indians, with Rev. Mr. Parker. It is dated St. Louis, November 7. He left Mr. Parker on the Green river, branch of the Colorado of the West, which empties into the Gulf of California. He speaks of the place as the general rendezvous of the hunters and troopers, among the mountains. Besides these they found there about 2000 Shoshonee and Snake Indians, and about 40 lodges of Flatheads and Napersas. The chiefs appeared remarkable well disposed, and anxious to receive instruction. The Flatheads and Napersas have received some notions of religion, from traders and travellers, amounting to a mixture of Catholic ceremonies, Protestantism and common morality. They say "they have always been unhappy, since they have been informed of the religion of the whites. They do not understand it. It has only reached their ears. They wish it to affect their most vital parts."

The Missionaries thought the Flatheads and Napersas very interesting tribes for missionary labors. Dr. W. returned for the sake of making arrangements, if the Board should think fit, to take in a reinforcement and establish a mission there next spring. Meanwhile Mr. Parker will remain, and, in company with his new made Indian, French, and English acquaintances, will visit Walawalla, Vancouver, and the Methodist mission; all of which are farther north.

According to the statements of the Indians and others at Green River, the Lees, (the Methodist Missionaries,) did not visit the Flatheads, but located themselves among the Chenoots, on the Multinoma. Perhaps, however, these Chenoots are a family of Flatheads. The Napersas are probably the *Nexperces*, i. e. *Bored Nose* Indians.—*Recorder.*

THE BIBLE.—The British and Foreign Bible Society have refused to appropriate any of their funds in circulating the translation of the Bible into the Bengalee language, made by the Baptist Missionaries at Serampore, on account of the unauthorized rendering of the original, in which it is made to teach that *immersion* is the only mode of Christian Baptism. The Baptist Missionaries at Burmah have taken a similar liberty with their translation, and it is supposed that they will thereby cut themselves off from all future aid from the American Bible Society. If our Baptist brethren were a little more *immersed* in Grecian and Hebrew learning, they would be less confident in their innovations.—*Presbyterian.*

PROSCRIPTION.—The most violent measures have been adopted to excite a clamour against the Synod of Philadelphia for the suspension of Albert Barnes. It is represented as an act of iniquitous persecution and as a proof of the domineering spirit of the clergy. The charge of persecution is designed *ad captandum*, and is sufficiently refuted by the following statement, viz: Mr. Barnes was never coerced to enter the Presbyterian Church—he was never forced to remain in it—he voluntarily entered it by adopting its constitution—he willingly submitted to one provision in that constitution which prescribes that any minister who proclaims doctrines in the face of standards, after having voluntarily promised to maintain them, shall be excluded; his peers have decided by a solemn vote, that he has so far violated his obligations as to incur this censure; and where is there in all this transaction a spirit of persecution? As well might a man, excluded from any voluntary association for an infringement of its constitution, complain of persecution; with as much reason might any public functionary complain of persecution, in being displaced from office for a violation of the constitution of his country. Mr. Barnes has fallen under the operation of a principle, the justice of which is universally recognised. He was not condemned for holding any particular sentiments, but only for obtruding upon a particular community, sentiments which were at variance with its acknowledged standards. He might have retired from the church peaceably, and held the same sentiments without molestation, but that he should have insisted upon remaining in the church, and still retaining these conflicting views, is a demand of license which no community, religious, political, or social, would countenance.

It is an equally great mistake, that his suspension was the result of clerical domination, as nearly an equal number of intelligent laymen voted for the act. That religious men, and men too professing a very peculiar and preeminent zeal for religion, should resort to such methods to excite popular odium—that they should make an appeal to the world and to the very worst passions of men on a matter pertaining to the church—that they should enlist the political prints in the outcry, is to us a thing utterly irreconcilable with their professions. The cause which is thus to be sustained *must sink*, for upon it the frown of God must rest. We blame not the people of Mr. Barnes' charge for the expression of personal esteem and affection for him—we blame them not for supposing that he is in all his views consistent with the formularies of the church; all this was to be expected; but when they decide upon the unrighteousness of his condemnation upon the ground that he is a man "of unstained purity of life in the midst of eminent usefulness," they put the case upon a wrong basis. Mr. Barnes was not condemned on any such ground, but merely because he was not a consistent Presbyterian. There were hundreds of Episcopal, Methodist and Baptist clergymen who enjoy an unspotted reputation, but surely that is no reason why they should be permitted to preach their peculiar views in the Presbyterian church.

But the proscriptive, and as we might justly retort, the persecuting spirit now rife, is most strikingly illustrated in the following resolutions passed by a congregational meeting held in the Rev. Mr. Patterson's church of this city. They partake so much of the denunciatory spirit of the worst class of political meetings, that it is difficult to believe that they emanated from a *religious* assembly. The reader shall judge.

"And whereas, finally, we believe this persecution of Mr. Barnes to be but the commencement of a system to return to darkness—and enslave the mind which God has made free. We as Freemen and Christians will not stand by and tamely submit to see, so good, and so useful a man as we believe Mr. Barnes to be, sacrificed, lest we become partakers in other men's sins. Therefore,

Resolved, That we have undiminished confidence in the Rev. Albert Barnes, and are determined to stand by him, and afford him all the countenance and aid in our power.

Resolved, That we will aid and support only such men and measures as can tolerate and fraternize with the Rev. Albert Barnes, believing those of an opposite kind to be bigotted, unchristian, and unkind—making divisions, contentions and war in the church, where there ought to be peace, harmony and love.

Resolved, That we recommend to our Session the propriety of prohibiting all collections in our Church for any society in which ultra old school men have the management and control, and that we recommend to all our members that may be subscribers or patrons to any fund for Education, or Missionary, or College endowments of which they have the control, to discontinue their aid.

Resolved, That it be recommended to all the lay members in all the Churches belonging to the Assembly's Presbytery to hold meetings forthwith—and that each Church appoint three conferees, who, as soon as may be after the appointments are made, shall meet together and make arrangements, and procure a place for a general meeting to give expression to the views and feelings of the Churches, upon this subject."—*Presbyterian*.

CASE OF CHAMBERS-STREET CHURCH.—The case of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, (Mr. McLeod's,) which was recently argued before the Court of Errors in this city, has been settled by an arrangement of the parties, in advance of the decision

of the Court. We understand that according to the terms of the settlement, "*the Consistory*" are to retain their name, corporate character, legal rights, and the control of their property, real and personal. The complainants relinquish all their prosecutions, and release all claims, upon the condition that the Consistory shall pay to them a sum of money, equal to one third the net value of the property in Chambers and Reed streets according to an estimate agreed upon. This agreement is to be sanctioned by a decree of the Court.—*Jour. of Com.*

Suicide in France.

I witnessed a scene this morning, which has left a very deep and melancholy impression on my mind. I had heard a day or two ago, that *Baron Gros*, President of the Academy of Fine Arts, one of the most distinguished painters in France was dead. As I was going from my hotel with a friend to visit the hospital of the invalids, we met his funeral procession, near the Louvre. The hearse, covered with the richest velvet, and deeply embossed with silver, was preceded by a long procession of the artists of Paris, and drawn by the pupils of the deceased, who had earnestly solicited the privilege of doing this public honor to the memory of their illustrious master. The car was followed by a long line of mourning coaches, occupied by distinguished members of the National Institute, dressed in their respective uniforms, of literary and scientific costumes.

Till then I had heard nothing of the manner or circumstances of the artist's death, whom so many delighted to honor; but supposed he had been carried off, rather suddenly, by some acute disease. After the procession had passed, and while I was beginning to meditate upon the final departure from this world, of one so eminent in his profession and so deeply lamented, my friend turned to me and said, "Perhaps you are not aware that *Baron Gros* perished by his own hand. About a month ago, I attended a meeting of the National Institute at which he presided. He was a tall fine looking man, not far from sixty years of age. Since then, I understand he has appeared somewhat depressed at times, but not so much so, as to excite any particular anxiety for him in the minds of his friends. Near the close of last week, (I do not recollect the day,) he left his house without telling any one where he was going, or when he expected to return. As he was gone all night, his friends became anxious about him. They found in his bureau a paper, which greatly increased their alarm, by the intimations which it contained of his design. Diligent inquiries and search were made, and at length his body was found in a small lake, with his cloths on, near *Verdun*, a few miles from Paris. The leading journals," added my friend, "say that he died in a fit; but others do not hesitate to record his death as a case of undoubted suicide, and in this I have no doubt they are correct."

I was exceedingly shocked, as you may well suppose, by this account; and further inquiries which I made of other persons satisfied me, that the impression of my friend was but too well founded—that *Baron Gros*, waited not for the summons, but rushed, unbidden, into the presence of his Judge.

Here, then, is a palpable exhibition of infidelity and popery in Paris, which may stand in the place of a great many arguments. A man of distinguished talents, and at the head of his profession, becomes tired of life. He looks forward, not by the light of revelation, (for I presume no one will pretend that he believed the Bible,) he looks forward to the gulph of dim uncertainty, or blank annihilation. Perhaps he hesitates. It is more than probable, that the voice of God speaking to his heart, startles him. But he takes the fatal leap. His body is found, and instead of being privately buried, he is drawn in state through the principal streets of the city, to a Catholic Church. There thousands assemble, and the religious ceremonies are performed, just as if he had died in his bed, and in

the faith of Rome. From the church he is borne to *Pere la Chaise*, and there funeral orations are pronounced over his grave, by three distinguished members of the Institute.

All this actually took place, as the journals of the next day informed us, and a splendid monument will no doubt be erected to his memory. Such is the state of public feeling and opinion in Paris. I presume not to lift the veil which conceals the eternal destiny of the self-murderer from our view. But what must be the state of religion in a country, where such public honors are decreed to men who lay violent hands upon their own lives? What must that church be which thus profanes and prostitutes its most sacred rights and ceremonies!—*New-York Observer*.

ART. VI. Notices.

THE PRESBYTERIAN MAGAZINE, from which we extract so liberally, is a most valuable monthly periodical, published at Edinburgh, under the patronage of the ORIGINAL SECEDERS. The editor, we believe, is the Rev. Thomas McCrie, son of the late Dr. McCrie. From our connection with the Original Seceders, we shall consider ourselves justified in making a pretty free use of the matter which appears in their Magazine. The article in this No. headed *The Errors of Dr. Dwight and the Hopkinsian School*, and which will be concluded in our next, is from that paper. And we also propose, as soon as practicable, to transfer from it to our pages a judicious Review of the Lectures of the late Dr. Dick, Professor of Divinity in the Theological Seminary of the United Secession Church. The Dr. it seems differs in sentiment from all the old Seceders respecting the "assurance of faith," the "absolute promises of the gospel," "conditions of salvation," &c.

In the absence of more suitable original matter, we have inserted in this No. a Sermon, which we confess makes too long an article; but having been solicited to publish it, by some who heard it from the pulpit, we thought we would do so, notwithstanding its length, and notwithstanding also that we are aware that it is not according to the taste of some of our readers to have sermons appear in the Monitor. The Sermon in question relates to a subject of vital importance, and we hope it will be perused with care and attention.

The communication by W. A., referred to in our last, is headed, "Miscellaneous Remarks on the nature and extent of Christ's mediatory power," &c. This explicitness we trust will prevent any mistakes arising from our abridgement of the author's name.

In the published Minutes of Synod a mistake appears in relation to the name of the person appointed Treasurer of the Bible Society, in place of Mr. Beveridge. Instead of "S. Young," it should read, "William S. Young." We hope this correction will be remembered by those who may have business to transact with Mr. Young in the above capacity.

It is with pleasure we learn that Messrs. W. S. & A. Young, of Philadelphia, have issued proposals for publishing, by subscription, the whole works of the Rev. Ebenezer Erskine, consisting of sermons and discourses, in three volumes. We hope they will be encouraged to go on with their undertaking. And we would recommend to the readers of the Monitor to become subscribers for these sermons of Mr. Erskine, as we have no hesitation in saying that they are the best, taken altogether, that ever have been published. Let the reader peruse the following testimonials.

"In these sermons, the reader will find a faithful adherence to the design of the Gospel, a clear defence of those doctrines which are 'the pillar and ground of truth,' a large compass of thought, and a happy flow of words, both judicious and familiar."—*Rev. Thomas Bradbury, author of sermons on the "Mystery of Godliness," &c.*

"Were I to read with a single view to the edification of my heart in true faith, solid comfort and evangelical holiness, I would have recourse to Mr. Erskine, and take his volumes for my guide, my companion, and my familiar friend."—*Rev. J. Hervey's "Theron and Aspasio."*

"These sweet discourses were wonderfully blessed to my soul. Great was my rejoicing and triumph in Christ. The Lord was with me of a truth, and his gracious visitation revived my spirit.—The Lord was gracious to my soul this afternoon. The Spirit was my Comforter, and Mr. Erskine's two sermons on the Rainbow of the Covenant were the channel through which that comfort was conveyed."—*Rev. Augustus Toplady's Memoirs.*

THE
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,

AND

EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

FEBRUARY, 1836.

ART. I. *On the nature and extent of the obligations assumed in Religious Covenanting.*

[It seems, that some little controversy has arisen, in a certain section of our church, respecting the extent of the obligations assumed in Religious Covenanting. The nature of this controversy may be sufficiently learned from the article below. We cannot say that we altogether coincide with some of the views expressed by our Correspondent; although we do not wish to meddle with this affair. We may state, however, that we are rather surprised to find him denying the position, that "the law of God binds us to perform impossibilities." He must be aware that this is the *popular ground* taken by Hopkinsians, and which has so mightily contributed to their success; although, to do him justice, he has explained himself in an entirely different manner from them. But in that part of his paper, if we are not greatly deceived, he completely overthrows the main pillar of his own argument. He had all along been contending, that although the law requires perfect obedience, yet inasmuch as there was no promise of grace, given, to enable us to yield that perfect obedience, therefore, it would be folly and rashness to vow it. But now he contends, if we understand him, that the law requires nothing, that there is not a promise, in Christ, of grace to perform. If so, then, there is a promise given of grace to enable a person *perfectly* to keep the law; for on his own admission *perfection* is required by the law. Hence he nullifies all the force of his own argument. Besides, in his illustration of the point, he confounds mere physical impossibilities with those that are moral; but it is only the latter, to which the objection, he is answering, has a respect. It is our decided opinion, notwithstanding of all that our Correspondent urges to the contrary, that the law of God demands of us the performance of moral impossibilities: For it says, "be ye perfect as your father in heaven is perfect"—"thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and all thy soul and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind and thy neighbor as thyself." There is no grace promised to make the performance of these things *possible* in the present life. Indeed these things are demanded of the Heathen, who have not the gospel and consequently have no promise of grace held forth to them. Their performance of them is, therefore, confessedly impossible. But we will not enter into the argument with our respected Correspondent. However, our pages will be open for a *reply* to this article by some of those who have ranked themselves on the other side of the question; and since their views have been impugned, perhaps it becomes necessary that they should step forward and defend or explain them. But let their reply be short, as we do not wish to occupy our pages with a long controversy on this subject.]

MR. EDITOR—

A sentiment of late obtains ground in some sections of our church, and is advocated in the Monitor, in Vol. X., in a paper entitled "Public Social Covenanting," on which I ask the liberty, through your Miscellany, to pass a few remarks. It appears to me to be a new doctrine taught in the Secession Church. And for this reason I believe that it is entitled to particular attention. The sentiment in question is this, "That it belongs

to the covenanter coming under solemn vows to God in the duty of public religious covenanting, to engage to give perfect obedience to the law of God." And according to it they are held to be in an error, who teach or believe the contrary doctrine, viz: that it is universal but not perfect obedience that is to be engaged to in this duty. As it belongs to us as a witnessing body, engaged in bearing testimony for precious truth, to speak all the same thing, and with one mind, and one mouth, to endeavor to glorify God, even the Father, it would seem to me that it would be highly proper that the sentiment itself should be enquired into, to see how far it agrees, or disagrees, with the word of God, and our subordinate standards; more especially as it is avowed by numbers and taught in the Monitor, as above mentioned. And perhaps a free discussion of the subject, by both sides, in the spirit of meekness, the only way in which controversy on religious subjects is to be managed, might subserve the interests of truth in this particular.

In order to bring the matter as fairly into view as possible, what I propose to do is: *First*, To show what is the doctrine of our church, as expressed in her public standards on the subject, which I believe to be altogether opposite to the sentiment referred to. *Secondly*, To give the judgment of some of the most approved writers of the Secession Church, in reference to the mind of our church on the subject; and also their own views expressed by them without reference had to our public standards. *Thirdly*, To show my own reasons why I cannot agree with said sentiment; and, *Fourthly*, To answer some objections which have been made, or may be made to the contrary opinion, and which have been advanced in support of the sentiment itself.

1st. The doctrine of our church on the subject, in her public standards, may be learned from the Westminster Confession of Faith, chap. xxii, entitled "Of lawful Oaths and Vows," section 3d. "Whosoever taketh an oath ought duly to consider the weightiness of so solemn an act and therein to avouch nothing but what he is fully persuaded is the truth. Neither may any man bind himself by oath to any thing but what is good and just, and what he believeth so to be, and what he is able and resolved to perform." And sect. 7. "No man may vow to do any thing forbidden in the word of God, or what would hinder any duty therein commanded, or which is not in his own power, and for the performance of which he hath no promise or ability from God." In the first of these quotations a person is to engage to what he is able and resolved to perform, and nothing else. In the second, what he has not in his own power, and for the performance whereof he hath no promise or ability from God, he is not to engage to.

In the Act concerning the doctrine of grace, which is a standard work of the Secession Church; speaking of the connexion between God's covenant of grace, and our covenant of duties; to shew what influence the covenant of grace has upon our covenants of duty, it is declared that it has an influence, "In respect of the promise of the covenant of grace as it is a covenant promising all grace both habitual and actual. (Ezek. xxxvi. 25, 26, 27.) Grace for performing every duty required in the precept of the law is given forth to us in the promise of the gospel: And as we cannot set about vowing or resolving to perform any duty required in the law without the grace promised in the gospel: so the grace here promised is to be apprehended and depended upon by faith as the great encouragement to vow and resolve upon obedience saying, (Psalm cxix. 106,) "I have sworn and I will perform that I will keep thy righteous judgments." And also, "In respect of the furniture we have in our new covenant head, the Lord Jesus Christ. Having in him righteousness for acceptance, and strength for assistance in every duty, and particularly in solemn vowing of obedience unto him. The spirit of all grace being above

measure in our glorious head for our use and behoof: We are called to be "strong in the grace that is in Christ Jesus;" to be "strong in the Lord, and in the power of his might," by whom strengthening we can do all things. This furniture we have always in him as our New Covenant Head, and always access to the benefit of it by faith, the proper language whereof is, "surely in the Lord have I righteousness and strength." And as without this faith it is impossible to please God by any duty and service; so by this faith we are in case to please God and serve him spiritually and *acceptably*."

Again, "so as for the great work of covenanting to serve and obey him we may with humble confidence set about it in the faith of this new covenant furniture we have in Jesus Christ; saying as it is in Psalm lxxi. 16, "I will go in strength of the Lord God; I will make mention of thy righteousness even of thine only." According to the mind of the Associate Presbytery, as expressed in this part of our standards, nothing is to be engaged to by us, but what we have strength in Christ our Head to perform, and we are not to go in our covenant engagements beyond what the promise secures in this way. If we could say that the promise secures grace to enable us to obey the law of God perfectly, then may we engage to render a perfect obedience to the law but not otherwise.

In the New Exhibition of the Secession Testimony in Scotland, on the head that treats of public religious covenanting, it is said that in this duty the covenanters "profess to renounce all hope of life from the covenant of works; to take hold of the covenant of grace, and to devote themselves to the Lord, and *in the strength of promised grace*, engage faithfully to cleave to him, to hold fast his truths, to perform the duties which they owe to God, &c." Our Testimony speaks as follows, "we declare that it is our duty, *relying on the grace that is in Christ Jesus*, to engage jointly in a public solemn covenant, &c." And in all the covenant bonds that have been in use in the Secession Church, we find her speaking in still more express language on this head. In the original bond of Seceders covenanters say, "WE DO, with our hands lifted up to the MOST HIGH GOD, hereby profess, and before God, angels and men, solemnly declare, that through the grace of God, and *according to the measure of his grace given unto us*, we do with our whole hearts take hold of the Lord Jesus Christ, &c." In the bond contained in the New Exhibition it runs, "WE DO, &c. solemnly declare, that through the grace of God, and *according to the measure of his grace given unto us*, we desire to take hold with our whole hearts of the Lord Jesus Christ, &c." And in the bond contained in our Testimony, covenanters speak in the same language. "WE DO, &c. solemnly declare, that through the grace of God, and *according to the measure of his grace given unto us*, &c." A solemn and most guarded attempt is made in all the three to speak in as scriptural a manner as possible, and to let covenanters know that they are not to engage in this duty to do any thing more than there is grace in the promise to enable them to perform; nor further than that grace is given out to them by Christ for this purpose.

2d. In laying before your readers the mind of approved writers of the Secession on this subject, I shall first refer to Dr. Anderson, in his explanation of the bond in his Catechism on the subject of covenanting, wherein he says, "No obedience to the law of works is acceptable to God but that which is absolutely perfect, whereas imperfect obedience to the law of Christ, if it be sincere and proceed from true faith, is acceptable to him;" and puts the question, "May they (believers) not expect to be enabled in this life to keep the commandments of God perfectly?" and answers it as follows: "No; they have engaged and hope to keep them *no otherwise than as God has promised to enable them to do so*. He has not

promised to enable them in this life to keep his law perfectly, but to keep it acceptably, and to go on to perfection, &c."

Allan, in his sermons on the subject of covenanting, says, "With regard to the extent of people's engagements to duty, we observe that they ought to bear some correspondence to the extent of the divine law. God's commandment the Psalmist declares is exceeding broad. Broad, however, as it is, our engagements should reach to the full extent of it. Perfect obedience being absolutely unattainable by any mere man in the present state *it were the most daring presumption for any one to engage to it.* But perfect obedience is one thing, and an universal obedience quite another. The former is impossible, the latter is both attainable and a matter of duty."

Ralph Erskine, in his Sermon on Gospel Holiness, says, "The command of the covenant of works is *Do and live*; but in the hands of Christ it is *Live and do*; the command of the law of works is *Do or else be damned*; but in the hand of Christ the law is, *I have delivered thee from hell, therefore Do*; the command of the law of works is *Do in thine own strength*, but the law in the hand of Christ is, *I am thy strength, my strength shall be perfected in thy weakness, therefore Do.* The command is materially the same, yet the form is different. The command of the covenant of works is *Do perfectly that you may have eternal life*; but now in the hand of Christ the form is, *I have given thee eternal life in me by my doing and therefore Do as perfectly as you can through my grace, till you come to a state of perfection.*"

Brown, of Haddington, in his Bible Dictionary, on the word OATH, says, "The law of God binds all men to absolute perfection in holiness, be they as incapable of it as they will. But no man can *without mocking and tempting God, bind himself by oath to any thing but what he is able to perform.* While God remains God his law can demand no less than absolute perfection in holiness. While his word remains true no mere man since the fall, in this life, can possibly attain to it, *and therefore must never vow it.*"

The Marrow of Modern Divinity, which though it is not a Seceder work, is yet a display of the truth in general in accordance with the doctrines of Seceders, and ranks next to the standards of the Secession church in point of doctrine, may be heard on the subject; where Neophytus puts the question to Evangelista, "But will God in Christ accept of my obedience if it be not perfect?" which is answered thus by Evangelista, "Yea neighbor Neophytus, you being a justified person, and so it not being in the case of justification, but in case of childlike obedience, I may without fear of danger say unto you, God will *accept the will for the deed*, and will spare you as a man spareth his own son that serveth him."

It is true that two of these writers, in the quotations which have been used, do not say that we are not to promise a perfect obedience to the law of God, for they do not treat of the subject of covenanting in the places whence the words quoted are taken, but they speak what amounts to the same thing, as they shew that a perfect obedience to the law of God, no man can give, and that the obedience of the believer is accepted with God though it is not perfect, which is as much as to say that he is not to promise what he cannot give.

3d. The reasons I would assign why I cannot agree with the sentiment in question are,

1. That promises rightly made are solemn engagements to do what the promiser has both inclination and ability to do, according to the opinion of all writers on the subject of morals; and without both this inclination and ability, the person who makes them would be insulting a fellow-creature to come under them. It would be a still higher affront put upon

the God of truth. It would be to all intents and purposes lying to God, especially if done under a conviction, that what he promised he would never be able to perform.

2. The fact that God will accept the imperfect obedience of the believer rendered in faith according to the ability bestowed upon him makes it evident that no engagement to perfect obedience is required in this duty or expected; because if it were required he would not be accepted in a less measure of obedience rendered to God.

3. It is a sentiment that is greatly discouraging to the people of God going forward in this duty, while the Lord's manner of dealing with persons in calling them forward to duty, is to remove discouragements out of their way, which he does by telling them that he calls them to no duties whatever, but what he has grace for them in the promise to enable them to perform. To remove discouragements he connects commands with promises; making the latter always to run parallel with the former. He makes it the duty of ministers of the gospel to make the way of duty clear and easy; to cast up the high way and gather out the stones. But by teaching such a sentiment they would be throwing stones in the way, and spreading difficulties before tender souls which they could not easily overcome. I have gone the way of this duty myself. But were I to engage in it again, and told that by engaging in it I had to come under a promise to render a perfect obedience to the law of God, whilst that obedience to it I could not possibly give, though the command to the duty appeared very plain, I must be tempted to doubt of a mistake somewhere, as it would be so contrary to the Lord's usual ways to his people, in calling them to duty. And I do not see but that others must be in the same difficulty here with myself.

4. It is a departure from the marrow scheme of doctrine which makes privilege to go before duty, and to keep, in all cases, pace with it. Here there would be duty without privilege; because while this perfect obedience, a person is to render to the law of God, according to such a sentiment, is made his duty, and he is to come under solemn engagements to give it, he is left without strength for it, contrary to the promise of God which proportions strength always to the believers day.

5. Such an engagement come under in this duty would not be in accordance with the manner and spirit in which persons are to essay the duty itself. "Thou shalt swear the Lord liveth," is the command that is given in respect to the observance of the duty as in itself, and along with this we are to engage to all duties we owe to him as one who has supreme authority over us, and an undisputed right to our services. But the manner in which this is to be done is "in truth, in righteousness, and in judgment." Coming under such engagement, however, we would be swearing neither in truth, in righteousness, or in judgment: not in truth because we would be swearing to what we never could perform; nor in righteousness because we would be swearing to what we never would perform, and know that we never could perform in this life; nor in "judgment," because a person could not well be considered as swearing in judgment when he swears to perform a duty, which we have neither in ourselves nor in Christ our head strength to perform, while we are in this imperfect state. We are to go about this as well as all other duties in faith. But we have not in the whole word of God a ground for faith to act upon, in coming under such an engagement as this. The engagement come under in this duty is to be entered into under a resolution to perform it. But what man, who is not an high flying Arminian in principle, would come under a resolution to keep the law of God in this life perfectly? And who has any warrant from the word of God to come under such a resolution.

6. It is contrary to the whole tenor of scripture, which as I have already stated, connects commands with promises, and secures equal ability

for the greatest duties, as for the least : and also secures that the very thing commanded and which it is the duty of the Lord's people to engage to shall be done. A few of the passages which have a more particular bearing on the point I will now produce : and I will have more respect, in bringing them forward, to the order of their connexion than to the order in which they stand in the written record. They are as follows :

Psalms lxxi. 16 "I will go in strength of the Lord God, &c." which is in substance the language of a covenanter both at the time he is coming under vows to God, and after he has come under these vows; and it may be paraphrased thus, "As strength is given I will perform, and I will rely on God himself for it." This being in substance the language he speaks when he comes under vows, he promises no further, and is to promise no further than he has grace and strength in God's promise, and in Christ his head to secure that he may perform.

Deut. xxxiii. 25, "As thy days so shall thy strength be." If a minister of the gospel were to take this as his text; on that head which would treat of a person's *day* as mentioned in the text, *a day of duty* would very naturally come into view, as what, in discussing the subject, was to be treated of; and the word *day* referring to the present life in all the varied circumstances of it and situations we may be in; the promise must apply to these circumstances and secure grace answerable unto them: And while we engage to do the duties connected with them, it must be in the hope and belief that we engage to nothing impossible for us in these circumstances.

Phil. iv. 13, "I can do all things through Christ that strengtheneth me." and 2 Cor. xii. 9, "My grace is sufficient for thee, for my strength is perfected in weakness." From these two passages compared, we learn that the grace of Christ strengthening believers, and their duty go together, so that they are called to no duty but what they have grace in the promise and in Christ their head to enable them to discharge, and they are to engage to none, in respect to which, this grace is not secured. But there is not grace secured in the promise to enable us to keep the law of God perfectly.

Psalms lxxvi. 11. "Vow and pay unto the Lord your God, &c." Our vowing to God and paying are to be of equal extent as parts of Christian duty. But who can say that if he vows to give perfect obedience to the law of God he can pay it? If a person is assured that he is unable to pay such a vow, by what law of God is he warranted to come under it?

Isaiah xix. 21. "They shall vow a vow unto the Lord and perform it." And Psalms lxxv. 1. "To thee shall the vow be performed." Neither of these promises of the word of God are true promises of what shall be, if perfect obedience to the law of God is what men vow to give in the duty of public covenanting: For our Shorter Catechism rightly tells us, in answer to that question, "Is any man able perfectly to keep the law of God?" that "No man is able in this life perfectly to keep the law of God, but doth daily break it, in thought, word and deed." And the whole Word of God, together with observation and experience, concurs to show that this is a solemn and undoubted truth.

But one passage seems particularly to inform us, that the engagement we come under in covenanting is an engagement to keep the whole law, and yet, that it is not an engagement beyond what we are able through grace to perform. Hence it is not an engagement to render perfect obedience to the law of God. Says the Psalmist, Psalms cxix. 106. "I have sworn, and I will perform it, that I will keep thy righteous judgments." Here is a resolution distinct from the resolution or engagement entered into by him when he engaged particularly, and, likely on some occasion not mentioned, formally in the duty of covenanting; or a declaration of

his expectation that he would be able to perform his oath; which intimates to us his belief, as an inspired saint of God, and recorded for our instruction, that what he had engaged to he was able, and in this life too, to perform: And the word of God is our sure guide in these things.

One passage more I shall refer to. It is in the words of the Holy Ghost, by Solomon, in Eccl. v. 5, "Better it is that thou shouldst not vow than that thou shouldst vow and not pay." Here is a barrier set in the way of our engaging in this duty, which I cannot see how a tender conscience can get over, upon the principle necessarily involved in such a sentiment as is under consideration. For my own part, I cannot for the present see any other possible way to surmount it, than by the promises, as stepping stones by which we may rise above the common level of human weakness and corruption to the height of this great obstacle, which otherwise would seem to be a discouragement which a tender conscience could not easily overcome, and by this means we can get easily over it. For, relying on these promises, we may say with Paul, "I can do all things through Christ that strengtheneth me." I can overcome these discouragements in the way of being enabled, through the grace of my Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, to make my vows and perform them in a manner that will be pleasing to him. Such language presents to us a very solemn warning indeed. It teaches us, both how we should be careful in making our vows, and also in our endeavor to perform them, relying on that grace that is in Christ our head for this purpose. But taking the promise with us, which secures grace answerable to our day, we need not despair. Speaking to our own hearts, in an appropriation to ourselves of the grace that is in the promise in the words of Paul just now referred to, we may go forward and be assured that what we vow in agreeableness to his command, we will be enabled to pay.

I proceed now to consider objections—

1st. "The covenant of works, it may be said, was a covenant of duty. But in that covenant man was bound to perfect obedience. By what law is he loosed?" Answer: The covenant of works was a covenant of duty in a different way from the covenant, churches enter into. That was a covenant man was to keep for life. This covenant we are to keep from life and in love, and as persons in union to Christ, and in the strength of grace derived from him, our head of life and fulness: and accordingly, as that life of grace here is not perfected in us, we are not expected by God to be able to yield a perfect obedience to his law, and of consequence, not to promise what we cannot give in this world; because in doing so, in the duty of covenanting, we would be swearing neither *in truth* nor in judgment, according to the manner in which we are commanded to swear, the Lord liveth. If it is said "If in that covenant man was bound to perfect obedience, by what law is he loosed?" Answer: I think the Apostle tells us, when he speaks of the believer as divorced from the law as his first husband; namely, as a covenant of works, and married to Christ; or as being no more under the law but under grace. To be no more under the law is to be delivered from it as a covenant of works; and to be under grace, to be obeying it from love, and according to the measure of grace given unto us from Christ for this purpose.

2d. "The act of public covenanting is the act of yielding consent to the law of God. But that law requires perfect obedience: Therefore we are in covenanting to engage to this." Answer: The law of God, as a covenant of works, requires perfect obedience in order to justification. But as we are to give our consent to it, in public covenanting, it is not as a covenant of works, but as it is a rule of life in the hand of Christ as Mediator. And our obedience being to be given to it in love, it is to be given in dependence on Christ himself; and our promise or

engagement to this obedience, being a promise or engagement to give it in his strength, supposes that we are only to engage to a dependence on him for strength, and to an obedience to be performed by us in this way, according to the measure of the grace he confers upon us. The believer being delivered from the commanding and condemning power of the law as a covenant of works, and being only under law to Christ, supposes that he is to give obedience to it, from love to Christ, in subjection to him and dependence upon him; and while, through his present frailties and imperfections he fails in many things, this serves not to bring wrath upon him before God, because Christ has fulfilled the law for him, and his acceptance is through Christ and not at all through himself; so that the numberless shortcomings he is guilty of do not affect his state before God.

3d. "Those who only agree to yield obedience so far as they may be assisted, agree to yield imperfect obedience. But imperfect obedience is forbidden by the law of God; Therefore, &c." The language of covenanters is virtually neither more nor less than this, "I will go in strength of the Lord God, making mention of his righteousness, even of his only." If that will give perfect obedience they engage to it. If not, they do not and dare not engage to it; for to go on, in the engagements they come under in covenanting, in their own strength would be sinful; and also to attempt to fulfil these engagements in their own strength would be sinful. If we can say that perfect obedience to God's law in this life is to be expected of those who come under engagements to give it, we will have reason to say, that perfect obedience we are to promise in the duty of covenanting: But as such an obedience is not to be expected of any who come under vows to God, it follows that we are not to promise it.

4th. "Promised grace is not the rule of obligation. It indeed tells the fact, that further men will never perform; but the moral law binds them to perform more; and will the divine promise be an excuse to any in agreeing to perform less than the law requires?" Answer: As the law is a covenant of works, it indeed binds to a perfect obedience, in order to live upon the footing of that obedience to it. But as it is in Christ's hand as a rule of life for his people, it goes no further than the promise meets them with an engagement, on Christ's part, to bestow upon them grace sufficient for whatever duties it enjoins: For throughout the Scriptures, whatever duty is commanded of God there is a corresponding promise of grace to enable us to the performance of it; and the command and the promise are inseparably connected. This is good marrow doctrine, and a doctrine that holds a prominent place in the system of doctrine maintained by the Secession church. If such is the case, then, that the command and promise go together in the Scriptures so closely, the believer, as he is now under law to Christ, is bound to promise no more obedience to the law or commandment than the promise secures him grace to enable him to perform.

5th. "If you say it is absurd to bind yourself to impossibilities, it is not so; for we are all bound to impossibilities, because the law binds us to absolute perfection." Answer: Where it is taught in the Word of God that we are bound to impossibilities, I have yet to learn. I know that there it is required that the Scriptures as the Word of God should be read diligently, and a blessing is pronounced upon them that read them and understand them; and men are enjoined to search them that they may find Christ in them. But I scarcely think that a blame is attached there to those who do not read them, because they want their eyesight; or to those who never had an opportunity of obtaining an education sufficient to qualify them for it, or have a natural incapacity to learn to read the Word of God for their instruction and direction. To attend on pub-

lic ordinances is made there also a positive duty of all who have an opportunity or ability to give their attendance upon them. But those who have them not, or those who are confined to beds of sickness so as they are not able to attend upon them, it cannot be their sin that they do not give their attendance upon them; because, in the first case, they want the opportunity which is necessary to make it a duty; in the other case they want the ability, and the Lord will have mercy and not sacrifice. To believe on the Lord Jesus Christ is a duty obligatory on all gospel hearers; and such as are unregenerated among them, I know, until they are made partakers of the grace of regeneration, cannot and will not believe. But it is only as the thing is possible for them, that their not believing becomes their sin; for though they are utterly unable for it in themselves they are able for it in Christ, whose gift faith is: And accordingly, while unbelief is a sin in those who are favored with the gospel, it cannot be the sin of the heathen, who are without the word of God, which is the ground of faith. They are not bound to believe the gospel in their state of heathen darkness, as a thing impossible. But no sooner does it become possible for them, by the enjoyment of the gospel, with the promise in it of grace, to be made sufficient for them, in this way, than the command of God to believe reaches them, and leaves them guilty of disobedience if they live in unbelief.

In short, I do not find any where in the word of God the least hint given, or any thing that would appear to show, that men are bound to impossibilities, or are called to engage to perform impossibilities. The whole tenor of the word of God plainly speaks another language to men.

6th. Some seem to suppose that the obedience engaged unto in the duty of public religious covenanting, has not a respect so much to the particular personal obedience of the covenanter himself, as to the perfect personal obedience of Christ; and in this way they endeavor to get over the difficulty which appears to lie against men engaging to what they never, in their own persons, can perform in this world. To show how the covenanter may engage to perfect obedience, though he cannot give it, the writer, in the article in the Monitor referred to, says, "Now these requirements of the divine law lead the true covenanter out of himself wholly to Christ, as his only and great law-fulfiller. It is the perfect obedience and strength of Christ that the covenanter has a respect to in accepting him in this service, &c. 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." But it is to be remembered, that our engagements, we come under in public religious covenanting, have a respect to our own personal obedience, and not at all to the obedience given by Christ, any further than that we expect we shall be accepted in the duties we engage to, as duties to be performed by ourselves through this, and derive strength for the performance of them, through this doing of Christ as well as his dying, as the procuring means by which it is to be obtained. And this the whole tenor of our religious bonds makes evident, wherein we engage that we shall do so and so, and not that Christ shall do so for us. What respects Christ as a law fulfiller has a relation to what he has already done for us, as a part of that justifying righteousness which is the ground of both the acceptance of our persons and our services, including the duties we engage to in covenanting, with other services we are to render to God. And this that he has done for us we profess to take up with by faith, but are not to consider it as any part of that which we shall do in Christ, and are to engage to in this duty of covenanting.

7th. It is said "We know that perfect obedience to God's law will never be given by believers, in this world, though they are to engage to this in their vows to God. But when they come to heaven they will

give it. All those covenanters that are at God's right hand are fully paying their vows." Answer: Our vows, we come under in public religious covenanting, have only a respect to duties which belong to us in this life. Like other ordinances covenanting, is designed to help us forward to heaven, but has no respect to what we will be employed in there. This will appear from the uniform language of the covenant deeds of the church; which run generally after this manner, "That we will in our several places and callings, &c." The places and callings we are in here respectively, as ministers and people, public officers and private members in the church, husbands and wives, parents and children, &c. will be done away in heaven.

Having shown the doctrine of our standards, and the judgment of approved writers of the Secession church on the subject, and stated too some reasons of my own why I cannot approve of the sentiment, and also endeavored to answer some objections, I will now conclude these remarks with an extract taken from Allan's Sermons on the subject of covenanting, which appears to me to be exceedingly appropriate to the business in hand, showing that there is no reason for discouragement to those who would honor the Lord in this duty; as, being called to engage in it, they are not called to engage in a duty which they are unable to perform; but to one they are fully able for, as there is grace in the promise to fit them for the performance of it answerable to their need. "Well but, say some, the work is great and we ourselves are but weak and insufficient for the performance of it. Owing to our own weakness and corruption we are ready to mismanage every work in which we engage; how then can we think of putting hand to such an arduous work as this? It is no wonder the consideration of these things should fill us with discouragement; it is even sometimes like to deter us from engaging in the work altogether. But why all these unbelieving fears while there is a sufficiency of grace in the promise to enable the very weakest child in all God's family to discharge this duty with acceptance? He sends none a warfare on their own charges, but hath graciously promised that 'as their days are so their strength shall be.' Had they nothing to depend upon but their own stock, either for the making of their vows or for the payment of them they might well despair. But their mercy is that he calls to no piece of service without accompanying the call with the promise of all needful grace, to enable to the acceptable performance of it. This is particularly the case with respect to the work of which we now treat. He who hath said 'Vow and pay to the Lord your God,' hath also said 'They shall vow a vow to the Lord, and they shall perform it.'" (See Sermon 9th.)

Y.

ART. II. *Of Oaths.*

MR. EDITOR—

I send you, for insertion in the Religious Monitor, the following extract, from the subject of Oaths, from "Wayland's Elements of Moral Science."* The subject is one of much general and practical importance. Without that confidence which an oath is frequently necessary to inspire society could not exist. And few persons pass through the ordinary

* The writer of these remarks embraces this opportunity to invite the attention of the friends of morality and good order, to President Wayland's Elements of Moral Science; in the publication of which the author has performed an important service to the cause of moral truth. This book is designed as a class or text book, on the subject of moral science; and as such it is hoped it will soon be introduced into all our public schools.

course of human life, without being called upon some time or other to take an oath. That part of the extract to which the attention of the readers of the Religious Monitor is particularly requested, is that which states the principles upon which oaths are to be interpreted. These are evidently the only true principles upon which an oath must be interpreted, in order to gain the end for which the ordinance of the oath was instituted, viz: the termination of strife. (Heb. vi. 16.) But I will not detain the reader from the extract itself.

“Theory of oaths; lawfulness of oaths; manner of interpretation of oaths.

I. The theory of oaths.

It is frequently of the highest importance to society, that the facts relating to a particular transaction should be distinctly and accurately ascertained. Unless this could be done, neither the innocent could be protected, nor the guilty punished; that is, justice could not be administered, and society could not exist.

To almost every fact, or to the circumstances which determine it to be fact, there must be from the laws of cause and effect, and from the social nature of man, many witnesses. The fact can, therefore, be generally known, if the witnesses can be induced to testify, and to testify the truth.

To place men under such circumstances, that, upon the ordinary principles of the human mind, they shall be most likely to testify truly, is the design of administering an oath.

In taking an oath, besides incurring the ordinary civil penalties incident to perjury, he who swears calls upon God to witness the truth of his assertions; and, also, either expressly, or by implication, invokes upon himself the judgments of God, if he speak falsely. The ordinary form of swearing, in this country, and in Great Britain, is to close the promise of veracity, with the words, “So help me God;” that is, may God only help me as I tell the truth. Inasmuch as without the help of God we must be miserable for time and for eternity; to relinquish this help if we violate the truth, is, on this condition, to imprecate upon ourselves the absence of the favor of God, and of course, all possible misery forever.

The theory of Oaths, then, I suppose to be as follows:

1. Men naturally speak the truth, when there is no counteracting motive to prevent it; and unless some such motive be supposed to supervene, expect the truth to be spoken.

2. When, however, by speaking falsely some immediate advantage can be gained, or some immediate evil avoided, they will frequently speak falsely.

3. But, when a greater good can be gained, or a greater evil avoided, by speaking the truth, than could possibly be gained or avoided by speaking falsely, they will, on the ordinary principles of the human mind, speak the truth. To place them under such circumstances, is the design of an oath.

4. Now, as the favor of God is the source of every blessing which man can possibly enjoy, and as his displeasure must involve misery utterly beyond the grasp of our limited conceptions; if we can place men under such circumstances, that, by speaking falsely they relinquish all claim to the one, and incur all that is awful in the other, we manifestly place a stronger motive before them for speaking the truth than can possibly be conceived for speaking falsehood. Hence, it is supposed, on the ordinary principles of the human mind, that men, under such circumstances, will speak the truth.

Such, I suppose to be the theory of oaths. There can be no doubt, that if men acted upon this conviction, the truth would be, by means of them, universally elicited.

But inasmuch as men may be required to testify, whose practical conviction of these great moral truths, is at best but weak, and who are liable to be more strongly influenced by immediate, than by ulterior motives; human punishments have always been affixed to the crime of perjury. These, of course, vary with different ages, and in different periods of society. The most equitable provision seems to be that of the Jewish law, by which the perjurer was made to suffer precisely the same injury which he had designed to inflict on the innocent party. The Mosaic enactment seems intended to have been, in regard to this crime, unusually rigorous. The judges are especially commanded not to spare, but to exact an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth. It certainly deserves serious consideration, whether modern legislators might not derive important instruction from this feature of Jewish Jurisprudence."

I propose for the present to pass over the second division of this chapter, which treats of the *lawfulness* of oaths; as I trust this will be readily admitted by most, if not all, the readers of the Monitor. President Wayland's concluding remark on this part of the subject, ought, however, to be more seriously considered than what it generally is. "One thing," says he, "however seems evident, that the multiplication of oaths, demanded by the present practice of most christian nations, is not only very wicked, but that its direct tendency is to diminish our reverence for the Deity; and thus, in the end, lead to the very evil which it is intended to prevent."

"III. The interpretation of oaths.

As oaths are imposed for the safety of the party administering them, they are to be interpreted as he understands them. The person under oath has no right to make any mental reservation, but to declare the truth, precisely in the manner that the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth is expected of him. On no other principle would we ever know what to believe or to expect from a witness. If for the sake of personal friendship, or from personal advantage, or from fear of personal inconvenience, or from the excitement of party partiality, he shrink from declaring the whole truth, he is as truly guilty of perjury as though he swore falsely for money."

To this III. section, and particularly the concluding sentence, I would again invite the most solemn attention of the reader—where this conclusion is clear, that it is actual perjury to conceal or keep back, on oath, any fact, or any part of the truth, relative to the matter about which the person is called to testify, or to evade a direct answer to any question which the party on whose account the oath is administered, has a moral right to propose, and that is any and every question which will tend to elicit the whole truth on the matter at issue. And the person who does so, according to the nature of an oath as explained above, is chargeable with making a formal and voluntary abjuration of the favor of God forever; for the sake of whatever present consideration may have induced him to commit the act of perjury.

J. P. M.

ART. III. *The Origin and Import of the Word HEBREW.*

As names are commonly given in modern times, it would be an unprofitable labor to attempt to trace their history or signification; it would add nothing to our knowledge in any respect, as they are for the most part mere arbitrary signs, to distinguish one person or thing from another. This is not however the first or most natural use of a name, but to

give a brief description of the person, or to mark some prominent feature of his character or history. Hence it is from the names of primitive times that we obtain the most satisfactory hints of their history, where the narrative is silent. Of all names recorded in scripture as belonging to men, there is perhaps none that has more weight laid on it than the name *Hebrew*, both in the Old and New Testament. Its origin and import have been largely discussed by many learned writers, but so far as we know, with little agreement or satisfaction; it is observed that the word is derived from *Habar*—*He passed over*, and that Abraham is the first who is called a Hebrew; therefore it is concluded, that he was so called, because he passed over, or came from beyond the river Euphrates. Others think it is taken from *Heber*, one of the ancestors of Abraham, who, on account of some eminence, had his name transmitted in this manner to posterity. Others think that the origin of the name is clearly pointed out, Gen. x. 21, where Shem is called “The father of all the children of *Heber*.”

There is one difficulty in all these schemes, which proves that none of them is the true key to the question, viz: the reasons assigned are equally applicable to many whom the name is not given. If Abraham was called a *Hebrew* because he came from beyond Euphrates, then all the original inhabitants of Canaan and the adjoining countries ought also to be so called, for they also came over the river, as might be shown; or at any rate Lot and his posterity would be so called, for he was the companion of Abraham in his travels, and unquestionably the name would belong to all the descendants of Abraham alike; to Ishmael as well as to Isaac, to Esau as well as to Jacob; but none of these is by any means the case. A like objection lies against the derivation of the name from Heber or Shem to their posterity, because it is given to some only and not to all who have an equal right to it. The truth is, these names are given to these three persons, on three different accounts.

First: Shem is called the father of all the children of Eber or Heber. The term Heber here we do not take to be the name of any person, but a common noun, which might be rendered *travel*; and the expression “the children of travel,” is a hebraism very common, like these “the children of men,” meaning men; “the children of wickedness,” wicked men; “the children of Beliel,” &c.; so “the children of travel” were travellers, and evidently the same that are spoken of Gen. xi. 2; “they journeyed from the east.” These travellers were not the whole posterity of Noah, as some have supposed, but a colony setting out from the first settlement after the flood far in the east, where Noah and the greater part still remained, as the history of the most eastern nations sufficiently shows. This emigrating company, going to seek and settle some new countries; “found a plain in the land of Shinar,” and there made their first permanent stop. Shem is called the father of these; not that he was the progenitor of them all, (for it is plain that there were many of Japheth’s posterity among them, as also the children of Ham, and it is more than probable Ham himself,) but, in a sense very frequent in scripture, because he was the projector of the journey, or the chief captain of the company, and probably both. So Jabal is called the father of such as dwell in tents and have cattle; and Jubal is called the father of such as handle the harp and organ.—Gen. iv. 20, 21. Joab is called the father of the valley of craftsmen.—1 Chron. iv. 14; verse 21 we read, “the father of Maresha and the families of the house of them that wrought fine linen, &c.”

Second: The son of Salah was born sixty-seven years after the flood, probably about the time that the emigration before spoken of took place, and was called *Heber* (travel, or a traveller,) in commemoration of that event; as his son was afterward called Peleg, (division) to commemo-

rate the dispersion of men from Babel; "because in his days the earth was divided."

Third: Abraham and the nation of Israel were called Hebrews, (travellers) not only because he had left his country and kindred and travelled toward the land of Canaan, but because of his principle in doing so; it had a spiritual meaning in this case, it had its chief respect to the faith and religious profession of Abraham, and is well represented by the terms *Pilgrim* or *Sojourner*, one who is not in his own home or country; having no permanent abode, but moving from one station to another, making but short stays at any; still going on to his final destination, as the children of Israel did in the wilderness, and as those spoken of. Ps. lxxxiv. who come up through the valley of Baca, going from strength to strength, from one station of rest and refreshment to another, still prosecuting their journey towards Zion; and accordingly they are called *Hobri*, a word of the same derivation and import. Now this was precisely the profession of Abraham and the other patriarchs: "They confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth," and by this profession they declared plainly that they sought some country; and their practice showed that it was neither their native country which they had left, nor the land of Canaan unto which they had come, but "a better country, even a heavenly."—Heb. xi. 13—17. Hence we observe the name descends to those of his posterity only who professed the same faith with him; while all those who fell off from it, and conformed to the ungodly world, applying themselves to make worldly establishments, and obtain a part and portion in the present life, immediately lost it, as the posterity of Ishmael, Keturah, Esau, &c. The proper right to the name is bounded by the same lines as the covenants and promises; for it was an interest in these that induced them to enter on the life and profession of pilgrims. The heathen neighbors of Abraham might probably consider nothing farther in the name than as being descriptive of his mode of life, dwelling in tabernacles, &c.; but this was only a remote meaning of it, or rather, his external mode of life was his faith and profession put in practice in a particular way. "By faith he sojourned in the land of promise as in a strange country, &c."—Heb. xi. 9. In after ages it became a patronymic, and the surrounding nations might consider it as nothing more; the nation of Israel always looked on it as their most honorable title; hence Paul, enumerating his external privileges, says he was a Hebrew of the Hebrews, and if he were disposed to boast, as the false apostles did, he had as much right; "Are they Hebrews? so am I." But carnal men can have only carnal views of any thing; and so it was with them, though the mass of them had lost the spiritual sense of it, had lost the faith and practice of Abraham, they still assumed his honorable title, and claimed his privileges on a carnal account; therefore this was among the things which the apostle had once considered his gain, but at length counted only loss for Christ. As he teaches concerning another name of the same people, "He is not a Hebrew who is one outwardly, but he is a Hebrew who is one inwardly,—in the spirit and not in the letter."

According to this distinction we find the name and character highly valued by God and the godly. When God demanded the liberation of his people from Pharaoh's oppression, he calls himself the Lord God of the Hebrews.—Exod. iii. 18. The people are, through that part of their history, more commonly styled "the children of Israel," "Israelites," &c.; but there was a peculiar propriety in their being here called Hebrews, as they were thereby reminded that though they had now been in Egypt some generations, yet it was only as sojourners, and in this one word, their most precious concerns, their interest in the heavenly inheritance, was brought before them. And, lest they should think that their pilgrimage was to be only of an outward kind, and for a short time, to

be entirely ended when they should be settled in Canaan, he gave them an agrarian law, which should forever keep them in mind of it, as the true import of their natural title of Hebrews. Lev. xxv. 23.—“The land shall not be sold forever, for the land is mine; for ye are strangers and sojourners with me.” Again, when they had reached the height of their earthly prosperity as a nation, we find David, the greatest of their kings, taking the humble character as his honor and delight. “I am a stranger with thee and a sojourner, as were all my fathers.”—Ps. xxxix. 12. “I am a stranger on the earth.”—cxix. 19. “Thy statutes have been my songs in the house of my pilgrimage.”—cxix. 54—&c.

In conclusion, then, we may learn the fulness of the scripture; there is not a single term used without signification; and where any word has any mark of importance put on it, there is a treasure to be searched for. Again, we may learn the propriety of professors of religion being designated by appropriate names; it is one way in which they briefly declare their faith. It is commonly said, names are nothing, but that is only when men have the name without the thing; and then, indeed, they are worse than nothing; as it was with the carnal, formal, and hypocritical Jews, who took to themselves all the names and titles that belonged to precious saints before them, and thereby only deceived themselves and others; and so it is at this day with all empty professors. QUIDAM.

ART. IV. Errors of Dr. Dwight and the Hopkinsian School.

(Concluded from page 243.)

To make the argument still plainer, let it be observed that there are two ways in which an obligation may be discharged; either by paying *the very thing* stipulated for in the engagement, or by paying *some other thing* which may be accepted as an equivalent for that payment. In the first case, when, for example, a person pays the money he owed, or suffers the whole amount of punishment due, he is entitled, *ipso facto*, to a discharge; but, in the other case, where something is paid *different* from what was stipulated for, the payment does not, *of itself*, release the criminal from his obligation; there must be a previous act of consent on the part of the creditor or ruler to accept of this payment, and this act may be justly termed a remission of the debt or crime to the original offender. This latter mode of payment, which may be either accepted or refused, is properly called a *satisfaction*, and may be even opposed to *payment* strictly speaking. We usually speak of Christ having paid our debt; but he did so in the way of satisfaction; he did what was held by law and justice to be equivalent with our paying our own debt. It will be easily seen here, that we do not mean to assert that Christ did not bear in his own person *the same kind of punishment* that was due to justice by his people; it is the comfort of the believer to know that, as he obeyed the same law which we had transgressed, so he suffered under that law the *very punishment* which we had incurred by transgression. What we intend is, that, we being the offenders, owed *our own lives* to justice, and that God, by accepting of the life of another in our stead, mercifully relaxed the claims of his justice, and granted us a gracious remission. It is not so merely because he was paid by *another person*, (for, as in the case of pecuniary payment, this does not make the discharge a gratuitous remission,) but because that person did not, and could not, pay *the very thing* which justice originally demanded, namely, the life of the sinner; though he paid a full equivalent for this, which justice was pleased to ac-

cept in our behalf. Thus, justice was satisfied, the debt was paid, and yet the person of the debtor was mercifully spared, and his debt graciously remitted.

If it should still be alleged that such a translation of our debt to Christ leaves no room for the *actual remission* of our sins on conversion, we reply that the same reasoning we had used above applies to the sinner even after the atonement has been made. The debt of our guilt was transferred to Christ, but not in the same manner in which it was due by us; for we owed personal punishment, which could not be transferred to another. Still, therefore, we are personally criminal, and worthy of death; so that, if forgiven, we have to thank the grace and mercy of God for having accepted of a satisfaction in our stead, and graciously imputing the merit of this satisfaction to us. The personal guilt of the sinner still remains to be graciously forgiven, though it is forgiven on the ground of the satisfaction of Christ. After he is forgiven, the sinner, though still worthy of death, is no longer obnoxious to it: The law can still charge him; but these charges are answered by the righteousness imputed to him.

Though it is impossible to find a case among men corresponding in all respects with that of our redemption by Christ, we may refer, as an illustration of what we have advanced, to that of Paul and Onesimus. Onesimus had offended his master Philemon, and seems also to have contracted a pecuniary debt to him. Paul was anxious that his master should be reconciled to him, and to effect this, engages to pay any debt that Onesimus might have incurred. "If he hath wronged thee, or oweth thee ought, put that on mine account; I Paul have written it with mine own hand, I will repay it." Here the debt might be considered as paid; and yet, as Onesimus was a criminal as well as a debtor, Paul beseeches Philemon to forgive him. The payment of the debt was not inconsistent with the free forgiveness of the criminal. Philemon might still have refused to forgive the offence done to him by his servant. But we shall suppose that he accepted of Paul's satisfaction; in this case, we may suppose him to have thus addressed his returning servant: "I might have punished you for your evil deserts, but, for the sake of what Paul has done, who has satisfied me, I now freely receive you into my favor again, and forgive the wrong you have done me." So Christ took upon him the debt of his people, in order, that, being transferred to him, it might be remitted to them, and so "God for Christ's sake, hath forgiven us."

Thus the conclusion to which we come by attending to the same distinction, is quite the reverse of that drawn from it by Dr. Dwight and his followers. We maintain that there is not the slightest discrepancy or opposition between the grace of God, and the meritorious satisfaction of Christ, even viewing that satisfaction as the payment of the criminal debt of sinners. In the Scripture the grace of God is opposed to all merit on the part of *the sinner himself*, but never to that of *his surety*. So far from this, the grace of God and the purchase of the Saviour are uniformly combined, and each represented as enhancing the glory of the other. "In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace." Being justified *freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus.*" Besides what has been already advanced to shew the compatibility of these two things—full purchase and free pardon—let it be observed, 1st, that the grace of God was the *originating cause* of the whole work of redemption. The Scripture traces the whole to "the good pleasure of his will," to "his great love wherewith he loved us." Let none suppose, from what we have said, that we hold that Christ purchased for us the grace, the love, or the mercy of God. No; this was beyond all purchase, and would have been "no more grace," had it been purchased. What he purchased for us was the fruits, the effects, the blessings of that

grace. But the grace or love of God itself, so far from being purchased, was that which provided the purchase. In so far, therefore, as respected the love of God, all that the purchase of Christ effected was to open up a way in which it might be honorably and consistently exercised towards guilty man. In estimating the gratuitous nature of the gospel salvation, we must ascend to the original cause, which pervades and gives its character to the whole. The redemption of Christ was only one of the means devised in infinite wisdom, whereby the grace of God might be manifested in the pardon of guilty man. It was subordinate to his grace; and according to the old maxim, *subordinata non pugnant*, "things subordinate are not inconsistent with each other," there was a perfect harmony between them. 2dly. Consider that God the Father himself was *at the expense of providing the satisfaction*. It was not as if he had received this satisfaction from another being: "God purchased the church with his own blood." The union betwixt the Father and the Son renders the transaction between them altogether peculiar and extraordinary. There was no extrinsic influence employed to bear upon the Divine mind: "the covenant of peace was between them both." Each, however, may be viewed as bearing their own share in the expense of the work; for while it devolved on the Son to pay the price immediately into the hands of Divine Justice, it became the Father to "make him perfect through suffering." "God spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all." "God loved us, and gave his Son to be the propitiation for our sins." Here the creditor not only freely forgives the debt, but comes forward in the most generous manner, and pays the debt out of his own exchequer. And yet some of the debtors, thus forgiven, have the assurance to step forward, and ask, "If Christ has paid the debt for sinners—how can they be said to be pardoned or delivered by grace?" 3dly. Let it be noticed, that though pardon was an act of *justice to the Surety*, it is an act of *free grace to the sinner*. Dr. Dwight and his friends are constantly putting such questions as these, "If an equivalent is paid for our redemption, may we not, on the ground of justice, *demand* salvation? Is not God then *bound in justice* to forgive the sinner? And where then is the room for pardon?" These questions proceed on the supposition, already shewn to be groundless, that we hold the pecuniary view of the satisfaction of Christ, which they are pleased to ascribe to us; but, according to the principles laid down, we may hold, with perfect consistency, that in bestowing pardon, God performs an act of justice to his Son, while he confers upon us a boon of absolute and unmerited grace. Besides, the terms of the questions are invidiously and erroneously stated. No believer in Christ, we will venture to say, ever imagined that God was *bound in justice to him*, to forgive his sins; or thought of *demanding* salvation as something *due to him*. He feels that he is only worthy of death, and this keeps him humble even when assured of salvation. But can it be denied that God has *bound himself*, has pledged his justice for the salvation of the sinner? Is it not said, that "if we confess our sins, he is *faithful* and *just* to forgive us our sins?" and "that he hath set forth his Son a propitiation through faith in his blood for the forgiveness of sins, *that he might be just*, and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus?" And to whom is he faithful and just, but to himself and to his own Son, to whose meritorious sacrifice he has respect in justifying the ungodly? Pardon, then, is an act of justice, as well as of mercy; these two have "met together and kissed each other," in the blessed work of our reconciliation. It does not follow from this, however, that God is bound in justice to confer salvation on all men; this absurdity belongs exclusively to the doctrine of universal redemption. It is only in regard to the elect, considered as in Christ their federal head, that justice has thus become pledged; and the duty of faith is to realize and rejoice in this pledge as

given in his word. "Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect?"

Dr. Dwight asserts, indeed, the necessity of an atonement, but then this atonement consisted in nothing more than in Christ having "rendered to the law, character, and government of God, such peculiar honor as to make it consistent with their unchangeable nature and glory, that sinners should, on the proper conditions, be forgiven." (Sermon 64.) That is, as he expresses it elsewhere, "Christ accomplished something, without which man would not have been redeemed from the bondage of death and sin." (Sermon 38.) It is plain, that, according to this doctrine, Christ can in no proper sense of the term be called *our Redeemer*; he merely did something without which we could not be redeemed. The Holy Spirit may, with as much propriety, be called our Redeemer; for it is certain that he "accomplishes something, without which man would not have been redeemed." Nay, even the minister who brings the tidings of salvation is equally entitled on this ground to the designation. Thus this blessed name loses its signification: our tongue must falter when we utter it, lest the very sound should beguile us. The Doctor tells us that "we are not, *in the literal sense*, purchased at all." But if no price whatever was paid for our redemption, if the blood of Christ was not a true and proper equivalent to procure our deliverance from the bondage of death and sin,—we cannot be said to have been purchased by him, *in any sense* of that term. We allow that the term is metaphorical, but the metaphor surely points to a real transaction; unless, indeed, the Doctor means to say that Christ only redeems us metaphorically, and that we are saved from death, as Isaac was, "in a figure." We wish to know, then, what was the nature of this transaction? It will not do to say merely, that Christ made it consistent with the honor of justice that sinners should be forgiven. We admit this, but desire to know *what he did*, in order to render this consistent with the honor of justice? The Doctor answers, "he accomplished something." And we ask, in return, what could this "something" be, but a plenary satisfaction to divine justice? If, as he elsewhere admits, it would have been inconsistent with justice to have forgiven the sinner without an atonement, it is impossible to conceive how it could become consistent with justice, except the atonement had made satisfaction to that attribute; for, what made it inconsistent with justice to forgive the sinner, but just this, that justice *demand*ed the death of the sinner? To forgive sin, therefore, in consistency with justice, must necessarily imply that this *demand* has been answered, or, in some way or other, *satisfied*.

To avoid this conclusion, which seems inevitable, the Doctor and his party have recourse to a distinction between *distributive justice*, and what they call *public* or *benevolent justice*; understanding by the former that justice which distributes good or evil to men according to their deserts, and by the other some other kind of justice of their own contrivance, which consults the general good of the universe. To satisfy the claims of this latter kind of justice, they suppose Christ to have suffered and died. Without entering, at present, into the examination of such a distinction, which has no foundation in Scripture, it is sufficient to observe, that if Christ suffered under the hand of justice at all, he must have satisfied its claims upon all those for whom he suffered; that justice must always act according to law; and that, as there is but one law, by which the sinner is condemned, and by which he shall be judged, so it must have been to answer the claims of that law that this surety died.

That Christ, by the all-perfect obedience and satisfaction which he rendered to the precepts of the law and the demands of justice, paid down a true and proper price or ransom for the deliverance of his people from the bondage of sin and death; in other words, that he did that which

procured them a right and title to the enjoyment of pardon and eternal life, is a truth so clearly stated in the gospel, and lies so close to the foundation of the Christian's hope, that it is matter of astonishment that any professing to believe that gospel, and to cherish that hope, should have thought of denying it. What is it that constitutes the ground of the Christian's title to pardon and eternal happiness? Is it the grace of God? Certainly not. It is nothing else than the surety righteousness of his blessed saviour. The grace of God has provided that righteousness for him, has revealed it, has brought it nigh, applies it, and will reign, through the application of it, unto eternal life. But it is the merit of the Redeemer's righteousness that *entitles* him to life. There is no other way in which the merit of another can entitle us to a blessing, except in the way of its being imputed to us, or accounted as ours in law; and if, when imputed, it conveys a title to life, the death of Christ, by which it was wrought out, must have possessed a meritorious value to procure, and, let us say it now without hesitation, to *purchase* that and all other blessings for his people. "Ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, but with the precious blood of Christ." "Ye are bought with a price."

We cannot conclude without again warning our readers, especially any young aspirants to the ministry who may peruse these pages, from being led astray by the plausible reasonings of this school. They will find, we trust, on serious and candid consideration, that they proceed from an ill-judged attempt to bring the ways and thoughts of God into a closer correspondence with the ways and thoughts of man. Aiming to exalt one attribute of the Deity at the expense of all the rest, they, in reality, obscure the glory of the grace of God.

The quotation we have made from Dwight is sufficient to show where the system would lead us. It makes no provision for the return of the sinner, and leaves the Saviour himself without any security of seeing the travail of his soul. It suspends both the grace of God and the justification of the sinner, on certain conditions to be performed, and certain dispositions to be cherished by us; and leaves us, after all, with nothing but a bare *hope* that we may be forgiven, if these conditions are properly fulfilled. At the same time, it shuts in our face the great "door of hope" opened in the revelation of "the redemption purchased by Christ," leaving us no other ground to build upon but the mere grace and good pleasure of God. And it involves the gross and degrading conclusion, that God is condemning sinners every day to everlasting perdition, though something had been done which rendered it quite consistent with his justice to have forgiven them!

We may mention also, that we were sorry to find Andrew Fuller, in his excellent little work, entitled, "the Gospel its own Witness," compromising the doctrine of Christ's purchase, and puzzling his brains to very little purpose with the distinction between debtor and criminal. The example is useful to teach us, that, before we adopt, or at least publish, views inconsistent with the obvious tenor of Scripture, and which require us to explain away its most familiar phrases, it would be well to study what has been already written in their vindication. **TITUS.**

ART. V. *The Christian World Unmasked.*

(Continued from page 251.)

But, Sir, you call yourself an honest man, and honest men will pay their debts: you own yourself a sinner too, and sins are debts due to

God. How are these debts to be discharged? They are a most enormous sum; and when felt, prove an heavy load; and if not cancelled, must bring eternal ruin. Do you think of this matter, Sir? It is a weighty business.

Yes, yes, *Doctor*, I have had some thoughts about it, and do not apprehend much danger or much trouble here. I must *repent*; and *amend*; and do what I *can*; and Christ will do the rest. Some debts I shall pay myself, a *decent* part of the shot, and Jesus must discharge the rest of the reckoning. This is our parish way of paying sinful debts, and seems a very good way. We desire no better, and only wish to pay our neighbour's debts as easily. What think you of it *Doctor*? sure you can have no objection here.

Indeed, *Sir*, this way of paying sinful debts, as easy as it seems to you, would ruin me effectually. *The wages of sin is death*; and if I must pay off only one sin, I am ruined; for that debt is death. So of course I die, and perish. No help is found for me in this way. Either I must be forgiven wholly, or wholly be undone.

This method of payment would make you a bankrupt presently, and ruin you eternally. Pray, examine it a little closer. First, you talk of *repenting*. True; repentance goes before forgiveness.* But you speak as if repentance was your own work; whereas the Bible says, it is the *gift of God*: Acts xi. 18. 2 Tim. ii. 25. and Jesus is exalted up on high, to give it. Acts v. 31. You had better pray for repentance, than try to squeeze it from a millstone; and such is every heart by nature. No kind relenting is found there, till Jesus sends it. What your own hands bestow can avail nothing, but will need to be repented of. And where God gives repentance, it is never meant to purchase pardon. For tears pay no debts. They will not pay your neighbor's: and much less God's, which are weighty debts indeed.

Repentance is designed to make the heart loathe sin, through a sense of its deep pollution; and dread sin, through a feeling of its guilty burden. Thus the heart becomes acquainted with its nakedness and ruin, is broke down and humbled, and forced to fly to Jesus Christ, and seek deliverance by *grace alone*. Nor is the business quickly done. When the heart is conscious of its misery, it will try a thousand legal tricks to shake its pitched shirt off; but wearied out at length with endless disappointment, it falls at Jesus' feet, and meekly takes up Peter's prayer, *Lord, save, or I perish*.

After repenting, you talk of *amending*. Ay, to be sure: no repentance can be true without amendment. But you seem to think your heart only wants amending, and may be mended just as easy as your coat. Truly, *Sir*, it wants new making; and no real mending can be found without new making. All the rest is varnish; which may please yourself, and satisfy a neighbor, but will not pass with God. A blackmoor painted white, is but a blackmoor still; and gives the image of a decent modern Christian. Your conduct may be much reformed; but your heart, unless created new, will be full of earthliness and uncleanness, and remain the devil's forge and workshop still. No thorough change is made, until the work begins above, and God creates the heart anew. When repentance is bestowed, David's prayer will suit you well, *Create in me a clean heart, and renew a right spirit within me*. Nay, do not pout at David; your heart and eyes are teeming with uncleanness too, and make you stand in woful need of David's prayer.

But supposing God should bless you with a *new heart and right spirit, and thereby cause you to walk in his statutes*, Ezek. xxxvi, 26, 27, still I ask, what becomes of past arrears? No compensation yet is made for for-

* The existence of the *grace* of repentance in the soul precedes forgiveness, but the *exercise* of that grace follows it.—ED. REL. MOR.

mer trespasses. Doing present duty cannot pay off past debts; yet these debts must be discharged, or you are ruined; and you have no overplus to pay a single debt; nay you are running deeper into debt daily, by doing what you ought not, and leaving undone what you ought to do. Still your deserved wages every day and every hour is death. Let me remind you once again of Peter's prayer, *Lord, save, or I perish.*

Lastly, you say, I must do what I *can*, and Christ will do the rest. This is the common cry, the general run; and is thought a safe and easy passage for a Christian. But the passage is too strait and hazardous for me; I dare not venture my own soul upon it. Supposing you have will and power for duty, then I ask, Do you pray as much as you *can*, or read the scripture as much as you *can*, or relieve the poor as much as you *can*, or visit the sick as much as you *can*? Do you deny yourself as much as you *can*; and watch against sin as much as you *can*; or do any one duty as much as you *can*? Indeed you do not, and you know you do not. But if you put salvation on this footing, of doing what you *can*, and have not done it, what sentence can you look for from the Lord, but this? *Out of thy own mouth I will judge thee.* Luke xix. 22.

If this plea, of doing what you *can*, will not abide a trial, no other plea remains but doing what you *will*, or what you *please*, and making Jesus Christ do all the rest. But you dare not urge this plea: it is too shameful and barefaced for any mortal to avow it. Now, Sir, if you are not able to abide the trial, of doing what you *can*; and dare not urge the shameful plea, of doing what you *will*; how is it possible for you to be saved by your doings? Either a full pardon and a free salvation must be granted through Jesus Christ *alone*, or you are *undone* by your *doings*, cast and lost for ever.

Perhaps you think that Christ came to shorten man's duty, and make it more feasible, by shoving a commandment out of Moses' tables, as the papists have done; or by clipping and paring all the commandments, as the moralists do. Thus, *sincere* obedience, instead of *perfect*, is now considered as the law of works.

But, Sir, if Jesus Christ came to shorten man's duty, he came to give us a licence to sin. For duty cannot be shortened without breaking commandments. And thus Christ becomes a minister of sin with a witness, and must be ranked at the head of antinomian preachers.

And what do you mean by *sincere* obedience? It is a pretty expression, and serves many pretty purposes. It sears a conscience notably, and daubs the face of Jesus Christ wonderfully; and has so vague a meaning, it will signify any thing, or nothing, just as you please. It is satan's catch-word for the gospel; and upon his gates might be truly written, *Room for sincere obedience.*

But what is it? If sincere obedience means any thing, it must signify either doing what you *can*, or doing what you *will*. So we are got upon the old swampy ground again, are sinking apace into a quagmire, and shall be strangled presently unless we retire.

Jesus Christ is so far from intending to pare away Moses' tables, that he carries every commandment to its utmost extent. A wanton look is declared to be adultery; and a wrathful heart is deemed murder; and the man, who calls his neighbor a fool, is threatened with hell-fire. This does not look like shortening man's duty, and making it sit more easy on a squeamish stomach. Surely this preaching cries out mainly against sincere obedience; a doctrine sweetly framed to set the heavenly gates wide open for drunkards, whoremongers, and all men.

Jesus says expressly, that *he did not come to destroy the law*, by weakening or shortening Moses' tables; and he assures us, that whoever shall break the *least* commandment, and teach men to do so, shall be *least* in the kingdom of heaven, or farthest from it.

If another witness is needful, we may call in St. James, who is just at hand, and a favorite with the champions for works and sincere obedience. But the good apostle happens to be rather sturdy in this matter, and declares, that if a man should keep the whole law, except in one point, he is yet guilty of all. James ii. 10. A failure in a single article ruins him. Whoever breaks the least command, or neglects the least duty, thereby procures to himself as solid a title to eternal misery, as the man who breaks all the commandments every day of his life. Which is designed to shew the absolute impossibility of being justified in any manner by our works.

Why, Doctor, you amaze me mightily. I never heard such language in my life before. Our parish Doctor does not treat his patients in this rough manner. Surely you have overshot the mark. What is really just and equitable among men, will be just and equitable with God. And is any thing found among men, that bears a resemblance to this proceeding of God?

Yes, Sir, enough is found in every country, and in your own land, to justify God herein. Many crimes are punished with death in Britain, and the punishment is inflicted for a single crime. The law does not inquire, whether you have offended often, but whether you have offended once. It tries you for a single offence; and if found guilty, will condemn you without mercy. Now if human laws are not taxed with injustice, though they doom a man to die for a single act of treason, murder, robbery, or forgery, why should God's law be thought unjust, because it punishes a single crime with death?

However, you must not mistake St. James' meaning. He does affirm, that a single breach of God's law deserves eternal death, as well as ten thousand; yet he does not say, that small and great offenders will have equal punishment. No: mighty sinners will be mightily tormented. Men's future torment will be suited to the number and the greatness of their crimes. Yet moderate offenders can have small consolation from hence, because the shortest punishment is eternal, and the coldest place in hell will prove a hot one.

Sir, by your countenance, I perceive you are not yet disposed to renounce sincere obedience. And though unable to maintain your ground, you are not willing to give up your arms, and ask our noble Captain quarter, to save your life. Let the matter take a little more sifting. You seemed to complain of God, for making death the wages of a single sin; but you might have reason to complain, if God had made sincere obedience a condition of salvation, because no man understands what it means. Much talked of it is, like the good man in the moon, yet none could ever ken it. I dare defy the scribes and all the lawyers in the world, to tell me truly what sincere obedience is. Whether it means the doing half my duty, or three quarters, or one quarter, or one fiftieth, or one hundredth part. Where must we draw the line of sincere obedience? It surely needs a magic wand to draw it. And can we think that God would leave a matter of such moment at such dreadful hazard? Whatever is made a condition in a human or divine covenant, be that condition less or more, sincere or perfect obedience, it must be executed punctually, from first to last, or the covenant is forfeited. On this account, conditions in a covenant always are, and must be marked out precisely. Yet here, sincere obedience is called a condition, and no one knows what it is; nor will allow this poor unmeaning thing, whatever it is, to be absolutely binding. It is a condition and no condition: just as much grace as you choose, and as many or as few good works as you please. O fine condition! Surely Satan was the author of it.

When human law-givers judge a crime deserveth death, and make it capital, they always draw the line of death, and mark the crime exactly, that all

may know what it is, and when they do commit it. And if God hath made sincere obedience the *condition* of salvation, he would certainly have drawn the line, and marked out the boundary precisely, because our life depended on it.

If some Utopian prince should frame a body of laws, and declare that every one, who did not keep the laws *sincerely*, as well as ever he could, should die, this pleasant sanction would make a dull Bæotian grin; and when the judges took a circuit in this fairy land, each assize would prove a maiden one, no doubt. Now if such a constitution would be hooted at among men, as the utmost foolishness of folly, can we think the wise God would adopt such a system?

Sincere obedience is called the condition of salvation; but God has drawn no line to mark the boundary; therefore every man must draw the line for himself. Now, Sir, observe the consequence: mark how this ravelled clew winds up, and shews its filthy bottom. One prays on Sundays, but at no other time: that is his line of devotion. Another only prays in a tempest: that is his line. And a third will only pray when he is sick or dying.—One is mellow once a week, and staggers home, but keeps upon his legs: that is his line of sobriety. Another gets much tipsy every night, but drinks no spiritous liquors: that is his line. And a third will take a dram stoutly, but declares *sincerely* that he *cannot* help it: he should be dead without it. One does not break the bond of wedlock, but casts a wanton look upon his maid: that is his line of chastity. Another has no wife, but keeps a whore; that is his line. And a third has both a wife and a whore. What must we say to these things? They are all condemned: but if God has drawn no boundary, man must draw it, and will draw it, where he pleaseth. Sincere obedience thus becomes a nose of wax; and is so fingered, as to fit exactly every human face. I look upon this doctrine as the devil's master-piece, the most ingenious trap that ever was contrived by him. Where other woful doctrines slay a thousand, this will slay ten thousand. Talking of sincere obedience, and of doing what we can, is mighty plausible: it sounds well, and looks decent; but opens a dreadful sluice for the profligate, and erects a noble pillar for the deist.

I cannot think that the growth of deism is chiefly owing to the growth of immorality. A person will not surely choose to be a deist, because he grows more wicked: he will not merely reject Jesus Christ, because he stands in more need of him. But a man becomes a deist, by hearing of sincere obedience, and believing there is merit in it. Now the price of merit is not fixed in a protestant market: it is much talked of, but not *rated*. He therefore sets what price he pleaseth on his own merit; and pays his heavy debts off, as a neighboring state one did, by raising the currency of his coin. Thus, though he may have been enormously wicked, yet by the fancied merit of a few good works in life, or by a charitable sum bequeathed at his death, he goes in a fiery chariot up to heaven, unless he chance to be kidnapped in the way by satan.

If works are a *condition* in the gospel-covenant, then works must make the *whole* of it. Sincere obedience, as a condition, will lead you unavoidably up to *perfect* obedience. No intermediate point can be assigned, where you may stop. All the commands of God are enforced by the same authority. He that saith, *Commit no adultery*, saith also, *Do not kill*. And if you allow *one* duty to be absolutely binding, you must allow *all* the rest. For they all stand upon the same footing.

But perhaps you think, though all the commands of God are binding, they bind only to a *certain degree*: and hence the gospel-covenant is called a covenant of grace. Then I ask, Sir, what is *that degree*? How far *must* we go, and where *may* we stop? You cannot mark the limit, and God does assign none. Yet if this had been the tenor of the gospel-

covenant, he would have marked *that degree* precisely, because my life depended upon knowing it.

What saith your Bible? How readest thou? Does it allow you to be guilty of adultery or murder, or blasphemy, or perjury, or theft to a *certain degree*? Indeed it does not. Or may you indulge a *measure* of anger, or envy, or malice, or lying? Indeed you may not. My testament says, *put away from you all bitterness and wrath, and anger, and clamor, and evil speaking, with all malice.* Ephes. iv. 31. And it commands you not only to abstain from all evil, but from all *appearance* of it. 1 Thess. v. 22.

Thus you can neither exclude *any kind* of duty, nor *any degree* of each kind. But the moment you seek to be justified in any measure by obedience, that moment you *fall from grace*, and become a debtor to do the whole law.

God has proposed no more than two covenants. The first was *wholly* of works, which says, *do and live*; and gives the man a title unto life, who shall keep the law perfectly. The second covenant is *wholly* of grace, which says, *believe and be saved*. In this covenant, salvation is *fully purchased* by Jesus Christ, and *freely applied* to the sinner by his Spirit. Grace lays the foundation, and grace brings forth the top stone with shouting. Glory be to God for this grace.

Now the first covenant is allowed on all hands to be *too hard*; and the second is thought by most to be *too easy*, and would fall to pieces, unless shoared up by sincere obedience. Accordingly, by the help of this rotten buttress, men have patched up a third covenant, consisting *partly* of works and *partly* of grace. In which the sinner owns himself indebted something, he knows not what, to Jesus Christ; and takes the rest, be what it will, to himself. The captain and the soldier make a joint purse, and purchase a crown between them. The soldier wins some gold to make the crown, and Jesus studs it round with diamonds. O rare soldier! He must not ascribe *salvation unto God and the Lamb*, as the saints do, (Rev. vii. 9, 10.) but to the *Lamb* and the *soldier*.

This mixed covenant is the darling of nature. It both cherisheth our vanity, and opens a door for licentiousness. The judaizing Christians, mentioned in the Acts, were the first who began to adulterate the gospel, by blending the covenants, and seeking to be justified by faith and works conjointly. They did not consider the precepts of the gospel, as a *rule* of life, but as a *bond* of the covenant. And they were led into this error, partly by a *constitutional pride* which is common to all; and partly by a *national prejudice* which was peculiar to themselves. Moses had been their law-giver, and works were the letter of his covenant. Of course they would be tenacious of a law of works, and as unwilling to give up their old law-giver, as an husband is to part with the wife of his youth. Moses had reigned long over them, and they gloried in being his disciples; but Jesus now would be their king. And like a besieged people, who are driven to the last extremity, if they cannot keep the conqueror out, they will make the best terms they can for themselves and their prince. If Moses must not reign alone, he shall be seated near the conqueror, and they will swear fealty to both.

Wherever these judaizing Christians came, and found men disposed, as they are naturally, for the mixed covenant, they always preached circumcision to them, saying *Except ye be circumcised, ye cannot be saved.* Acts xv. 1. And they preached right, if the gospel be a mixed covenant of faith and works. For in such a covenant, there is just the same reason for circumcision as for baptism. If you desire benefit from the covenant of grace, you must be baptised: and if you seek advantage from the covenant of works, you must be circumcised. A rite of initiation is appointed unto both the covenants; and you cannot enter into both without partaking of the double rite.

Are you free of the mercer's company, and desirous to be incorporated among the sadler's? You must undergo a second initiation. The former rites have made you a free mercer, but cannot make you a free sadler. So, if you join mount Sinai to mount Sion, and would partake of benefit from both the covenants, you must undergo a double initiation, because the rites are different. Baptism will no more admit you into Moses' temple than circumcision can receive you into the church of Christ.

Allowing therefore that the gospel covenant is a mixed one, of works and grace, the judaizing Christians did not preach amiss, when they said, *Except ye be circumcised, ye cannot be saved.* You expect, say they, a share of your salvation from the covenant of works; but no profit can you have from that covenant, till you have fairly entered it by circumcision.

And does it not seem equitable, in this mixed covenant, that the Sabbath should be equally divided between the Jewish service and the gospel worship? You are half a Jew in heart, Sir, though not in profession; and having abundantly more cause to sacrifice a bullock to Jehovah, than the wise man of Athens had to kill a cock for Esculapius, and thus at his death infatuate the doctrine of his life.

However, Sir, at all events you must be circumcised, if your mixed covenant be a true one. And you have only this alternative, either to reject the covenant, or to admit of circumcision. And since you seem unwilling to give up your works, I must send a Jewish rabbi, or some Hebrew professor to your house, with a pruning knife.

No, *Doctor*, hold there; more words than one to this bargain.—I desire to hear no more of circumcision; and the thought of your pruning knife so bewilders me, that I have dropt all the ends of your discourse about sincere obedience. Could you pick the threads up again, and wrap them in a little compass?

I will try to oblige you, *Sir*. And first, sincere obedience is no where mentioned in the gospel as a *condition* of salvation. But if it were a condition, sure it would have been *expressly* mentioned, because of its high importance. Yet the Bible is not only silent in this matter, but asserts the contrary. St. Paul declares roundly, *We are saved by grace through faith: not of works, lest any man should boast.* Ephes. ii. 8, 9. The reason added, *Lest any man should boast*, plainly shuts out all works of sincere obedience, as a *condition*. For though these works are often small enough, yet if the condition is fulfilled by them, such is human vanity, they would afford a ground for boasting. Therefore, to dig the whole cankered root of merit up, and give all the glory of *salvation unto God and the Lamb*, the apostle says absolutely, *It is of grace; not of works.* Works have no share in the covenant of grace as a *condition* of life; they are only the *fruit* of salvation freely bestowed, and the *genuine evidence* of a true faith, which *works* by love.

Again, if because obedience is inculcated in the covenant of grace it is thought to be required as a *condition* of salvation; and though not mentioned expressly, is certainly intended. Then I ask, what is the condition? It is highly needful for me to know it, and to know it perfectly, because my life depends upon it. I suppose sincere obedience must mean something *short* of perfect. Pray, *Sir*, how *much short*? Half an inch, or half a mile? Where must I draw my line, and fix my staff? The Bible has not told me, and you cannot tell me, nor all the scribes in Christendom. So, I am brought to a fine pass! Here my life depends on a condition, which must be performed, and I know nothing of it, nor can know, and yet am ruined if I take a step too short. Oh, *Sir*, if sincere obedience had been a condition of salvation, God would certainly have shewn me how much short it comes of perfect; and have marked out the line exactly, whither I must go, and where I might stop.

Further, you describe sincere obedience, by doing what you *can*; and thus explain one loose expression by another full as loose. I call the expression *loose*, not merely for its loose meaning, but for its loose tendency. And here we may behold the subtlety of satan, who blinds our eyes with such expressions, as bear a *decent* countenance, and *seem* to have a meaning, yet leave us wholly in the dark, or leave us at full liberty to put any soft construction on them. Yet if men were honest, they might see, that doing what they *can* means nothing more, in plain English, than doing what they *will*; and if they are tried by the rule of doing what they *can* they must be all condemned, because they daily do such things as they need not and ought not, and leave undone other things which they might do and ought to do.

Here it may be noted, that what is called by plain men, *sincere obedience*, is entitled by the scribes a *remedial law*, or the *law of love*. They are all cankered branches from the same cankered stock; and their number is convenient. A troop looks well. They serve as pretty loop-holes, to play hide-and-seek in. No wonder that the foot is often shifted, when the ground is miry. Men will make an hundred *kind* of laws, but God has only *two*, the *law of works*, and the *law of faith*. Rom. iii 27. And what has been urged against sincere obedience, equally affects a remedial law, the law of love, and all their Jewish kindred. They must stand or fall together.

Lastly, sincere obedience, as a condition, can only terminate in perfect obedience. No middle point can be assigned, where you may stop. *No kind* of duty can be excluded, nor *any degree* of each kind. Thus you are unavoidably thrust upon a perfect law of works, and *become a debtor to do the whole law*. And if you dare not rest on a perfect obedience, unceasingly performed from the first day to the last, there is no other resting for you, but on Jesus Christ *alone*. He must be your all; and he will be your all, or nothing.

Thus I have gathered up my ends, respecting this matter; and I trust you see at length, that sincere obedience is nothing but a jack-o-lantern, dancing here and there and every where: no man could ever catch him, but thousands have been lost by following him. A cripple might as well rest upon his shadow for support, as your heart depend upon the phantom of sincere obedience.

Your mixed covenant is a mere bubble, blown up by the breath of pride. It has neither got a foot in heaven, nor a foot on earth, but is pendulous in the air, and rests upon a castle floating in the clouds, which threatens downfall and ruin every moment. Woe be to the man that is seated on it. Yet this castle, though the fabric of a vision, is the glory of a modern Christian; and, being built upon the clouds, has been reckoned safe from gun shot; but I trust the cloud is burst, and the phantom disappears.

(To be continued.)

ART. VI. On the Observance of Sacramental Fasts.

[The late Dr. Anderson in his pamphlet, entitled "A Word in Season," addressed, by way of letter, to the Rev. John Hemphill, speaking of the fruits of the union which gave rise to the Associate Reformed Church, has the following judicious remarks on the subject of Fasting as connected with the dispensation of the Lord's Supper.]

"A sixth fruit of the union formerly described, is an attack upon the practice of having humiliation days before and thanksgiving days after the celebration of the Lord's Supper. This attack appears to me highly

blameable, as it was unprovoked: nobody, at least as far as I know, aving proposed that any addition should be made to the Directory for public worship, with regard to these days; nobody having represented the observance of them as essential or indeed properly any part of the ordinance of the Lord's Supper. Only as the public setting apart some time for those exercises, which are undoubtedly seasonable before and after the communion, was a mean of helping Christians in their private and personal exercise: so it was blameable in church members to neglect opportunities, when they were offered, of attending on such exercises. This was particularly plain with regard to the exercise of humiliation; which cannot be denied to be an appointed mean of promoting self-examination. It is not hereby meant, that persons ought to set apart some time for humiliation, whenever they examine themselves: for Christians are to examine themselves daily. But it is meant, that the dedicating of some time occasionally to that self-abasing exercise is an appointed mean of promoting the habit of self-examination; and therefore it will often be requisite that it should accompany such more formal and solemn essays to examine ourselves, as that which is enjoined in 1 Corinth. xi. 28. *Let a man examine himself and so let him eat of that bread and drink of that cup.* Nor does any instance occur of persons being justly charged with superstition, *merely* for going about one commanded duty before or after another; while the performance of each of them, separately considered, is agreeable to the Divine rule; and while it does not hinder the performance of any other duty. You yourself do not deny that a fast may be warrantably observed, when the condition of a congregation requires it, in connexion with the Lord's Supper. And who ever pleaded for the observation of a fast by a congregation, when the condition of the congregation did not require it? Who ever said or thought, that a congregation should fast, if they had no other ground or cause of fasting than their purpose of communicating the following sabbath? The truth is, the prospect of that near approach to God at his table is not properly, in itself, a cause of fasting or humiliation; but a solemn occasion that may well excite our attention to the causes of fasting both in our personal case and in that of the church. The near prospect of the communion must have this effect, if we allow, that our exercise and frame of mind in going to the Lord's table should be much the same with that which we ought to have in going out of time into eternity. In going to the Lord's table we ought to expect a lifting up by the free grace of God in Christ; but the scripture assures us, that humiliation before God usually goes before such a lifting up, Jam. iv. 9. 13. The preaching of the word in which the apostle enjoins ministers to be *instant in season, out of season*, is necessary both before and after communicating, as an appointed mean of stirring up and encouraging church members to the exercises that are suitable on that occasion. Your distinction between ordinary and extraordinary ordinances or religious duties seems to have no foundation in the language of scripture or of the Westminster Assembly. According to the Larger Catechism all the ordinances of Christ are ordinary means whereby Christ communicateth to his church the benefits of his mediation; among which ordinances is religious fasting. When it is said in the 21st chapter of the Confession that the reading and hearing of the word, the singing of Psalms and the receiving of the sacraments, are all parts of the ordinary religious worship of God; besides religious oaths, vows, solemn fastings and thanksgivings upon special occasions; it is not meant that oaths, vows, fastings and thanksgivings are not parts of the ordinary worship of God, as some seem to have understood this article; but that they are parts of *that worship* distinguished by their occasional nature from those parts of it that are mentioned before. Great and notable judgments felt or feared, and the taking place of an extraordinary pro-

vocation are, no doubt, eminent occasions of fasting; but the seeking of some special or particular blessing, such as, deliverance from a great backwardness to the duty of self-examination, and such special direction of our exercise, as is necessary to avoid the special danger of unworthy communicating is also a just occasion for fasting. We have need to seek of the Lord a right way as earnestly in going to the Lord's table, as Ezra sought it in going from the river Ahava to Jerusalem. Ezr. viii. 21.*

"Your scheme is certainly wrong and of a dangerous tendency, so far as it leads any to deny the peculiar solemnity of the ordinance of the Lord's Supper, arising from the condescension of that near approach which a God in Christ makes to us in this ordinance, exhibiting and presenting himself to us in sensible signs; from the various exercises which are included in the duty of communicating; and from the mark of distinction that God has put upon this ordinance above all others, in the special charge to examine ourselves before we partake of it, and in the special denunciation of God's displeasure with the unworthy partakers.

"Farther, though it is desirable, that communicating were more frequent; yet the celebration of the Lord's Supper *every day* or *every Lord's day* appears to be neither consistent with the nature of this ordinance, nor warranted by scripture. Such a frequency seems inconsistent with the nature of this ordinance: for the outward act of eating and drinking in this ordinance are appointed to be sensible signs and means of exciting our attention to the spiritual things signified. Now, such a frequent use of these outward acts, as that now supposed, seems to lessen their aptitude to answer that end. The Lord's Supper, as to the very outward form of it, is a feast. But to receive it every day is to use it as a common meal. In speaking of the outward means of grace, is it not more agreeable to the scripture account of them, to consider the reading and hearing of the word and prayer as our common meals; and to consider the Lord's Supper as a feast? *The breaking of bread*, in Acts ii. 42., is, no doubt, to be understood of the partaking of the Lord's Supper. But, in v. 48, what is said of the first Christians, *breaking bread from house to house*, may be understood of their society in their common repasts. And though we read of their *breaking bread*, which may be understood of the partaking of the Lord's Supper on the first day of the week, Acts xx. 7, yet it will not follow, that Christians then partook of that ordinance on *every* first day of the week. It is our Lord's revealed will that we should often shew forth his death in this ordinance; but he hath not said, that we should do so once in the week or once in the month. On the other hand, the import of the Divine command to communicate *often* and the communion which Christ allows his people in this ordinance are much disregarded by the practice of communicating only once in the year.

"I shall only add, that it seems very preposterous for you and others to display so much intemperate zeal on this unnecessary controversy, bringing the heavy charge of superstition and will-worship against some religious exercises, of which you dare not say, that either the *matter* or *manner* or *measure* is unscriptural; merely because Christians find them reasonable and useful to their souls before a sacramental occasion. Does not this look like infatuation for men to be so clamorous, where there is no cause; (for we have rather too little than too much of these exercises about sacraments and other occasions,) while they are in a great measure silent about a multitude of manifest errors and delusions which overspread the land?"

* Jejunia et preces, fasting as well as prayer is mentioned in ecclesiastical history, among the exercises used by Christians in the second century in preparing for the communion. See Spanheim's *logog.*

ART. VII. *Miscellaneous Matters.*

A SUGGESTION RESPECTING UNANIMITY.—That the visible church is lamentably divided into sects and different denominations, is a fact, which need not, which cannot, and which should not, be concealed. This fact should occasion serious reflection, and searchings of heart, among all the friends of the Redeemer's kingdom. There must be an evil cause somewhere existing, which has produced, and which is still keeping up these divisions; or else all God's people would be "like-minded, having the same love, being of one accord, of one mind;" and would "with one mind and one mouth glorify God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." All "would speak the same thing; there would be no divisions among them, but they would be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment." Whatever then the evil cause may be, which is "letting" or hindering the approach of the glorious and happy period when this shall be the state of Zion; it should and must be taken out of the way, before we can hope to see it. But that such a period shall arrive, may be confidently and certainly expected. He, whose word shall stand when heaven and earth shall have passed away, hath said that "he will give his people ONE HEART AND ONE WAY;" that "the watchmen of Zion shall lift up the voice; with the voice TOGETHER shall they sing; for they shall see eye to eye, when the LORD shall bring again Zion." That the hastening of this glorious period should be the earnest and fervent prayer of all who love Zion and her peace, must be evident; but that all other scriptural and rational means for bringing it about should also be pursued with the utmost diligence, can not be less obvious to every intelligent Christian. Both the individual and united effort of all the friends of Zion should be unremittingly directed to the attainment of so great and so desirable an event.

Deeply impressed with the importance of unanimity in the visible church, and feeling persuaded that a greater and more vigorous effort towards accomplishing it than has yet been made, or is now making, is the imperious duty of all the true Israel of God, the writer of this would suggest the propriety of holding meetings in different sections of the country, and in our cities, composed of ministers of the gospel and other friends of the peace and unanimity of Zion, for the purpose of discussing in a candid and brotherly and prayerful manner, the points of difference, whether in doctrine, worship, or government, which may exist between the denominations to which they severally belong; with the ulterior object kept constantly in view, in said discussions, of effecting, if possible, an entire unanimity of sentiment, and of thus preparing the way for a more united and unhampered effort for promoting the cause of God throughout the world. The plan here suggested, it is thought, would, if carried into execution, be an excellent means of bringing Christians of different denominations to see eye to eye. None can deny that the end in view is all-important. Every rational and scriptural means, therefore, should be used in order to obtain it.

If any consideration drawn from expediency or reason could add to the interest which the word of God gives to this subject, let the effect be duly considered which such a state of unanimity in the visible church would produce, in giving influence and strength to the church, and in giving effect to the efforts now making throughout the Christian world to suppress vice and immorality, to extend the knowledge of the Saviour among the heathen, to put to silence the gainsaying of the infidel. But let none say the object is chimerical, for He, whose words are all faithfulness and truth, has repeated his promise, *to give his people one heart and one way.* Jer. xxxii. 39.—Ezek. xi. 19. And that nations and kingdoms shall be gathered together [united] to serve the LORD. Ps. cii. 22. And he will surely bring it to pass. UNANIMITAS.

THE ASSOCIATE SOCIETY OF INQUIRY.—The knowledge of church history relative to any period is an acquisition both interesting and important to every christian, and especially to those who are, or may be called, to maintain the cause of truth in a public capacity. But as events, nearer in point of time, and having an obvious bearing on the present situation of an individual, have greater influence in exciting his attention, and determining him to pursue any particular course of conduct; so the history of the church in our own times, is especially interesting and important to every friend of true religion. Influenced by such considerations, the students of the Associate Theological Seminary have formed themselves into a society of inquiry upon this subject. Their object (more particularly) is to obtain information respecting the state of the church in general, and especially of that branch with which they are more immediately connected; also, the demands and prospects for ministerial labor, both in our own and foreign countries. Now, as no systematic history, either of church or state, is ever written until some considerable time has elapsed, after the period to which it relates, so in order to gain their object it is necessary to have access to the religious papers and periodicals of the day, from which the condensed history of the church in our age is yet to be compiled. Accordingly they have established a reading room, into which they design collecting, as far as possible, all publications of this description containing pertinent and useful information. It is also their intention to carry on a correspondence with such persons as may feel an interest in the object of their association. In this they wish to be con-

sidered as concurring with the generous designs of the Associate Synod, in already furnishing a considerable library, and in still making exertions to increase the same for their advantage.

In most other theological institutions there are associations of a similar nature; and the extensive patronage received by them from a generous public encourages us to hope at least for a share, especially from the conductors of the periodical press. It is the duty of all, but especially of Zion's watchmen, or those who, incompetent and unworthy in themselves, are preparing to sustain this character, to be attentive and discern the signs of the times. But without those means of information to which we have referred, no one can discharge this important duty. In no other way can any one become accurately acquainted with the religious operations of the day, or the events of Providence which have a direct bearing upon the interests of Zion; and, therefore, he cannot determine whether the signs be good or bad; whether the cause of true piety be advancing or receding, in the controversy between truth and error; nor can he justly or condemn, in the presence of those who have inquired and learned, but must remain mute and inactive, through fear of exposure; and must not attempt to inform those who are desiring to be made acquainted with the subject, lest he may prejudice their minds against that which is good in favor of that which is evil. Such information is especially necessary at the present time, when infidelity and Antichrist are exciting their united forces to overthrow the cause of divine truth, the kingdom of our Lord, and the present and future happiness of our race.

As a society of inquiry we respectfully present these our views and wishes to a benevolent and Christian public.

Persons disposed to aid us in the prosecution of the above design, by favoring us with religious publications and other donations, will please direct—*The Associate Society of Inquiry, Canonsburg, Penn.* Signed, by order of Society,

JOSEPH MCKEE, *President.*

SAM'L DOUTHETT, *Secretary.*

ASSOCIATE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, *Canonsburg, Dec. 16, 1835.*

AN INQUIRY.—To what point should the Associate Church arrive, before it would be her duty to send ministers abroad?
J. M.

THE NEXT ASSEMBLY.—Much interest is felt in prospect of the meeting of the General Assembly. In various points of view it will be a meeting of thrilling importance, inasmuch as it will be called on to decide the destiny of the Presbyterian Church. The questions must be settled,—are the standards of the church authoritative or are they without authority? Have they a meaning or are they destitute of meaning? May they be received or may they be rejected at pleasure? If there be no difference between Calvinism and Pelagianism, let the Assembly so decide; if orthodoxy and heterodoxy are terms of equivalent import let the church know it through its supreme judicatory; or if it be true that the formula of doctrine adopted by the Presbyterian Church, may be legitimately interpreted as favoring two classes of sentiments directly opposite in their character, let the Assembly so pronounce, and then either abandon or remodel it. It would be unjust and cruel to keep the church in prolonged suspense; the next Assembly should unequivocally decide whether our standards shall be sustained in promoting *unity* in the faith, or whether they shall be perverted with impunity in maintaining a *diversity* in faith. Well may all creeds be scorned, if that of the Presbyterian Church shall be found to be so accommodating in its structure, as to be alike a shelter for truth and error. If it be a bond of union, let its character be asserted, but if it is destitute of all energy to effect this, let it be renounced as useless. The duty of the General Assembly appears to us to be obvious; they should vindicate and sustain the doctrines of the church, whoever may suffer inconvenience by their decision. A wrong act may produce incurable evils. Evasion or compromise will prove alike disastrous; present difficulties can be healed only by a firm and decided declaration, that no Presbyterian Minister can expect impunity in departing from the standards of the church, while he persists in remaining within its inclosures. Under this view who does not perceive the importance of an Assembly which will be regarded as the arbiter in these questions? If ever wisdom and discretion and courage were required, they will be required by that body; and if ever the church agonized in prayer, they should unfortunately and devoutly supplicate the source of all holy influences, to pour down upon that body, the wisdom which is profitable to direct, and the courage which will qualify them for arduous duty. We have not one private interest to secure, one ambitious feeling to be gratified, but we feel deeply solicitous that the Assembly should, in the face of all difficulties, stand forth for the truth. Let the history of the church in all past ages admonish them of the danger of tampering with error. Once countenanced it will proceed with unmeasured strides—each successive wave will rise higher, until the church is tossed and eventually engulfed in the commotion.

The materials of this Assembly are not yet collected together, but the time is approaching when the Presbyteries will be called on to contribute their delegates. And

what shall be the character of these delegates? Shall they be orthodox, not merely in name but in action? The question should not be, who will go? but who shall he sent? The orthodox should be awake; they should select their wisest, their most experienced, and their staunchest men; who will not be afraid to fulfil the most difficult duties.

Every effort is and will be used to secure a New School Assembly; and if these efforts succeed in this one instance, every attempt hereafter on the part of the orthodox to secure the ascendancy will be futile. Now then is the favorable opportunity for exertion, and we trust that every minister and elder who may hear our voice will give immediate attention to secure an orthodox representation to the Assembly. We speak not as partisans, but as lovers of the doctrines and order of the Presbyterian Church.—*Presbyterian.*

ART. VIII. Religious Intelligence.

SOUTH AFRICA.—The population of the Cape colony amounts to 145,000. The government have established 24 schools, which contain 1,400 children. There are besides the domestic circulating schools, the parish Dutch schools, mission schools, higher schools, and Sunday and infant schools. The district of Albany, settled in 1820, has 8 villages, 11 places of worship, and 15 schools, at which one-fourth of the population are enjoying instruction. The societies which are engaged in diffusing the gospel in South Africa are the United Brethren, London, Wesleyan, Glasgow, French Protestant, American Board, Rhenish, Berlin, British and Foreign Bible, Christian Knowledge, and London Religious Tract. The Brethren have 6 stations, 33 missionaries, and 3,090 native converts. The London society has been 33 years in the field, has 23 stations, and 25 ordained missionaries. Southern Africa has frequently enjoyed the refreshing influences of the Holy Spirit. Industry, temperance, and comfort, are generally advancing. The Grahamstown Journal of Nov. 14, 1833, announces the legal establishment of the Christian Sabbath in their extensive tribe, by the Caffre chiefs, Pato, Kama and Congo. The Wesleyans have 10 stations and 12 missionaries. The other societies commenced their labors at a comparatively recent date. Printing presses are established at Cape Town, Grahamstown, Lattakoo, and among the Bechuanas. Parts of the Bible have been translated into three or four of the native dialects. The Hottentots, who were once classed with the ourang outang, have savings banks, lending libraries, temperance societies, etc.

In 1818, the London Missionary Society commenced a mission in Madagascar. Not less than 500 natives maintain a constant profession of religion in the midst of persecution and danger. Scholars 2,351. The New Testament and the Psalms have been translated into Madagasse and a large number of copies distributed. At Mr. Cameron's establishment, 700 natives are employed in manufactures. The difficulties attending the progress of the mission have scarcely been diminished, but the missionaries are much encouraged.

NORTH AFRICA.—Mr. Ewald of the London Jews' Society, after spending some time in Algiers has been obliged to return from the station, in consequence of difficulties thrown in his way by the local authorities. Rev. J. P. Oster was about to proceed to Algiers, but was informed that he would not be permitted to land there as a missionary. A popish missionary has been sent away from the country. Mr. Ewald is now laboring with considerable success in Tunis, maintaining daily discussion with Jews of all classes and distributing the Scriptures. The Arabs in North Africa submit with great reluctance to the French authorities.

NORTHERN ASIA.—The emperor of Russia has just established on the borders of China a school for the study of Chinese, in order to facilitate communication between Russia and China. Since the London mission in Siberia was established, 16 years have elapsed. The entire Bible has been translated into Mongolian, the native language of the present dynasty of China, and used by many of the Princes and Tartar officers. Application has been made from Peking for copies of the Mongolian Christian books. A number of Mongul-Buriat youths are under instruction.

EASTERN CHINA.—It has been proposed to enter China from the south through Siam and Laos, or by way of the Birman empire, or from the north through Siberia. Equal facilities for entering the country may be found by way of Bengal, through Nepal or Bootan. Yet no part of the empire is so accessible as the coast, as has been proved by Gutzlaff's *six voyages*. The entire Bible is now possessed in the Chinese, the Mautchoo, and the Mongolian languages. The printing of Mr. Gutzlaff's Siamese New Testament is proceeding at Malacca. Mr. Medhurst of Batavia is preparing a revised edition of the Chinese Scriptures. The Bible is in the process of translation into the Fuhkeen dialect. Of the Chinese Repository, an ably conducted monthly, 800 copies are printed. A great number of Tracts have been put in circulation. From 10 to 15 natives have embraced the Gospel at Canton. The attention of the whole Christian world is turned extensively towards China.

SOUTHERN ASIA.—Satisfactory evidences are accumulating of the decay of Hindooism. The regulations of the East India Company for the abolition of the pilgrim tax, will have a beneficial influence in weakening the Hindoo superstition. Suttee and infanticide have been abolished, though the latter prevails to some extent in Cutch and Gezerat. There is an increasing persuasion among the Brahmins that the British must prevail, and the power of the Ganges come to an end. The number of ordained American and European missionaries in India and Ceylon is about *one hundred and forty*. Compared with the extent of country, the number of stations is small, but inroads have been made on every portion of the great empire of darkness, from the Himmaleh mountains to Cape Comorin, and from Bombay to Birminah.

UNITED STATES.—We think there is an increasing attention paid to the fundamental doctrines of the gospel, as they have been held by the great body of the New-England churches from the beginning. For ourselves, we have an increasing attachment to the Assembly's Shorter Catechism, and we cannot but rejoice to find that many clergyman are reviving the venerable custom of catechising the children of their parishes from this excellent manual. We trust also that clergymen are beginning to feel more and more the importance of bringing out the great truths of redemption, irrespective of controversy, in the manner that they were handled in the 17th century by Flavel, Baxter, Bates, Leighton and Howe.

EUROPE.—We have only space to say, that political affairs in Portugal and Spain, the increasing Christian and missionary spirit in France, Switzerland, and Germany, the noble philanthropic efforts of our brethren in Great Britain, the interest in some of the continental countries in education, and many things in the condition of the Roman Catholics furnish occasion for devout reflection and gratitude.—*Boston Recorder.*

DECLINE OF POPEERY.—The following remarks on the present state and prospects of Popery in different countries in Europe, are from the London Christian Observer for November.

“Upon the continent of Europe we find Popery every where crippled; its civil power is nodding to its downfall; and even in Spain itself, one of its strongest fortresses, while Don Carlos is attempting for political purposes to concentrate its ancient energies, the Queen's ministers have secularized its revenues, abolished its monastic institutions, and left it an enfeebled victim, bleeding beneath the sword of the civil magistrate. Nay, in Ireland itself Popery is decidedly upon the decline; to testify which, we may adduce a most competent witness in Mr. Nangle of Achill, who, in a recent letter to Dr. M'Hale, says: “In reference to the Bishop of London's statement concerning the increase of Protestantism in Ireland, I must testify, even at the broad of again exciting your indignation, that it quite accords with my own experience. I have travelled much through this province; and, in every parish, I have found among the most exemplary of the Protestants a greater or less number of persons who had been educated in the Church of Rome, and lately abandoned its communion. Of ten individuals, who have from time to time assisted me in the spiritual work of this mission as readers or schoolmasters, eight were persons of this description; all (and some of them with large families) had come out from Popery. This, sir, I think, looks like an increase of the Protestant religion in Ireland; and in the waning of that sacredness which once encircled the (Romanish) priesthood—in the loud and almost universal complaints of their avarice and rapacity—in the growing disgust which recent displays of their arrogance and tyranny have engendered in the Roman Catholic aristocracy—in the bold and wide-spread testimony which one (Romanish) priest has borne against the innovations in doctrine, and the monstrous impurities in practice, of his brethren—in the manly separation of other priests from the Roman church—and, as the result of all these combined causes, in the growing suspicion that Popery may be false, and that Protestantism may be true; and the growing persuasion that the Bible is the criterion by which the merits of conflicting opinions must be tried—in all these points I discover the germ of a still greater growth of Protestantism in this country.” In England, Roman Catholic chapels have sprung up rapidly, but we are far from thinking that they furnish a true test of the hold of Popery upon the public mind. They have risen under peculiar circumstances; but we do not believe that Popery will become deeply rooted in the soil; nay, it is even possible that this proximity to Protestantism will in the issue tend to subvert it. We have heard already the language which Dr. Murray and Mr. O'Connell feel it necessary to employ; and though this spirit of moderation, this recognition of Protestants as “beloved fellow-Christians,” should be only a weapon of policy, yet it may have a powerful effect upon the Roman Catholic laity, who have been kept together hitherto by being taught that theirs was the only Christian church, and that they ought to anathematize and labor to exterminate every trace of Protestantism. When their priesthood are forced to descend from this high ground, and to break down the first barrier, the laity will be very apt to overleap the mound, and look abroad upon the world for themselves, and form their own conclusions.”

THE
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,

AND

EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

MARCH, 1836.

ART. I. *Immersion not the Scripture mode of Baptism.*

There are two questions which have been extensively discussed between those usually denominated Baptists and Pedo-Baptists. The one respects the *mode* of administering the ordinance; the other respects the subjects to which it is to be administered. Baptists contend that the ordinance cannot lawfully be administered to any but persons who are capable of making a profession of religion for themselves. Pedo-Baptists, on the contrary, contend, that the infants of professing parents are entitled to the privilege of this ordinance, by virtue of their relation to their parents. This is an important question, and notwithstanding the many excellent treatises that have been written and published on it, a plain and comprehensive article on the subject would be well worth a place in the Religious Monitor. But it is to the former question, viz: that which respects the *mode*, to which I purpose at present to call the readers attention; and to offer some proof, that, "Immersion is not the scriptural mode of Baptism."

In general pedo-baptists have not attached so much importance to this question as to the other; admitting that if water, the appointed sign, be used, and it be administered in the name of the Holy Trinity, the ordinance is rightly administered—whatever the mode of applying the water may have been. But their opponents seem in general to attach the greater importance to the mode. They hold that a certain mode is essential to the right administration of the ordinance, and that that mode is the immersion of the subject, in or under the water. And unless the ordinance is performed in this manner, they deny it to be baptism at all. This question, then, is important, because it is a dividing question among the professed followers of the Redeemer. It is important, because many able and pious men, who have been eminent in the church, have espoused the Baptist side of the controversy. And the weight of whose authority may mislead some, who have not the means of making that investigation which is necessary to a true solution of the question. Again it is important, because there is reason to believe that the controversy on the side of the Baptists arose from an honest, but misinformed zeal for preserving the divine institution pure and entire. Many of those who have advocated *immersion* as essential to the right administration of baptism, have been men distinguished for piety, and clear in their views of the doctrines of free grace, and firm in defending them—Men whose sentiments in many things

we can most cordially subscribe. And it is our earnest desire, that all who love the truth as it is in Jesus Christ, may "speak the same things, and think the same things," in the whole of their profession of that truth.

What I propose in this paper, is an essay to ascertain and settle the scriptural mode of administering this ordinance. And I trust, by consulting scripture alone, the whole truth on this important question can be ascertained. And although it will be necessary sometimes to refer to the original languages of the scriptures, for it is in these that the scriptures constitute the ultimate and infalible rule by which all matters of religious belief are to be settled; yet I hope to do it in so plain a way, that even those who are not themselves capable of appealing to the original scriptures, will be able to understand.

I trust, it will plainly appear, from a fair examination and candid interpretation of most of those passages upon which the greatest stress has been laid, that they do not afford us any instruction, whatever, respecting the *mode*. Take for example, the passage in Acts viii. 38, so often referred to—"and he commanded the chariot to stand still; and they went down both into the water, both, Philip and the Eunuch; and he baptized him." Here we have the fact stated, that the Eunuch was baptized by Philip; but no intimation whatever is given, *how* it was done. The going down into, and coming up out of the water, were mere circumstances attending the transaction, and were no more a part of the baptism, than the riding in the chariot to the place: and for aught that here appears, we have as much right to suppose, that it was performed by sprinkling, pouring, or any other manner, according to the various meanings of the word *baptize*, as that it was done by immersion. Certainly if it teaches us that the Eunuch was immersed, Philip must also have been immersed—for the same expression is applied to the one, that is to the other. But a little further investigation, I am persuaded, must show that we have no right, from any thing said in scripture, to conclude that either was immersed; and that, were it not for such expressions as "going into the water" "in Jordan," "coming up out of the water," &c., we have good reason to believe we never should have heard of baptism being performed by immersion.

As the object of this paper is to point out the scriptural mode of baptism from *scripture*, and not from the *tradition* of men, it will be proper to examine those words which lead men to *infer* immersion; and to show that when correctly understood, no such inference can be drawn. It is clear that neither the original writers, nor the translators of the scriptures, intended to convey any such idea; but only to record the simple *fact*, where the transaction took place.

1. Let us examine some expressions used in the scriptures relating to baptism.

"And were baptized of him *in Jordan*;" (Matt. iii. 6.) *In Jordan* cannot mean that he went *into* the water of Jordan as a necessary part of baptism; for in (Mark i. 4,) we are told John did baptize *in the wilderness*. If it means immersion in the former place, it must also mean the same thing in the latter place, and then we should have them *immersed in the wilderness* and not in the water or the river.

In John, i. 28, we are told "these things were done *in Bethabara*, beyond Jordan." Bethabara is a town [or village,] and not a stream of water. If it means immersion in Matt., so it must here; and then we should have them immersed in the *town*, and not *in water*. Also in (chap. iii. v. 23.) "John also was baptizing *in Ænon*," near to Salim, because there was much water there"—Greek "polla udata—many waters," for it is in the plural number. Ænon is also a town, and not a river. If

* The village or city of Ænon appears to have received its name from the circumstance of its situation here referred to. The name is Hebrew, and signifies a *fountain* or *spring*.

therefore, in Jordan, proves immersion, it would likewise prove they were immersed in the wilderness, and those towns, and not in the water, supposed to be in those places, for it does not say so.

Neither the Greek writers, nor the translators could mean this, for this could not mean baptism *with* water. They therefore used this word, [translated *in*, in all those places] in another sense, showing *where* the transaction took place, but not *how*. That this is the fact, (see Matt. iii. 3, Luke iii. 2—6, and Isaiah xl. 3—6, where we have the ministration of John pointed out, and the place where he was to perform this, namely, *in the wilderness*, and not the *mode* of his performance.

The fact that the prepositions under consideration were used to shew *where*, and not *how* the thing was done, will appear more clearly from the various translations given of them, as may be seen in the following examples:

The Greek word *en* [ἐν] translated *in*, (Matt. iii. 6,) "*In* Jordan," in the wilderness;" (Mark i. 5,) "In the river Jordan," and "*in* Ænon;" is translated (in Acts viii. 1,) *at*, twice in the same verse, "at that time," "at Jerusalem;" it is also translated *at*, in other places, as, "at the Passover," "at the last day, &c.;" and it is said this same word *en*, [ἐν] has been translated more than a hundred times *at*, in the New Testament.

With perfect propriety and correctness, it might have been translated *at* Jordan in Matthew, and then no one with any propriety could have inferred immersion from the form of expression.

This same word *en* [ἐν] is also translated *by*, "by the Spirit," (Luke, iv. 1,) "by the word &c.," (Eph. v. 26.) It would not make good sense in those places, to translate it *in*, therefore, the apostles did not use it in this sense here; yet it is the same word used, "*in* Jordan, &c."

Again, "This is he that came by water and blood, even Jesus Christ;" not [ἐν] by water only, but [ἐν] by water and blood. Here the same word *en*, is translated *by*, and it would not read properly to say he came *in* water and blood.

It is also translated, *among*, "among the Jews," "among the Gentiles;" (Acts xxi. 19.) and *within*, "within yourselves;" (Matt. iii. 9.) and *with*, "with water," "with the Holy Ghost;" (Matt. iii. 11, and John i. 26, 31, 33, and it is said that is translated one hundred and fifty times, *with*, in the New Testament.

Had the translators believed that the original writer intended to convey the idea that they went into the water, or into Jordan, as a necessary part of baptism, they certainly would have translated these last places *in* water, and not *with* water!

The words selected by the translators, clearly shew that they did not understand the inspired writers to teach, that either John or Philip baptized by going *into* the water; for they no where say they baptized *in* water but where such a translation of the preposition would convey such an idea, they translate it *with* water; shewing the fact, that baptism was not to be performed by going *into* the water, but that water was to be used another way.

Let us now examine the Greek word *apo*, [ἀπο] translated *out of*, "out of the water," in (Matt. iii. 16, and Mark i. 10.) This word is translated *of*, "of camels hair," in (Matt. iii. 4.) The same word [ἀπο] is translated *from*, "from Nazareth," (Mark i. 9,) "from the door," (Matt. ii. 28) "from the earth," Acts viii. 33, "from the wrath to come," (Matt. iii. 7, and Luke iii. 7,) "from Jordan," (Luke iv. 1,) and would have been as correctly translated *from* the water, in Matt. and Mark, and then none could have supposed they came up out of the water.

We will now examine the words translated *into* and *out of*: The word translated out of, is *ek* [ἐκ] "out of the water." This word is also variously translated, as in (1. Cor. xiii. 12,) it is *in*, "in part;" and (Matt.

iii. 9,) of, "of these stones." In Rom. ix. 32, it is translated by, "not by faith;" and from, in various places. as "from my Father," (John, x. 12,) "from the dead;" (Heb. xi. 9.) "from the sepulchre;" (John, xx. 1,) "from heaven," (Matt. iii. 17)

Thus these words [*απο* and *εκ*] translated *out of* (the water,) vary so much in their meaning, according to the connection, and require to be so variously translated, that certainly no definite idea can be attached to this form of expression, to shew any particular mode of baptism, or that they actually came up out of the water. The word translated, into, in (Acts, viii. 38,) is *εις* [*εις*] "and they both went down *into* the water." This word is translated in other places, *unto*, "unto repentance." (Matt. iii. 3,) "unto the sepulchre," (John xx. 1,) and *towards*, towards the first day of the week," (Matt. xxviii, 1,) "towards God," (Acts xxiv. 15.) In (John xi. 48,) it is translated *on*, "on him;" and *at*, in various places, as "at Azotes;" (Acts viii. 40,) "at his feet," (John xi. 32,) &c. Also, *upon*, "upon the which;" (Acts xi. 6,) and *by*, "by the disposition of angels;" (Acts vii. 53,) and *to*, "to the sepulchre;" (John xx. 3, 4,) "to Jerusalem;" (Acts viii. 25,) and *for*, "for the remission of sins;" (Luke iii. 3.) In the passage before us, (Acts viii. 38,) it would have been just as well, and as correctly translated, had it been *to the water*, and then it would not have appeared from this, that they went into the water.

From the various ways and connections in which these words are used in the original, and the various translations given, it is clear that neither the original writers, nor the translators, intended to shew, by them, any particular mode of baptism, but the simple fact *where* it was performed. It says after they went into the water, "he baptized him," but *how*, is not here said; *going into* the water, was not baptism; neither was *coming up out of* the water, baptism; but after going in he was baptized, and after he was baptized, he came up out of the water; this only shews the fact not how the thing was done. Aside from the criticisms on these prepositions, these passages as they stand in our translation, only shew the simple fact that the thing was done, but not how.

To many, it may seem from what has been said, that there is no certainty in the use of these prepositions, and that we cannot tell whether they mean *into* and *out of*, or not; and therefore, that one man has as much right to say they went *into* the water as another to say they did not.

The Greeks, however, were at no more loss to determine this matter than we should be. They could, and did, express their meaning with perfect precision, by adding something to determine it; but when this determination is not made, we are at liberty, in translating those words, to select any one of their various meanings, that will make good English, in connection with the subject in hand. But when this determination is made, we have no such liberty, and are bound to translate the word accordingly. This is done by adding the preposition *to*, and making it a part of another word; or by repeating the preposition twice, and this is no more tautology than our English word *into*. For examples, see (John xx. 4, 5, 6.) "So they ran both together; and the other did out-run Peter, and came first to [*εις*] (the same word that is translated into, in Acts viii. 48,) the sepulchre. And stooping down and looking in, saw the linen clothes lying; yet *went he not in*. Then came Simon Peter following him, and went *into* the sepulchre." In this scripture, the same word [*εις*] is translated *to* and *into*; but the determination is made to shew that Peter went into the sepulchre—4th verse, "and came first to the sepulchre;" Greek "kai *elthe* protos *εις* to mnemeion." Here *εις* stands by itself and is translated *to*. 5th verse, "yet went he not in, Greek, "ou mentoi *εις*-elthen," which should have been translated went in or into, if the word *ou*, (not) had not been there. 6th verse, "And went into the sepulchre," Greek, "kai *εις*-elthen *εις* to mnemeion." Here *εις* is repeated

or used twice, once as a part of word, and again as a word by itself, which determines that Peter went into the sepulchre. Again, (Matt. xii. 29,) "enter *into* the strong man's house," Greek, "eis-elthein eis ten oikian tou ischurou." (Acts xi. 12,) "and entered into the man's house." Greek, "kai eis-elthomen eis ton oikon tou andros." Acts xxi. 8; "and we entered into the house." Greek "kai eis-elthontes eis ton oikon." Mark xvi. 5; "and entering *into* the sepulchre;" Greek, "kai eis-elthousai eis to mnemeion." Acts ix. 17, "and went *into* the house." Greek, "kai eis-elthen eis ten oikian." In all these places the determination is made, by using the preposition, as before said, which shews they meant *into*. Thus they could and did determine with perfect precision, when they meant *to* or *into*, as we speak in English. Now contrast the difference of expression in Acts viii. 38, "And they went down both *into* the water;" Greek, "kai katebesan amphoterōi eis to udor." Here *eis* stands by itself, and no determination is used to shew they went into the water. So in all the cases, where it is said of John and Philip's baptizing, no such determination is made.

Seeing then the fact, that they could and did determine when they meant *in*, or *into*, in other places, and that they did not thus determine when speaking of John and Philip's baptizing, it is clear they designed to convey the idea, that they *did not go into the water*, as a necessary part of baptism.

If it be a fact that they went into the water, as a necessary part of baptism, and the apostles had a way to determine this fact, with perfect ease and precision, and did not do it, then they wrote incorrectly; and either through carelessness or design, wrote in a manner, if not to deceive, at least to leave their meaning in great obscurity. Such a supposition is entirely unwarranted, of inspired men, writing under the teachings of the Holy Spirit!

If in our common transactions of life, a man was to act so, we should esteem him a dishonest man. You go to your lawyer for counsel, in an important case, and he uses indefinite language, so as to lead you into error, when he could with perfect clearness, determine your case; would you not consider him morally responsible for all the consequences growing out of the misunderstanding? Or, you apply to a physician for a sick child, and he gives his prescription in this undetermined way, when he could with perfect clearness, point out the proper mode to be pursued; and in consequence of this undetermined manner of instructing you, a wrong course is pursued, and the child dies—would you not consider him as the murderer of your child? Could you confide in the moral honesty of the man! And would not this be the case with the apostles, if they meant that baptism was to be performed by going *into* or *under* the water, and did not determine this fact when they could have done it with perfect clearness? Would not the sin of all this evil in the church, growing out of this mode of writing, be fairly attributable to them? They knew this principle to be a general one, for it is taught in the Bible; there fore they could not thus commit themselves.

The case is then as clear as any manner of expression could make it, that they designed by these prepositions thus used, without any determination, (that is, without any other words limiting and defining their precise meaning,) to show that they did *not go into* the water, as a necessary part of baptism, much less to immerse; but to convey the simple idea that *at*, *by* or *in* those places mentioned, they were baptizing.

So far then from these prepositions, [*at*, *by* or *in*,] holding out the idea, that they went into the water, for the purpose of immersing, to say the least of the matter, no such idea is inculcated; and nothing whatever in favor of immersion is gained. On the contrary, unless the apostles were careless men, and did not regard how they wrote; or designed to lead

us into error, as they made no such determination of their meaning, they could mean no such thing! Then they meant they *did not go into the water*, as a necessary part of baptism.

Thus from the way and manner these prepositions are used, the fact is clearly and unequivocally settled that immersion is no part of christian baptism; otherwise the apostles were bad men, and not entitled to our confidence, which it would be impious to suppose. J. P. M.

P. S. The writer of this paper acknowledges himself indebted for the greater part of the argumentative part of it to a small tract, in the form of a Sermon, by Alex. A. Campbell, printed without any date, or the residence of the author being given. For this tract the writer is indebted to the politeness of his friend Mr. G. M., of Baltimore. When the argument suited his purpose, he extracted with mere verbal alterations, and sometimes but few of even these. And he would further add, that in some hundreds of places where he finds the original words used in the New Testament, and the Greek translation of the Old, which he has examined with a particular reference to this subject, the above argument is confirmed in the most conclusive and satisfactory manner.

ART. II. Remarks on the Mode of Baptism.

[Since the foregoing article was handed to the printer, we have received the following on the same subject, from another correspondent. In giving it to the public, we have taken the liberty to omit so much of it as is occupied in the refutation of the argument of the Baptists drawn from the common translation of certain Greek prepositions; as this point is so extensively and satisfactorily treated in the foregoing article. For a similar reason we also omit the introductory remarks. These two papers taken together, although perhaps containing no new arguments, do, in our opinion, most effectually overthrow the doctrine of immersion. It is something of a singular providence that two communications on the same subject should have been sent us for the same number of the Monitor, without any understanding to that effect on the part of the writers. Perhaps this is a plain indication, that our church needed to have her attention particularly directed to the mode of baptism, in order to maintain her testimony on that point with firmness against the Baptists, who have become so numerous, and who are so well practised in the arts of proselytism. Under this impression we cheerfully devote so large a portion of the present number to these reasonable productions. Let them be read with care and attention.]

The word *baptize* is considered by the Baptists, as affording of itself no small evidence in favor of their doctrine. It is a Greek word, which, they say properly means *to dip*, and so well satisfied are they with this criticism, that in some translations of the scriptures they have positively so rendered it. But any scholar can see at a glance in any Lexicon, that it is of much more general meaning, viz: to apply to a person or thing, water, or other liquid in almost any manner. And with this latitude of meaning we find it used in the gospels. (Mark i. 3, 4.) "For the Pharisees, and all the Jews, except they wash (*baptize*) their hands oft, eat not." Here, application of water to a small part of the body only, is called baptizing, and in what manner it was applied, is not intimated. The hands were *dipt* in it, unquestionably, says the Baptist. Perhaps so, but in the end of verse 4th, we read of their washing (or baptizing) also *tables*, or as the word may also be rendered, *beds*; either article was extremely unlikely to be frequently plunged in the water, and the custom is well known to have been only a very light aspersion.

There are many texts of scripture, say the Baptists; that speak of baptism almost expressly as an immersion, (as Rom. vi. 4. Col. ii. 12. 1 Cor. x. 1, 2. 1 Pet. iii. 20, 21. These passages must therefore be carefully enquired into. The first two named are almost in the same words.

"Therefore we are buried with him by baptism unto death, &c." To be buried in baptism can mean nothing else than to be entirely immersed in the water, say the Baptists; but let us consider whether this would not bring an insurmountable difficulty into the text. The apostle is speaking of the interest of believers in the efficacy of Christ's death and resurrection, for the destruction of sin, and consequently their actual conformity to his death and resurrection in this respect. In baptism they are buried with him, but if this be only a burial of the body in the water, then, their resemblance to his resurrection must be only by the raising of the body out of the water, (and so say they it is,) but the apostle explains it very differently—"that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." There is a likeness here between Christ and believers, in that [1.] Their death was a death to sin, v. 10, 11. For that he died, he died unto sin once:—Likewise reckon ye also yourselves dead indeed unto sin—[2.] There was a likeness, in that their death was followed by a resurrection. [3.] In that their resurrection is of the same character, viz: rising to a life of holiness. Verse 4. That like as Christ was raised up from the dead, by the glory of the Father; even so we also should walk in newness of life. When the believer is raised up by the power of the Spirit, to a life of new and holy obedience, it is his conformity to the resurrection of Christ, (and the only conformity the apostle notices,) that is to say, the resemblance is altogether of a spiritual nature; therefore the resemblance of Christ's death and burial in the baptism of believers must also be altogether spiritual. And from the scope of the place it is very plain the apostle is not speaking nor even alluding to the external form of administration; but as if intending to prevent such an idea, he twice changes the figure, while speaking of the same thing, within a very few sentences. What in verse 4, is a being "buried with him;" is in verse 5, a being "planted together in the likeness of his death;" and in verse 6, it is, "our old man is crucified with him, &c." It is therefore reasonable to insist on a form of administering the ordinance that shall resemble planting, or a form that shall some way resemble crucifixion, as that of the papists, as to maintain that the only form must be a resemblance to burying. But the expression in verse 6 is a perfect key to the whole difficulty; "our old man is crucified with him." It is this old man, the body of sin that is to be buried in forgetfulness, and that by renunciation at baptism, and not the natural body.

The next passage to be considered, is 1 Cor. x. 2. "And were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." When we consider the situation of the Israelites passing through the Red Sea, the waters on each side like walls of immense height, the pillar of cloud, which was also water, behind and spreading out entirely over them; what can more exactly set forth to us the condition of persons immersed, wholly and entirely, and this the apostle calls their baptism! There is one thing, however, on account of which, this example is not a happy one, viz: that the glory of the miracle by which this baptism was administered, consisted in their being kept perfectly dry: while thus immersed there was no application of the water made in any manner; and it must require a great stretch of imagination indeed to discover a resemblance, where the principal features are directly contrary. But let us consider the expression, "They were all baptized unto Moses." Not in or into the name of Moses, for that would be giving him such homage and worship, as belongs to God only, but Moses here is taken, as it is very frequently, for that system of worship and ordinances which God gave by the hand of Moses. They were baptized, consecrated and separated to it. And how the cloud and the sea served to that end is not difficult to understand. What the water of baptism represents to the eye of faith, the water of the cloud

and of the sea represented literally ; by it Israel was visibly, completely, and forever separated from the ungodly, and set apart to the special service of God: it might very properly therefore be called a baptism.

The next passage is (1 Pet. iii. 20, 21,) "when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the Ark was preparing, wherein few, that is eight persons were saved by water. The like figure whereunto, even baptism doth also now save us, &c." The Ark and those in it had the great waters beneath, and the mighty rain pouring on it from above, it was as it were in the midst of the water, and the apostle here calls baptism a figure like unto it. Can any thing be more plain in favor of immersion ! But there is the same objection as in the former case, viz : the water did not so much as touch any one in the Ark, and it was perfectly evident from the apostle's expression that he is not at all speaking of the outward form of administration, he does not call it a figure of baptism ; for baptism itself is a figure, and the figure of a figure would be absurd ; but he calls it a figure like to it, a figure of the same spiritual import, and in which the same element is used. The use and import we might show to be precisely the same, as of the cloud and sea to Israel. If it had been said that the ungodly world were baptized in the flood and the Egyptians in the sea, it would have altered the case very materially ; it would have been decisive in favor of immersion. And if either of the apostles in the places quoted, had had any intention of representing to us the mode of baptism by immersion, it seems impossible they should have neglected such notable illustrations and chosen others in which the resemblance is so faint, that it requires the utmost stretch of ingenuity to discover it.

Finally, say the Baptists, the sprinkling of a little water on the face, is a very inadequate representation of our total defilement by sin, and the renewing of the whole man in regeneration ; that nothing less can answer to this than the total immersion of the body. If we could observe such a principle in any other divine ordinance, that the symbol should bear a proportion to the substance, then might it be plead for here ; but this is not the case ; no quantity of water ever can represent the extent of efficacy of the thing signified ; on the other hand the manifest disproportion is of excellent use to instruct us that the benefit consists in nothing, natural or visible, but in the sacramental character of the water only. If the argument were good, it would apply with equal force to the sacrament of the Supper ; it might be said, that tasting a crumb of bread and the smallest quantity of wine, cannot be called a supper, a feast ; can be no proper representation of our reception of whole Christ and his salvation, and our living upon him ; that nothing less can do this but to eat and drink to excess, which the apostle severely reproveth in the Corinthians, and none pleads for. But we have the argument and answer to it very briefly but clearly handled by our Lord himself. (John xiii. 9.) When washing the disciples feet, Peter refused to have his washed till instructed in the symbolical meaning of the action, and then, sensible of his total defilement, thought it insufficient to represent the extent of cleansing he stood in need of. "Lord not my feet only but also my hands and my head;" he thought no less than immersion would answer. "Jesus saith unto him, he that is washed needeth not save to wash his feet but is clean every whit."

We might now consider the arguments against the mode of administering this ordinance by immersion.

1. It is not agreeable to the spirit of the gospel dispensation in two respects. In respect of *modesty* ; it is true, that the divine appointment of any rite, at once answers all objections of this kind and renders any act, whatever it might be in itself, perfectly modest ; but divine ordinances may be considered also as they appear to those that are without, and in

this view there is a great difference between some of those under the Old Testament, and those of the New; the latter being at the greatest possible distance from indelicacy, which cannot be said of immersion; but considering the promiscuous state of society in which we live, there is a positive indecency in it. But particularly it agrees not with the spirit of the gospel in respect of the *lightness* of gospel service. This was one of the greatest outward differences between the old and new dispensations; the former had many laborious, expensive and painful observances; the latter has the fewest, simplest and easiest possible. There are no journeys necessary, no great bodily exertion. It is equally suited to all parts of the world, to all sexes and conditions of men, and all seasons of the year; which cannot be said of immersion. It savours very much of the laborious bodily exercise—a certain measure of bodily strength in the administrator is essentially requisite; in many parts of the world it could not be administered without undertaking considerable journeys, in some countries it could not be administered at all during a great part of the year, and even in any country it is often a great exposure of health and life to weak constitutions.

2. We find baptism to have been administered by the apostles in circumstances that will not allow the supposition of its having been by immersion; as on the day of Pentecost. (Acts ii. 41.) “Then they that gladly received his word, were baptized, and the same day there were added to them about three thousand souls.” Of this it has been remarked not without reason, that it was scarcely practicable for the twelve to immerse such a number, in the part of a day, in which this was done. But passing this we may notice the place in which it was; it was certainly in the city of Jerusalem, and from verse 46, it would seem most probable in the courts of the temple, where the multitude was to be met with, and in either place it is certain there was no sufficiency of water free to the public like a natural stream, for the immersion of such a multitude. Dr. Gill, and after him Baptists generally, find more than enough, and abundant conveniences also, in the ten brazen lavers, each of sufficient size for the immersion of a man, the brazen sea, large enough to receive a great number at once, the bathing room where the High Priest washed himself on solemn occasions, besides the pools of Siloam and Bethesda, and private baths and cisterns. All this however only proves to what length good men will sometimes go in support of a favorite theory. Admitting there were the lavers and sea in the temple at this time, the same as in the days of Solomon, it was utterly unallowable for any man to bathe in them; the priests who had the exclusive use of them for the sacred services, washed the sacrifices and their own hands and feet at them; but on no occasion of their bathing the whole body, did they do so in the open courts, but in the bathing rooms for the purpose. Or even if we might suppose such a use to be made of them at any time, the followers of Jesus of Nazareth were not yet so popular with the chief priests and captain of the temple, as to obtain that accommodation. The same may be answered to the notion of their immersing in the pool of Siloam, which was a reservoir from which the city was supplied with water. Now, though water is not so precious with us as then and there, is there any of our cities in which the authorities would permit the immersion of a number of persons into the reservoir? The very proposal shows the absurdity of the notion. The pool of Bethesda was a public property of the city, used for a special purpose; and what its size and particular character were Dr. Gall himself admits to be uncertain. Another instance we have in the Philippian jailor. (Acts xvi. 33.) “And he took them the same hour of the night and washed their stripes, and was baptized he and all his straightway.” This took place about midnight, and within the precincts of a prison, where it cannot be imagined there was suitable

place for immersion. Baptists, therefore, confidently assert that the apostles took the jailor and his family, even at that unseasonable hour, out of the city to the river near it, and baptized them and returned; because it is said, first that he brought them out, and then that he brought them into his house, as if referring to two different times. But surely this is a very unmerciful conjecture, both to the family and to the apostles, considering their wounded and painful state of body by stripes, stocks, &c. It is also a most unreasonable conjecture, for which the text affords not a shadow; it is said, verse 30th, that he brought them out, viz: from the inner prison into which he had thrust them; and, verse 34th, that he brought them into his house, viz: the apartment allotted to his own family, but still in the same building; there is no reference to two times here, nor the least hint that they had been without the enclosure, but on the contrary the following verses make it certain that they had not. When the magistrates sent next day to discharge them, they would not go out *privately* though lawful. And can it be supposed that before this they had gone out secretly and unlawfully, and still made these professions? It would discover such duplicity as cannot for a moment be admitted against them. In a word, it may with as good reason be maintained that the jailor took the apostles out to the river to wash their stripes as that they took him and his family there to immerse them, for it was in the same hour of the night, and the washing of their stripes is first mentioned. But such a supposition would be too ridiculous. Once more the apostle Paul effected the conversion of Onesimus while a prisoner in bonds, and speaks of him as advanced to a good standing in the christian church by his means in that condition, so that his baptism must be supposed, but that the apostle could immerse him in these circumstances is in the last degree improbable.

3. Wherever the same spiritual things are set forth as are represented by baptism, it is always under the idea of sprinkling or pouring, and not once by immersion. Does baptism signify the application of the cleansing blood of Christ? Through the whole Old and New Testament this is constantly represented by sprinkling. It was the blood of *sprinkling*; the blood of the paschal lamb was *sprinkled* on the lintel and door posts; the blood of calves and goats at the dedication of the Sinaitic covenant, and the people's entering into that church state, was *sprinkled* on the book and the people. The water of separation was *sprinkled* on the unclean, to which the apostle compares the application of the blood of Christ, (Heb. ix. 13, 14.) And again no less plainly, (ch. x. 22.) "Having our hearts *sprinkled* from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water." Here we observe that the heart and conscience are properly the subjects of this cleansing, but the terms washing and sprinkling must be figurative as applied to them and proper only to the body, the plain meaning then is that the washing of the body by sprinkling it with pure water was emblematical of this cleansing of the heart and conscience as well as the purity of life flowing from it. The only type in which dipping was at all used, (that is, *certainly* used) we have, Lev. xiv., where for cleansing the leper, the living bird was to be *dipped* in the blood of the slain bird, &c., of which we observe, that the occasion of this ceremony did in no way correspond to that of baptism, nor the living bird to the person baptized, as might be proved at length, and therefore could not represent the mode of it; and after all the application to the person was made by *sprinkling*. There were many occasions on which the washing of the whole body was enjoined, but these represented the washings of sanctification rather than the initial washing of regeneration. And even then there is no evidence that they were performed by immersion and not rather by ablution. The case of Naaman the Syrian is sometimes quoted, and he did indeed dip himself seven times in Jordan;

but that was no type or standing ordinance of worship, but an arbitrary appointment for the trial of faith and obedience. Again, does baptism signify the washing of regeneration? It is constantly spoken of as *sprinkling* or pouring. (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, &c." (Titus iii. 5, 6.) "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost which he *shed* or poured on us abundantly, &c." Does baptism signify the gift of the Holy Ghost in any part or all of his gracious operations on the soul? He is constantly said to be shed or poured on men as in the passage last quoted, to *fall* on them; he is compared to rain, and dew, and the like. And the idea of immersion in the Holy Spirit is monstrous.

4. We have in one instance an intimation so plain as to come little short of an express example. (Acts xi. 15, 16.) "And as I began to speak the Holy Ghost *fell on them* as on us at the beginning, then remembered I the words of the Lord how that he said John indeed baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost. [1.] This was the baptism with the Holy Ghost, and the thing signified by John's baptism, and also by the standing ordinance in the christian church. [2.] It was administered, if we may so say, by his falling upon them, and not by any thing resembling immersion. [3.] Therefore if there ought to be a correspondence between the mode of administering the sign and the mode of communicating of the thing signified; it must be by causing the water to *fall on* the person. And we may remark by the way that this is the plainest hint any where given of John's mode of administration. Finally, when Peter commanded them to be baptized with water, and having this baptism before his eyes by the Holy Ghost falling *upon them*, it is inconceivable why he should reverse the order, and cause them to *fall into the water* as the sign of it.

From all which it is fully proved that the mode of sprinkling in baptism is abundantly held forth in scripture, and this mode only.

BAPTIZO.

ART. III. *Lectures on Theology.* By the late Rev. JOHN DICK, D. D., Minister of the United Associate Congregation, Greyfriars, Glasgow; and Professor of Theology to the United Secession Church.

On a few points, Dr. Dick differs from the views that have been entertained by many eminent theological writers, or, at least, rejects the phraseology which they had employed. In some instances, we think he has detected an inaccuracy of expression, and has succeeded in placing the subject in a more correct light. But we are neither prepared to adopt every alteration in phraseology which he has proposed, nor to concur with him in all his opinions. The statement which has been usually given respecting the condition of the covenant of works seems to us sufficiently accurate; and the remarks of Dr. Dick with regard to that statement, hypercritical.

"In some systems, the condition of the covenant is said to have been perfect, personal, and perpetual obedience; but this statement is far from being accurate. I do not deny, that it required perfect obedience in the sense already explained. The whole law was concentrated in a single positive precept, which put to the proof the principle upon which all obedience depends, profound submission to the authority of the lawgiver;

but if perfect is here used to signify universal in extent, as well as pure in motive, the obedience presented in the covenant was only perfect constructively. Adam had not to go through a course of all the duties, but to evince that he was ready to perform them as opportunity should occur, by attending to this particular duty. I grant also that the obedience was personal, or, in other words, was to be performed by himself; but as no doubt ever did, or ever could, arise in any mind upon the point, it was altogether unnecessary to mention it. I deny also that it was perpetual obedience. The period of his probation was not to be commensurate with his existence, nor indefinitely extended; there was a time fixed when the trial would end, and the reward would be conferred. To say that the obedience was to be perpetual, is contrary to the nature of a covenant, for in every transaction of this kind it is implied, that, when the stipulated service is finished, the promise will be fulfilled. But when the term perpetual comes to be explained, we find that it does not signify perpetual, but temporary, and is employed to teach us that Adam was to continue to obey till the trial was ended. But why is a word used which suggests any idea contrary to truth, and different from what the speaker or writer intended? Why should that be called perpetual, which would have probably terminated in a few days or weeks? Besides, if the meaning is, that man was bound to obey during the term prescribed, this notion is implied in the word perfect, for that obedience only is perfect which is sustained so long as the obligation to perform it lasts. Here, then, we have an instance of repetition under the name of distinction." Vol. ii. p. 346.

Though the special test of Adam's obedience was a positive precept relating to the fruit of a particular tree in the garden, and though it should be admitted that Adam was secured against sinning otherwise than by the violation of this positive precept; yet we must contend that he was required to yield obedience to the whole revealed will of God. His obedience behoved to be perfect, not only in respect of its principle and motive, but also in respect of parts, extending to every precept of the moral law, which was imprinted in the fleshly table of his heart. It was not necessary, we grant, that Adam should actually perform every duty which that law requires of man, for, in the nature of things, this was impossible; but every duty incumbent upon him in the relations and circumstances in which he was placed, he was bound to fulfil. Perhaps no one ever doubted that the obedience was to be performed by Adam himself; yet, we apprehend, there is a propriety in applying the term personal to the obedience which the law of works required. This term indicates an important distinction between the covenant of works and the covenant of grace. The latter accepts of the obedience of a surety; the former admitted only of obedience performed by man himself. Upon the supposition that Adam failed in fulfilling the obedience demanded, and that a substitute both able and willing to do it had offered, the covenant of works could not have accepted of him. The term perpetual was unquestionably never intended by those who have employed it to signify that Adam's obedience to the law, in its covenant form, was to be continued forever, or even till the termination of his residence upon earth; but merely to denote that it was to be uninterruptedly continued till the expiration of his probationary state. We know no word more suitable for expressing this idea, and the use of similar language in scripture authorises the application of the term to that which is only to continue for a limited time. We are not, therefore, convinced by the arguments of Dr. Dick, that the current phraseology upon this subject, sanctioned by the authority of so many distinguished writers, ought to be discarded.

All evangelical divines harmonize in asserting, that the condition of the

covenant of grace is, the surety-righteousness of Christ. Three things are usually mentioned as constitutive of that righteousness, viz. the holiness of his human nature, the righteousness of his life, and the satisfaction that he gave to the justice of God for sin by his sufferings and death. From this representation of the ingredients included in the righteousness of Christ, Dr. Dick dissents. Speaking of the condition of the covenant of grace, he says,

“In many theological books, we are taught that it comprehends the three following things : holiness of nature, righteousness of life, and satisfaction for sin by sufferings and death. To answer these demands our Redeemer assumed human nature without a stain, gave perfect obedience to the precepts of the law, and shed his blood as an atonement for sin. I am disposed to call in question the accuracy of this statement. To the second and third particulars I have no objection, and believe that they were truly the terms of the covenant ; but I do not see that the first was any part of the condition. My reason of dissenting in this instance from the common opinion is, that besides satisfaction to divine justice, which is now required in consequence of sin, no other thing can be conceived to be the condition of the covenant of grace, which was not the condition of the covenant of works. Now, holiness of nature was not part of that condition, because man was already possessed of it when the covenant was made, and all, therefore, that could be required of him was, that he should act agreeably to the principles and dispositions with which his Maker had endowed him. A condition bears a reference to the future, and implies something to be done. No man enters into a covenant with another, on the ground of what he at present is, but on the ground of what he promises to be or to do. God did not promise eternal life to Adam, because he had a holy nature, but in the event of his obeying the command which he had given him respecting the tree of knowledge. The only condition prescribed to him was obedience, and it is the only condition, therefore, which could be prescribed to his surety. It is true, indeed, that man, having lost the holiness of his nature, is bound to account for it ; but this is done, not by substituting the holiness of the human nature of Christ as a compensation for the want of it, but by his atonement on the cross for all sin, original and actual ; and being indispensably necessary to communion with God, and the enjoyment of heaven, it is restored to the elect by the operation of his Spirit. The holiness of his human nature I consider rather as a qualification for the work which he was appointed to perform, than as any part of the work itself. The holiness of the human nature of Christ was a gift of his Father, by which he was qualified for his work, and in receiving it, considered as a man, he was passive. There was, therefore, no place for merit, although his unspotted purity was in the highest degree pleasing in the eyes of his Father. His merit consisted in the use of the gift, in retaining his holy nature amidst all the temptations of Satan and the world, and exerting its faculties in the service of the Father. It could not therefore be a part of the condition of the covenant, which consisted in active duties, in doing something which God had enjoined, and to which he had promised a reward. For these reasons, I reject the first particular which is usually mentioned as included in the condition of the covenant.” Vol. ii. pp. 434—436.

We are aware that this opinion is not peculiar to Dr. Dick. Though we do not recollect having met with it in any theological work, we know that it has been held by some very acute and profound divines. But we are not yet prepared to relinquish the ancient, and still prevalent sentiment, that the holiness of Christ's human nature constituted a part of his surety-righteousness. The law of the covenant of works has a claim for holiness of nature, upon all who are under it ; it demands entire conformity to the nature and will of God ; and God being essentially holy, no-

thing can be so contrary to him as an unholy nature. Man having lost that purity of nature with which he was originally endowed, it was necessary that Christ, as his surety, should present at the bar of the law a nature perfectly holy, that he might fully answer every demand which the law had upon those whom he represented. How could it be truly affirmed that Christ "fulfilled all righteousness," and that he is "the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth," unless he had presented to the law a pure, untainted nature, answerable to that holiness which the law required of them? If it be alleged that the law did not require this holiness of nature, it would necessarily follow that the want of original righteousness, and the corruption of nature, is no sin; for, where no law is, there is no transgression. But such an opinion is at variance with numerous explicit declarations of Scripture, and, therefore, we must maintain that the law demands holiness of nature, and, consequently, that this formed a constituent part of that righteousness which Christ fulfilled as our surety.

We are unable to perceive the force of the first argument which Dr. Dick brings forward against the common opinion, viz. "that besides satisfaction to divine justice, which is now required in consequence of sin, no other thing can be conceived to be the condition of the covenant of grace, which was not the condition of the covenant of works." It is here admitted that one thing is now required, which was not included in the condition of the covenant of works; and where is the difficulty of conceiving that another thing may also be required? If, in addition to the obedience which was the condition of the covenant of works, it is now necessary, in consequence of sin, that satisfaction be rendered to divine justice, why should it not be equally necessary, that the holiness of nature, which was concreated with the first Adam, as the head of the covenant of works, and of which he deprived himself and his posterity, be restored in the person of the second Adam, as the surety of the covenant of grace? Man having received a holy nature at his creation, was bound to retain it; and having lost the holiness of his nature, is bound to account for it. This is admitted; but we are told that this obligation is answered by the atonement of Christ upon the cross: with equal propriety, it may be said, that the atonement of Christ answered the claim which the law has upon man for obedience, or afforded satisfaction for his want of obedience; and thus Christ's active obedience is wholly set aside as unnecessary. Another argument adduced by Dr. Dick in support of his views upon this subject is, "that the holiness of the human nature of Christ was a gift of his Father, by which he was qualified for his work, and in receiving it, considered as a man, he was passive. There was therefore no place for merit, although his unspotted purity was in the highest degree pleasing in the eyes of his Father."—We shall express our opinion upon this point in the appropriate words of a contemporary author;—"Our Lord's human nature was assumed by him pure, and free from every moral stain. Its original formation in true holiness, though fundamental to his righteousness as a surety, was not properly a part of it, for its preparation in order to its assumption was not his own personal act, but the work of the Father through the Spirit, and belonged to the *promissory*, and not to the *conditional* part of the covenant of grace; but the Son's own agency, in taking our holy nature, and continuing to present it spotless, and in the exercise of all its holy principles, at the bar of God's law, without doubt entered into the matter of that righteousness."*

It has been often objected by the opposers of the imputation of Christ's obedience to believers, that, being subject to the law as man, and so bound to fulfil it for himself, his obedience could not be meritorious for others,

* Stevenson on the Offices of Christ, p. 180.

or imputed to them. As Dr. Dick admits, that Christ "owed obedience to the moral law for himself as a man, because his human nature being a creature, was necessarily subject to the authority of God;" (Vol. iii. p. 348) he felt himself called upon to encounter this objection on different occasions, and repeatedly mentions a variety of considerations to take off its force—when treating of the covenant of grace, he furnishes the following answers to it.

"It may be objected, that the obedience of Christ, however perfect, could not be available for us, since he owed it for himself, because as man he was subject to the same moral law which is obligatory upon all mankind. Its merit, therefore, could not be imputed to others, but must have terminated upon himself. Different answers may be returned to this objection. It may be said, in the first place, that, although it was performed in the human nature, it was the obedience of our Mediator in his whole person, and consequently, that he did not owe it for himself, because, being the Son of God, he was not subject to the law. It may be said again, that even his human nature owed no obedience for itself, in order to its admission into heaven, but in virtue of its union to his Divine person, was immediately entitled to all the glory and felicity of which it was capable. Whatever obedience, therefore, he performed upon earth, and in a state of humiliation and trial, was not upon his own account; and hence, according to justice, the benefit of it might be transferred to his people. It may be said once more, that, although the human nature of Christ was necessarily subject to the law of God as the eternal rule of righteousness to all intelligent creatures, yet it was from choice that it became subject to the law in that particular form in which it was binding upon men. To them it bore the form of a covenant; but this form was incidental and temporary, and would have ceased as soon as the condition was fulfilled. I may subjoin to these answers to the objection, that it cannot be consistently advanced by those who acknowledge the representation of Adam, and believe that, although he was subject to the law on his own account, and bound to obey its precepts for himself, yet, if he had fulfilled the terms of the covenant, his descendants would have been entitled to the promised reward on the ground of his obedience. If his obedience could have been considered as virtually the obedience of his posterity, there is evidently no reason why the obedience of Christ should not have been accepted in behalf of his people, and have entitled them to the reward promised in the covenant of grace, even although it were true that he was himself personally bound to perform it." Vol. ii. p. 438.

Upon the supposition that Christ owed obedience to the moral law for himself as man, we think that Dr. Dick has satisfactorily shewn, that his obedience might notwithstanding be imputed to others. But we would be disposed to solve the difficulty by a shorter process. We would not hesitate to deny that Christ was subject to the law on his own account, and bound to obey its precepts for himself, and if we succeeded in our proof of this position, the objection which Dr. Dick so elaborately refutes would instantly disappear. We apprehend there is a fallacy in the use of the word *creature*, when it is said, that Christ's human nature, being a creature, was necessarily subject to the authority of God,—when we apply this word to human beings, we associate with it the idea of personality,—but, though the human nature of Christ was, no doubt, a created nature, yet it was not a human person; it never had any distinct existence as a rational agent; it subsisted not, for a single moment, separate from his divine person; and consequently, never could have any agency but as subsisting in the person of the Eternal Son. It is only a human person that is a proper subject of the moral law, and as Christ had not a human person, but only human nature united to his divine per-

son, we maintain that his obedience was in no respect for himself, but wholly for his people.

"Many Theologians," as Dr. Dick remarks, "are of opinion that there are two covenants connected with the salvation of men, which they call the covenant of redemption and the covenant of grace, the former made with Christ from everlasting, and the latter made with sinners in time." We are not disposed to exclaim against this statement as fraught with dangerous error, for we know that it has been adopted by some of the most profound and evangelical divines; but though it was explained by them in a sense consistent with the perfections and grace of God, there is, in our opinion, no foundation for the distinction in the sacred Scriptures. The first Adam is said to have been a *figure* of Christ, who is called the *second* Adam. Now, there was not one covenant made with Adam, the condition of which he was to perform, and another made with his posterity, the condition of which they were to fulfil, but one covenant included both him and them. It was made with him as their representative, and with them as represented in and by him, and the performance of its condition by him would have entitled them, no less than himself, to the felicity promised in it. In like manner, one covenant includes Christ and his spiritual seed, and his fulfilment of its condition entitles them, as well as himself, to the eternal life promised in it. The Scripture, accordingly, everywhere speaks of it as *one* covenant, and the blood of Christ is repeatedly called "the blood of the covenant," not "of the covenants," as we may presume it would have been called, if it had been the condition of the covenant of redemption, and the foundation of the covenant of grace. The notion of the two covenants for the recovery of fallen man is now generally exploded, and we are happy to find Dr. Dick supporting the prevalent opinion, that "the covenant by which men are saved is one, and was made with Christ before the foundation of the world." (Vol. ii. p. 424) The Westminster Confession of Faith has been frequently appealed to as recognizing the distinction between a covenant of redemption and a covenant of grace, but while we can discover no trace of this distinction in the Confession, we find an explicit condemnation of it in the Larger Catechism, which entirely harmonizes with the doctrine of the Confession. "The covenant of grace was made with Christ, as the second Adam, and, in him, with all the elect as his seed." The Scripture, indeed, frequently speaks of God making a covenant with believers, but this language admits of an easy explanation, consistently with the doctrine now stated. "The covenant of grace," says a judicious writer, "was made with Christ in a strict and proper sense, as he was the party-contractor in it, and undertook to fulfil the condition of it. It is made with believers in an improper sense, when they are taken into the bond of it, and come actually to enjoy the benefit of it. How it is made with them may be learned from the words of the Apostle, Acts xiii. 34,—'I will give you the sure mercies of David,' which are a kind of paraphrase upon that passage in Isaiah lv. 3, 'I will make an everlasting covenant with you, even the sure mercies of David.' God makes the covenant with them, not by requiring any thing of them in order to entitle them, or lay a foundation for their claim to the blessings of it, but by making these over to them as a free gift, and putting them in possession of them, as far as their present state will admit, by a faith of his own operation."*

The idea of a covenant of grace made with sinners in time, different from the covenant of redemption made with Christ from eternity, led many eminent men to speak of faith as the *condition* of the covenant of grace. As the remarks of Dr. Dick upon this point afford a fine exam-

* Sermons by the Rev. David Wilson. London, p. 72.

ple of that candor with which he uniformly discusses opinions from which he differed, we shall lay them before our readers. "The use of the term *condition* in reference to the covenant of grace may also be considered as objectionable, because it commonly means something, which when done by one party, gives a right to what was promised by the other. To call faith therefore the condition of the covenant, may seem to imply, that there is merit in faith, which entitles us to salvation. This, however, is far from being the meaning of those whose sentiments we are at present considering. The term is used by them in a lower sense, and signifies something which goes before another, and without which the other cannot be obtained. They do not assign merit to faith, but simply precedence. According to them, faith is the condition of the covenant, because the promise of salvation will be performed to none but believers. They hold as well as we, that it is only the means of obtaining an interest in the salvation offered in the gospel, and that it is itself an effect of grace, being wrought in the heart by the spirit of regeneration. If they err, then, it is not in sentiment, but in language; and we should be cautious in affirming that they err even here, lest the censure should recoil upon persons of whom we are accustomed to speak with great veneration, and to whom some are disposed to look up as almost infallible oracles, the framers of those public standards which we have adopted; for they did not hesitate to make use of the obnoxious term. 'The grace of God,' they say in the Larger Catechism, '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.' As, however, the condition had been often employed in an unscriptural sense, and is apt to suggest false ideas to the ignorant and unwary, it is more prudent to lay it aside." Vol. ii. pp. 425, 426.

With the first part of this quotation we entirely agree, but the taunt in the close of it, we think, might well have been spared, especially as the compilers of our public standards have not employed the obnoxious phrase upon which the Doctor was animadverting. True, they call faith a *condition*, but not the condition of the *covenant of grace*. All they say is, that God requires faith as the condition to *interest us in the Mediator of the covenant*; but to say that faith is the proper condition of the covenant, and to say that it is required as the condition of interesting us in Christ, and instating us in the covenant, are two things exceedingly different. That faith is indispensably necessary, as the instrument or mean by which we are savingly interested in Christ, and personally instated in the covenant, is a most important truth, and is all that is intended in the Larger Catechism. The term, *condition*, however, even as applied by the compilers of our standards, is, we frankly admit, exposed to misconstruction, and has become so appropriated by the opponents of free grace, that it is very properly disused by evangelical divines.

(To be concluded.)

ART. IV. *The Christian World Unmasked.*

(Continued from page 282.)

Indeed, *Doctor*, I begin to perceive my old sweet-heart, *sincere obedience*, is a very sorry hussey. Yet her face is so plausible, and her speech so winning, none would suspect her for a jilt. She must be packed off; but what shall I do, when she is turned out of doors? You have jostled

me out of my easy chair, and now I have not got a stool to sit upon. My own obedience will afford no *sort of title* under heaven; where then must I find a title? Beside I do not understand your doctrine, though I must give up my own. Sometimes you preach up Moses stoutly, and then suddenly Jesus Christ is all in all. One while you talk notably of being born again, and then presently you seem to speak as if my own obedience was only fit to destroy me.* Pray, explain yourself, and do not leave me in the dark. You have blown my candle out, and in civility should lend your lanthorn.

Nay, *Sir*, candle-light will not serve you here: sun light is wanted; rays from the sun of righteousness, or you continue dark, notwithstanding all that I can say. May this light be granted.

The law is preached for two reasons, as *a schoolmaster, to bring men unto Christ, that they may be justified by faith*: (Gal. iii. 24.) and secondly, as a *rule of life* to walk with Christ, but as no condition of salvation.

Jesus Christ has no business with a pharisee, who can plead his own righteousness; he came to *seek and save them that are lost*. (Luke xix. 10.) And the moral law must be preached in its utmost rigour, to awaken every sort of sinners, and convince them of their *lost estate*. When the law is set home by the Holy Spirit, it becomes a schoolmaster, sharp indeed, and scourges sinners unto Christ. The fox is then unkenelled, and driven from his old haunt, sincere obedience, the common refuge and convenient screen for drunkards, fornicators, liars, thieves, and simpering deists who are all at their wits-end presently, when they find their thatched hovel in a blaze.

No sooner is the rigour of the law perceived by the understanding, and felt in the conscience, but it forces every one to say, as Paul did, *When the commandment came, came home to my heart I died*, all hope of life through my own obedience perished. (Rom. vii. 9.) And they can take up Paul's lamentation, a mighty strange one to a modern Christian, who has got no feeling, *O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from this body of death?* (Rom. vii. 24.)

Now they know by good experience, that *death is the wages of sin*; and feel themselves in a state of condemnation. This makes them dread sin, and free to part with it; because it has lost its painted cheek, and shews its haggard countenance. The prayers of the church become very suitable and welcome. The frequent supplication of, "Lord, have mercy on us," is neither loathsome nor tiresome. The much repeated cry, "for mercy on us miserable sinners," is not thought a cry too much. And those strong communion words, "the remembrance of our sins is grievous, and the burden of them is intolerable," are not muttered by a hollow lip, but uttered with a feeling heart.

A sinner, thus convinced of sin, struggles hard to help himself. He watches, strives and prays, and fain would keep the whole law. But as he strives, the law opens to his view, and shews its spiritual nature, and its marvelous extent; reaching to every action, word and thought, and calling for obedience every moment. And now he feels his nature's sad depravity. His heart is earthly and unclean, and therefore has a fixed dislike to spiritual duties. It may be *forced* on them, but cannot *relish* them, nor keep a *full attention* to them. He could sit four hours in an idle play-house; and though crowded up exceedingly, could keep a fixed attention all the time, and be sorry when the farce was over. But his heart goes to prayer, like an idle boy to school, sauntering every step, and would play truant if he dare.

* N. B. The judicious reader will perceive, that I have not wrote against sincere obedience, as it is the genuine fruit and a necessary evidence of faith, but only decry it as a *condition* of salvation.

After many fruitless struggles to keep the law, he finds himself *without strength*. Fain he would delight in God, and in his spiritual service, but he cannot. His nature will not kindly move towards God, and, when thrust upon the task, groweth quarrelsome or sleepy, and is quickly jaded down. Hence he finds an utter need of the Spirit's aid, to create his heart anew, and breathe some *spiritual life*, to enable him for *spiritual service*.

The *curse* of the law has now made known his *guilt*; the *spirituality* of the law has shewn his *depraved nature*; and his *vain attempts* to keep the law have disclosed his *utter feebleness*. Thus the law has prepared him for Christ. His heart is humbled, and broken down with an awful sense of his guiltiness, and filthiness, and feebleness; he is possessed of the first beatitude, *poverty of spirit*, (Matt. v. 3,) but does not yet know it is the leading step unto the kingdom of heaven.

The first beatitude conducts him to the second, *Blessed are the mourners*. He mourns because he is poor in spirit, sensible of his spirit's poverty; stript of all his fancied worth, and fancied ability to help himself; *weary of sin*, and of his evil heart; *heavy laden*, with a guilty burden; and seeking rest, but finding none.

Pray, *Doctor*, who is this sorry fellow, this weary wretch, that comes to Jesus Christ with such a loaded pack upon his back? Some highwayman, no doubt, or some housebreaker; perhaps a murderer; at least a person excommunicated, who has been very naughty, and would not wear a white sheet.

Indeed, *Sir*, this sorry fellow is the *Doctor* himself, and every one who comes aright to Jesus Christ. Did you never read the invitation which he makes to sinners? *come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest*. (Matt. xi. 28.) You are a sinner, *Sir*; and all men are sinners, and condemned by the law: but all men do not feel their condemnation, and therefore are not heavy laden with a guilty burden, nor labouring after rest. Yet such are invited; and only such are accepted. What right have you to come to Jesus Christ, unless you come in his appointed way?

If your wealthy neighbor should invite his poor parish widows to dine on Sundays at his house, this invitation would give you no right to dine, nor yet the vicar: you are not *poor widows*. And supposing you should borrow female clothing, put on a gown and petticoat, and call yourself a *poor widow*, this female dress would not procure a right to dine, but might expose you to a cudgel. Yet this is now become the genteel way of coming unto Jesus. Men borrow at a church the garb and language of a Christian, and say most sad things of themselves, while they are upon their knees, as if they were *poor sinners* truly, and yet would execrate a preacher, who should say the same things in a pulpit which they uttered in a pew.

You have heard, no doubt, of beggars who tie a leg up when they go a begging, and then make hideous lamentation of their lameness. Why, this is just your case, *Sir*. When you go to church a praying, which is begging, you tie your righteous heart up, and then make woful outcry for *mercy on us miserable sinners*. Oh, *Sir*, these tricks may pass awhile unnoticed; but Jesus Christ will apprehend such cheats at last, and give them their desert.

Would you know where God will cast a gracious eye? He tells you, *To this man will I look, saith the lord, even to him that is poor and contrite*; (Isaiah lxvi. 2.) poor in spirit, and bruised with a sense of his sinfulness.

And would you hear whom Jesus calls? His own lips inform you, *I am not come to call the righteous*; no: why should he? If he did, they would not come in his way, for they have found a better. But I am come, he saith, *to call sinners*; sinners sensible of sin, and bruised with it; and

to call them daily, to *repentance*; not to patter over good confessions with a frozen lip, but to breathe them from a mourning heart. (Luke v. 32.) St. Luke introduces the call with these words, *The whole need no physician, but the sick.* And pray, Sir, who are the *whole*? Have any kept the *whole* law, without offending in a single point? Not a man. Then *all* are condemned by the law, and have passed under its curse. Yet many think themselves *whole*, or *nearly whole*, and therefore see no *need*, or *little need* of Christ's atonement. Alas for such! when the stone they have rejected falls upon them it will grind them unto powder. But the *sick* need a physician: they feel that woful sickness, the *plague of the heart*, (1 Kings, viii. 38,) and lothe themselves in dust and ashes.

But we must take a little further notice of our young pilgrim, before we drop him altogether. He was left disconsolate, with raw back and weeping eyes, just flogged out of Moses' school, and seeking balm to heal his wounds but finding none. At length the invitation of Jesus reaches his ears, *Come unto me, thou heavy laden soul, and I will give thee rest.* He hears and wonders, listens and is pleased. A gleam of joy steals into his heart; a joy he never felt before, springing from a cheering hope and dawning prospect of deliverance. This kindles highest esteem and kind affection for the Saviour, who appears all lovely in his sight, and often draws an heavenly tear from his eyes. The name of Jesus groweth musical, his love adorable, and his salvation above all things desirable.

The weeping sinner enters now upon a new world, and joins himself with the praying citizens of Zion. Jesus is welcomed as his King and Saviour, and receives hosannahs from him. He begins to understand what grace means, even mercy, rich mercy, freely shewn to a lost and ruined sinner. No sermon suits him now, but what directs his heart to Jesus, and sets the Saviour forth as prophet, priest and king, to save his people. A full and free salvation captivates his heart: 'tis just the thing he wants, and therefore highly welcome. And whilst the tidings of this royal grace are sounding in his ears, he seems to give them credit; but when the book is laid aside, or sermon over, fresh doubts arise which must perplex him. His understanding is enlightened, but his heart retains a *legal bias*, and a secret harping after merit still. Sometimes he fears the gospel-tidings are so good, they are not true; or if they may be true, they are too good for him. He likes and wants the promised grace, but *staggers* at the promise. A sense of guilt and his uncleanness to dismay him, that he dares not bring a filthy naked soul to Jesus to be washed and clothed by him.

Sincere obedience often peeps again, and bids the pilgrim wash himself first, and Jesus Christ shall *rinse* him afterwards; bids him plant a fig-leaf here and there, and make a patched frock of duty; and if it prove too scanty, Jesus Christ shall eke it out with his fine linen. This expedient pleases for a season, and to work he goes, hoping to make himself so fair and tight, that Jesus Christ shall fall in love with him, and give him *rare commendation* instead of *free pardon*. But *though he wash himself in snow water, and make his hands exceedingly clean, he is plunged in the ditch again, and his own clothes abhor him.* (Job ix. 30, 31.) Thus he grows bewildered, and has lost the sight of grace, until he hears it preached afresh; and then he drops the snow-water, and hastens to the *fountain opened for sin and for uncleanness.* (Zech. xiii. 1.) He stands upon the brink, but cannot enter; and longeth for a washing, but must wait the moving of the water. He views the fountain, and sees it *fair and open*; he views the promise, and sees it *full and clear*; *He that believeth shall be saved*; which makes him cry, "Oh, that I could believe the promise; Jesus then would save me: but my heart staggers, and when my foot seems fixed upon the rock, a sudden gust of doubts blows me into the mire again."

Now he knows the meaning of St. Paul's words, *Believe in Christ Jesus and thou shalt be saved*, (Acts xvi. 31.) and he clearly understands that his want of pardon, peace and holiness, is owing to his want of faith. If he could believe, Jesus Christ would fulfil his promise : it would be *done according to his faith*. (Matt. ix. 28, 29—Matt. xv. 28. Luke vii. 50.—Luke xviii. 42.) Jesus Christ would save him from the *guilt* and *power* of sin.

This makes him feel his want of faith, and want of power to give it. He had been nursed in a Christian land, and thought a mere assent to scripture was sufficient ground to make him a believer ; and he marvelled that some preachers made a mighty stir about this easy matter. But he finds this human faith will neither purify his heart, nor wash his conscience : it will not save him from sin. And he feels that prayer is nothing, and procureth nothing, without divine faith. He sees a reason why the chosen twelve should say, *Lord, increase our faith*, because it is the gift of God. Could they give themselves one grain, they might add another, yea, a dozen grains, or twenty ; and had no need to ask for that which they could give themselves. Besides, these men, who ask for faith, were not heathen men, but Christian men, true followers of Christ ; and none but such can pray for faith, with a hearty feeling of their want of it.

Doctor, you talk mightily of unbelievers ; pray, where may they grow ? In Lapland, among the witches ; or in Greenland, among the whale-fishers ? Sure the people of England are staunch believers, and very good Christians. A modern set, I own, is started up among us, who think it courage to defy their Maker, and *act as freely* as if they could control him ; and if they *think as freely* as they act, may well be called *free-thinkers*. Such people cannot value Jesus Christ, because he brings hell-tidings to their ears. Who can love a messenger of ill news ? Mahomet would prove a sweeter prophet for this light-heeled gentry ; and would gain much credit, could he gain the pulpit, for he allows men concubines enough. However, these are but a few rotten pears among the heap ; the rest are sound ; and I can vouch for my own parish, they are all believers. Indeed, *Doctor*, it would do you good to see how smirkingly they go to church in summer ; and how tidily they look at church, with their better coats and gowns on.

Oh, Sir, the lifeless manner in which people pray, or hear the word of God at church, sheweth plainly, that they have no property in the blessings of the gospel. Glorious things are spoken in the scripture, but they make a mighty small impression on a Christian congregation. The heavenly tidings fall into their heavy ears, like money dropt into a dead man's hand. No comfort is received from the money or the tidings, because they both are dead, and have no interest in them.

If you, Sir, was an heir to a fine estate, your bosom would be often warmed with the joyful prospect ; but your father's servant could not feel your joy. His bosom would not glow, when the fields are viewed, or when the rents are paid. And wherefore ? Because he is not the heir.

A Bible is the precious store-house, and the magna charta of a christian. There he reads of his heavenly Father's love, and of his dying Saviour's legacies. There he sees a map of his travels through the wilderness, and a landscape too of Canaan. And when he climbs on Pisgah's top, and views the promised land, his heart begins to burn, delighted with the blessed prospect, and amazed at the rich and free salvation. But a mere professor, though a decent one, looks on the Bible as a dull book ; and peruseth it with such indifference, as you would read the title-deeds belonging to another man's estate.

I am amazed, to hear you vouch for your parish, as a whole flock of believers. Such a thing was never known before, and would make an eighth wonder of the world. Why, Sir, are there none among you, that

are slaves to divers lusts and pleasures? None, that live in malice and envy, hateful and hating one another? Have you no drunkards nor whoremongers, no sabbath-breakers nor common swearers, no extortioners nor covetous, no liars nor thieves, no lazy hands that will not work, and no light minds that cannot pray? If you think such church-goers are believers, I may fairly rank satan at the head; because he stands possessed of their faith, and is the noble captain of this troop. A troop, which often maketh up three quarters of a parish.

Jesus says, *He that believeth, shall be saved.* Saved from what? Why, from the *guilt* and *power* of sin. Such is Christ's salvation here on earth. But this black troop is visibly and willfully under the power of sin; and therefore cannot have that faith which saves from sin.

Thus at one reckoning, the greater part of your sheep prove goats or wolves; but a remnant is behind of *decent* people, the modern soft phrase for a Christian. Let these decent people take a decent trial: it will not hurt them, if they are good men and true.

St. Paul says, *Examine yourselves, whether ye be in the faith.* (2 Cor. xiii. 5.) He takes it not for granted that Christian professors must be true believers, but commands them all to *prove their own selves*; and drops a question, as a touchstone, to prove themselves by. A strange question it must seem to such as have not true faith, yet is a most important question, and the only one that distinguisheth true faith from counterfeit. The apostle does not ask the Corinthians whether they are sober, honest, charitable, church-going people, the present pigmy standard for a Christian soldier; but he asks a very searching question, even this, *Know ye not that Jesus Christ is in you?* And declares, if they knew it not, they must be *reprobates*, disapproved of God as hypocrites, notwithstanding all their decent carriage.

The meaning of St. Paul's question is plainly this, *Know ye not that the Spirit of Christ is in you?* For where Christ's Spirit is, there is he. The same kind of question is asked in the first epistle, *Know ye not, that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?* (1 Cor. iii. 16.)

Very right, Doctor, here we are agreed. All Christians, to be sure, must have the Spirit of Christ; and though we feel it not, but are utter strangers to its influence, we must be supposed to have it; because we are born in a Christian land, wear a Christian name, breathe a wholesome Christian air, have a pew in some Christian church, keep a merry Christmas every year, and bury upon Christian ground. Here is proof enough, Doctor.

Yes, Sir, proof enough that you live in a Christian land, but no proof that you are a Christian people. To suppose you have the Spirit's presence, and yet remain an utter stranger to its influence, is the topmost tower of enthusiasm, the soaring pinnacle on which its floating weathercock is fixed. So! this blessed guest comes to lurk in your bosom, like a spy in a camp; or like a thief in a cellar; and stealeth in, and stealeth out, without your notice: mighty fine! But you are not such a wild enthusiast in common life, as to suppose there is money in your pocket, when you feel none; or bank-notes in your drawer, when you find none. If you never feel any symptoms of patience, you cannot well suppose yourself possessed of any; and why should you dream of the Spirit's presence, when you never find any tokens of it?

The Spirit's influence must be felt, or it cannot profit; and the very offices of the Holy Spirit do suppose and warrant such a *feeling*. Let me mention some of them, which are these, *to quicken*, (John vi. 63. 2 Cor. iii. 6,) *to strengthen mightily*, (Eph. iii. 16,) *to witness our adoption*, (Rom. viii. 15, 16,) and *to bring heavenly joy*, (Acts ix. 31. 1 Thes. i. 6. Rom. xiv. 17.) Now, Sir, what avails that *quickening* which I cannot see! It

leaves me just as heartless to spiritual duty, as it found me. And *what* advantage does that *mighty strengthening* bring, which is not perceived by me? It yields no further power to subdue my lusts than I had before. And of what service is that *witness* in the court of conscience, who speaks in such a low or mumbling tone, that none can hear or understand him? I am just as well without his evidence as with it. And lastly, of what use or value is that *heavenly joy*, which I can have no taste of? All this is just the picture of Isaiah's hungry man, who *dreamt he was eating, but awoke and was empty*. (Isa. xxix. 8.)

But, Sir, St. Paul did not ask this idle question, "Do you *suppose* the Spirit of Christ is in you?" All the Church at Corinth, and all the churchmen in Great Britain, might have answered quick, "Yes, Mr. Paul, we do *suppose* it." But he asks a weighty question, "Do ye *know* it?" Have you real experience, or heart felt knowledge, that the Spirit of Christ is in you? Are you acquainted with his operation? Do you *know* it?

St. Paul may ask this question safely, because his name is canonised, and his bones are mouldered into dust; but if a living preacher ask the same question, the world cry out, enthusiasm! And yet St. Paul makes this very *knowledge* the evidence of true faith; and accounteth other faith, which produceth not this knowledge, to be counterfoit; and the men themselves to be reprobates.

Jesus saith to his disciples, *Ye know the Spirit, for he dwelleth with you*. (John xiv. 17.) His words carry this plain meaning, that where the Spirit dwells, he makes his presence *known* by his operations on the heart.

St. John tells the whole Christian church, *Hereby we know that Christ dwelleth in us, by his Spirit, which he hath given us*. (1 John iii. 24. iv. 13.) We *know* the Spirit of Christ dwelleth in us, and thereby are assured of our union with Christ. And, like as Paul had done before, he proposeth this knowledge as a touchstone to try your profession: *hereby we know that Christ dwelleth in us*.

Indeed, Doctor, I am a stranger to the Holy Spirit's influence, yet do not seem disposed to question my profession. Still I think my faith is sound, like any roach; and am sure there is no better in the parish. The vicar never questioned it; and why should you? It is not mighty civil. Besides, I am free of my beer, and have the good luck to be loved by every one: scarce a dog will bark at me. "As honest as the old grazier," is a common saying; and this alone is proof enough, that I must be a Christian.

Indeed, Sir, this alone is proof enough against your Christianity. *While you are of the world, the world will love you: but when you cease to be of the world, and are chosen out of the world, the world will hate you*. (John xv. 19.) It hated Jesus Christ, and will hate every true disciple.

Paul affirms peremptorily, *Yea, and all that will live godly in Christ Jesus, shall suffer persecution*. (2 Tim. iii. 12.) Live *where* you will, in a Christian or a heathen land; live *when* you will, in the present or a distant age, Paul affirms universally of real Christians, *Yea, they all shall suffer persecution*. If you lead what the world calls a godly life, you will have the world's commendation. You may be sober, and honest, and friendly; you may pray, and give alms; and fast too, if you please; and, while these things are doing by your own strength, and made a ground of acceptance with God, you are waxing *godly in yourself*, or from yourself, made godly by the world's spirit, and the world will applaud you. But if once you grow godly in *Christ Jesus*; renouncing all your wisdom strength and righteousness; and come to Jesus, as a lost sinner, seeking all supplies from him, resting all your hope upon him, making him your all in every thing, and counting all things utter dross in comparison of him then the world will hate you, and lift a heel against

you. A godly life in *Christ Jesus* thwarteth human pride, and staineth all its glory, which will not be suffered very patiently.

Men are apt to bless themselves in the world's esteem; and look upon it as a kindly token that the Lord accepts them. To rectify the judgment, and sweep away deceitful hopes, arising from the world's good name, Christ has dropt a *curse* upon it, saying, *Woe unto you, when all men shall speak well of you.* (Luke vi. 26.) This is one of the Lord's *Shibboleths*, (Judges xii. 6,) which he useth to alarm a decent professor, the world's favorite. It is a frightful ugly bridge upon the king's highway. An Israelite goes over safely, but no Edomite can pass it. Esau, the elder brother, will not travel here, but trudgeth down to a ferry, built by Mr. *Fairspeech*, to make a smoother passage over the river.

So much for the world's esteem: happy is the man who has lost it wholly and honestly. But your faith, Sir, must be canvassed a little more. You are a grazier, it seems; and when you buy a bullock at a fair, you do not take the salesman's word, but feel the beast yourself, and examine all its points minutely. Now, Sir, do the same by your faith; take it not on trust as recommended by your neighbor, but examine it, and handle all its points by the word of God. Faith is an active and a fruitful thing: its fruit is pleasant both to God and man. And the man, who does possess it, is a noble man indeed, an heir of God through Christ. But it behoves us to be wary, for counterfeit faith, like counterfeit gold, is very current.

Paul says, *Being justified by faith, we have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ,* (Rom. v. 1,) (*ἐιρήνην ἔχομεν*) *we have peace, or possess it; for what we have, we must possess.* Now this peace is given to assure the conscience, that God is at peace with us, that he is reconciled, and has forgiven all our trespasses. And whoever feels this peace, must be assured of the pardon of his sins: it is the witness of his pardon.

This blessed peace does not grow in nature's garden, nor can be digged out of mines of human merit. It was lost in Paradise, and is *only* found at Calvary. It is called the peace of God, because it is of God's bestowing, and bestowed through Jesus Christ *alone*.

Where this peace is bestowed, it is found to be as Paul describes it, *A peace passing all understanding.* (Phil. iv. 7.) A peace, so exquisitely rich, that none can understand what it is, until he feels it; and when he feels it, never can express it. Men may mistake this peace, before they taste it, as ten thousands do; and take up with an *human calm*, instead of it; but he who feels it, never can mistake it; for nothing else is like it; it passeth all understanding.

The Holy Spirit seals this peace upon the conscience, and thereby proclaims the pardon of sin, and *sheds abroad the love of God into the heart,* (Rom. v. 1—5,) and *beareth witness to our adoption.* (Rom. viii. 15, 16.)

This sealing of the Holy Spirit is given, as an *earnest of our future inheritance*; (Eph. i. 13, 14,) it is a heavenly pledge, dropt into the bosom, to assure us of our interest in Christ. Thus conscience is delivered from the fear of wrath, and *fear of death, which bringeth bondage*; (Heb. ii. 15,) the heart rejoices now in God, as a reconciled God; calls him *Father by the Spirit of adoption*; (Gal. iv. 5, 6,) delighteth in his blessed service, and feels the meaning of St. Peter's words, *Believing in Christ Jesus, ye rejoice with joy unspeakable, and full of glory.* (1 Pet. i. 8.)

These are weighty words; directed unto all believing churches, and experienced by them: but never were, and never will be felt by a mere human faith, springing from the human intellect. The faith, producing heavenly peace, and the peace produced, are both the gift of God.

By the help of this divine faith, the happy Christian now repeats his church hymns with truth and pleasure, "My soul doth magnify the Lord, and my spirit hath *rejoiced* in God, my Saviour." Or with old Simeon,

"Let thy servant depart in peace, O Lord, for mine eyes have *seen* thy salvation."

Now, Sir, hear what your own peace is. You feel no distress of mind, but are mighty easy; and your calm which is a *dead calm*, ariseth from your character, though a sinful character at best. Your peace brings no heavenly joy, and so comes not from heaven; neither does it flow *entirely* through the golden conduit of the Saviour's merit, but drippeth from a rotten wooden pipe off your own duties. You are, it seems, a cheerful harmless creature, like a robin-red-breast, who is much respected every where; and you frequent the church, as many a pious mouse will, yet does not like her quarters: prayer-books are dry champing; a pantry suits her better. And you see many, who are worse than yourself abundantly, which makes you hope your state is good; and while outward things go smooth, your *calm* continues. But when calamities come on, and thicken as they come, your peace is gone: it cannot stand a tempest. And when your soul is hovering on a sick bed for its flight, it will either feel a *dead security*, or take a *frightful leap* into another world. Unless you are supported by divine faith you cannot sing the Christian's dying song, *O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?*

(To be continued.)

ART. V. *The Associate Reformed Synod of the North.*

To the Editor of the Religious Monitor:

DEAR SIR—Through the attention of a friend, I have received the Christian Magazine, for January, 1836, containing some notice of a remark respecting the Associate Reformed Church, which I conceived it my duty to make on taking leave of the patrons of the Religious Monitor. Now, although I cannot consent to have any intercourse, nor controversy with the editor of the Christian Magazine, personally considered, so long as he continues to occupy the same relation towards myself which he has chosen to assume for a year past; yet, as that Magazine is the organ of the Associate Reformed Synod of the North, there seems to be a necessity for noticing its course that we may know the true relation which that church sustains in respect to our own. Such a knowledge is necessary that we may not be found, on the one hand, condemning what is praiseworthy, nor on the other, giving countenance to that which is sinful. Should you be of the same mind, the following remarks are at your disposal.*

C. W.

Cannonsburgh, February 12, 1836.

That the reader may have the question fairly before him it is deemed advisable to quote the article entire from the Christian Magazine.

"THE RELIGIOUS MONITOR.

"By the December number of this work, the first with which we have been favored for some months, although we have regularly sent the editor our Magazine, we perceive that it has passed into new hands. We trust it will be improved by the change. Mr. Webster, in taking leave of his patrons, gives the Associate Reformed church, 'the last shot in his locker,' or his 'last kick at the English.'

"In this connexion, it should be noticed that the Secession cause appears at present to be more exposed to its enemies by the trimming course of our Associate Reformed brethren, than from any other cause. Professing to adhere to Secession principles, while in practice she denies those principles; maintaining a constitution separate from the General Assembly, while holding occasional communion with that church; and enjoined

"We cannot well object to the insertion of Mr. W's Remarks; believing as we do that great injustice was done him by the editor of the Ch. Mag: in the notice referred to.—[Ed. REL. MON.]

ing upon her own people the use of an inspired psalmody, while her ministers are constantly in the habit of singing psalms of human composure, whenever they have an opportunity of conducting the public worship in those congregations where a human psalmody is habitually used; they ought not, and cannot rightly be regarded in any other light than that of a backsliding church. And these facts cause the proposition recently made by the Associate Reformed Synod for a new version of the Psalms, to look exceedingly suspicious. That proposal comes from the wrong quarter. Of course no allusion is here made to individuals. That church is here spoken of as a public body, professing to be a witness for Jesus Christ. And in that respect let Seceders beware of her pernicious influence, remembering that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump.

“This is a mixture of peevishness and mistakes. The Associate Reformed church does not deny Secession principles. We hope there are few of our brethren in the Associate church, who concur in Mr. Webster's doctrine that Secession principles consist in nothing but singing David's Psalms, and holding close communion. The statement, that we propose a new version of the Psalms, to the exclusion of those now in use, is altogether disingenuous. It is at least four times stated in the Preamble to the Resolutions of our Synod on this subject, that no such thing is desired or intended. The attachment of the Associate Reformed church to a scriptural psalmody is unshaken, Mr. Webster's judgment and sentence to the contrary notwithstanding.”

In order to set this matter in a clear light, it may be proper to analyze and confirm the statement of the Monitor which the Magazine calls “a mixture of peevishness and mistakes;” and then advert a little to the objections, or assertions of the Magazine against that statement.

But before we proceed further, let it be understood that the following remarks are intended to apply particularly to the Associate Reformed Synod of the North. As there are three separate and independent Associate Reformed Synods; and as our information respecting those of the South and West is limited, so, it is necessary that they be excepted, in this article.

The matter being thus fairly before us, we may observe, that the statement of the monitor is in substance as follows, viz: That the Associate Reformed Synod of the North, is distinctly charged with a professed “adherence to Secession principles, while in practice she denies those principles;” especially on the Article of Psalmody. And the inferences drawn from this fact are, that she ought not, and cannot rightly be regarded in any other light than that of a backsliding church; that this fact causes her proposition for a new version of the Psalms to look exceedingly suspicious; and that Seceders should beware of her pernicious influence as a public witnessing body for Jesus Christ.

Now in support of the first part of the proposition, viz: that the Associate Reformed Church professes to adhere to Secession principles, on the article of Psalmody, we offer the following proofs, viz:

1. Her public standards; “It is the will of God that the sacred songs contained in the Book of Psalms, be sung in his worship, both public and private, to the end of the world.”* It is true they afterwards throw a mist over this clear and explicit statement, by adding—“nor shall any compositures *merely* human, be sung in any of the Associate Reformed Churches.” The insertion of the word *merely* justly exposes them to the charge of insincerity; because it may with truth be said by the advocates of a human Psalmody, (Watt's for instance,) that they are not *merely* human. But the first quoted sentence has no ambiguity.† Besides we have,

2dly. The authority of the Christian magazine in support of our proposition: “The Associate Reformed Church does not deny Secession principles.” It is true, the editor does not add on the article of Psalmody;

* Constitution of the Associate Reformed Church, p. 410, Pittsburgh edit. 1832.

† The writer is mistaken in this statement. For the sentence referred to is highly ambiguous. There are thousands who believe “that it is the will of God that the sacred songs contained in the Book of Psalms be sung in his worship,” who also believe and profess that mere human compositures may in like manner be used in the worship of God. Had the word *exclusively* been used to qualify the proposition it would have rendered it unambiguous. The United Secession Church in Scotland on the subject of Psalmody express themselves, in their Testimony, as it is called, precisely in the same manner as the Associate Reformed Church has done; and honest Seceders there have not failed to charge them with a designed ambiguity of expression.—[ED. REL. MOR.]

but if the sentence have any meaning, that must be it; for Psalmody is the subject in dispute.

Again, the number before us has a sensible and judicious article (page 29) going to show that *the use of human systems of praise* is one cause of division in the visible church, particularly deplorable, which it is believed could be profitably transferred to the pages of the Monitor. It will show conclusively that the Associate Synod of the North still professes adherence to Secession principles on the Article of Psalmody. We have been thus particular for the special benefit of such as are in the habit of regarding a consistent and practical adherence to religious principle as nothing more than "a mixture of peevishness and mistakes."

In proof of the second branch of our proposition, viz: that the Associate Reformed Church denies Secession principles in practice on the Article of Psalmody; we call the attention of the reader to the well known fact that her best ministers are in the habit of preaching occasionally in pulpits belonging to other denominations, where a human Psalmody alone is used. This practice has long existed. But she has not as a church lifted her finger against it. To prevent all quibbling on this point, though it is painful to do so, we must notice some particular instances. To say nothing of the long continued practice of the Rev. Alex. Proudfit, D.D. on this point, we state distinctly that during the last summer, the Rev. Wm. McAuley, of Kortright, one of the most venerable ministers in that church, preached in the 3d Dutch Church in the city of Albany, where human compositions were sung on the occasion. And we ask the editor of the Christian Magazine, how long it is since he preached for a minister of the General Assembly in the village of Johnstown, where a human system of praise was used on the occasion? and yet he goes home and seriously tells the readers of his Magazine, that one cause of division, particularly deplorable, in the visible church, *is the use of human systems of praise*, as if it were really a matter of conscience with him! Did we not do well to warn Seceders to beware of the pernicious influence of the Associate Reformed Church? "Thou that teachest another, teachest thou not thyself? thou that preachest a man should not steal, dost thou steal? thou that makest thy boast of the law, through breaking the law dishonorest thou God? For the name of God is blasphemed among the Gentiles through you."

There are many sensible laymen in the Associate Reformed Church, with some of whom we have an acquaintance, who are justly esteemed for their personal worth and christian deportment; but if they had not lost in a great measure the zeal and spirit of their reforming ancestors, they would never support a ministry who act with such inconsistency. How is this, brethren? You have solemnly professed to the world that "it is the WILL OF GOD, that the sacred songs contained in the Book of Psalms, be sung in his worship both public and private to the end of the world;" and your ministers enjoin this upon *you*, while *they* exercise the privilege of disregarding the will of God in this matter whenever it suits their pleasure or convenience. We say how is this? If your profession be good, will you permit those who are bound to maintain it to disregard it at pleasure? If bad, why is it solemnly made in the presence of God and men? Why not expunge it from your Constitution, and let both the friends and foes of a Covenanted Reformation know where to find you? "If the Lord be God follow him; but if Baal, then follow him."

In whatever light we view this policy in our Associate Reformed brethren, it is deplorable. It is so in respect to themselves. That servant who knew his master's will and did it not was beaten with many stripes: yet they profess to know his will, but do it not. They see the current of public opinion like an overflowing flood setting against an institution of God's own appointment, yet instead of coming up to the help of the Lord

against the mighty; they seek the company and the friendship of the enemy, and give them countenance and encouragement, while they are seeking to rob God of that honor which is his due. But they not only rob God, they rob his people also of that consolation which is found in the sacred and precious songs of his own inditing. "When thou sawest a thief, then thou consentedst with him."

But this conduct of our Associate Reformed brethren has a most pernicious influence upon others. First, upon those denominations who are in the habit of using human composites. They see that it is not a matter of conscience with those who make such loud professions; and that they would discard an inspired Psalmody altogether were it not for the fear of offending a few superstitious old men, who are "behind the intelligence of the age." Secondly, their influence is most pernicious on our own people; many reason with themselves, that the Associate Reformed are so near us that we should unite with them; or at least we may do so when it is convenient. They sing a scripture Psalmody! And on the same principle, when in that church, they might unite with the General Assembly, saying, our ministers also sing Watts or Dwight occasionally! And so the stone might roll, till this precious treasure shall be numbered among the things that were; or known only to some literary antiquarian. Let the church be once wholly divested of this treasure; and there will be another pillar of the Reformation gone.

These things are not mistakes, neither are they said in peevishness, but with unfeigned grief. They cannot but be a source of lamentation to any man who has his eyes open to see the true state of things among us. The Man of sin straining every nerve to extend his dominion over this fair inheritance of our fathers; infidelity flourishing apace both in church and state, and joining hands with Popery for the accomplishment of their nefarious plot. And while this work is progressing out of the church, a far more dangerous work of devastation is going on within. One bulwark after another of the Reformation is demolished, and even many of those who solemnly profess to maintain Reformation principles, deny them in practice.

Again: It is no pleasing task to point out the sins of men. It is the most certain road to reproach and contempt, especially in a time of general defection. Yet the christian who shrinks from the discharge of this painful duty, when a fit opportunity presents itself, does so at his peril. And the keenness of the opposition which he is called to encounter in such circumstances will be graduated by the professions of those whose delinquencies are exposed. The higher their pretensions the sharper will they whet their tongues. "Thus saying thou reproachest us also," said the pharisees to the Saviour. Neither Satan nor the world care what christians profess, provided they do not reduce their professions to practice. But when christians are found faithful in any good degree, the scene changes. All the difficulty that ever occurred in the world respecting religion, turned on this very point. It was for bearing witness against the perfidiousness of God's ancient covenant people, that prophets and holy men were stoned, and sawn asunder; were tempted and slain with the sword. It was for the same offence that the Lord of glory was crucified. It was the same offence that converted most of the nations of Europe into a field of blood, at and subsequent to the period of the Reformation.

The church has made a confederacy with the world; she has settled down under a dishonorable peace with her natural and necessary enemy. And this is the true secret of her outward peace; while she continues to evince so many marks of inward and spiritual decay. She looks to Egypt and Assyria for help; but this friendship with the world is enmity against God. And this enmity exhibits itself by a *growing indifference* to those peculiarities of christianity which are most offensive to the taste of the

polite, the gay, the fashionable, and the worldly minded; and by a *bitter and persecuting spirit* towards such as would warn them of their danger, that they may escape those terrible judgments which must sooner or later come with unerring certainty upon ever branch of the visible church, that persists in a course of begun defection. That defection from truth which has been once attained and professed, involves the highest degree of guilt of which the church is capable, and exposes her to the most tremendous judgments. This is a truth graven on every page of the sacred writings in characters durable as the hand that formed them; sealed in the blood of martyrs, and confirmed by the history of the world. The Jewish nation from the commencement of its national existence to the coming of Christ, constituted the visible church of God—the only true church. She was also a most accurate type of the New Testament church, and we find this to have been her constant, her most besetting sin, with few exceptions, throughout the whole period of her history. They murmured against God, they forsook him; they rejected him; they refused to put their trust in him; they continually provoked him to wrath. This was the sin for which their carcasses fell in the wilderness; for which their nobles were slain, their temple destroyed, and themselves made captives seventy years under the cruel oppression of the fierce Chaldeans; and for which they were at last as a nation and church totally destroyed, by the infliction of judgments, the bare recital of which is enough to cause the flesh to crawl, and the ear to tingle. And in all this God vindicates himself: “What iniquity have your fathers found in me, that they are gone far from me, and have walked after vanity, and have become vain?” (Jer. ii. 5.)

But nine-tenths of professors in our day will start up at all that we have said, and cry shame, bigotry, censoriousness, peevishness, want of charity towards others. Now all this is the syren song of Satan. It is a point which he guards with most sedulous care; for he well knows that if he can get professors to suffer sin upon one another without lifting the warning voice, he will soon have the most of them to grace his retinue. People must learn to distinguish between a *true* and a *pure* church; between the *being* and *well-being* of a church. And they must not cease to warn their professing brethren of the dangers to which they are exposed, and sedulously guard them against the least inroads of defection. The Jewish nation was always the *true* church till God destroyed her for her defections. Yet read the denunciations of the prophets against her for her backslidings, and learn not to be led astray by the example of any man, or body of men, who profess Christ, while they deny him in a single iota of doctrine or practice. In a time of defection, such for instance as prevails in our day, then is the “hour of temptation that cometh on the world to try them that dwell upon the earth.” (Rev. iii. 10.) In such a time the whole christian world may cry peace, peace, and prate of their own glorious doings; and were it possible they would deceive the very elect. (Matt. xxiv. 24.) The teachers of heresy in such a time, are far more numerous, than the faithful witnesses of Jesus Christ. They are “many.” (Matt. xxiv. 11.) At such a time people are perfectly willing to suffer sin upon a brother. Any attempt to correct his error would offend him; and we must have peace; and besides their own hands not being altogether clean, their neighbor might retort upon them; “Physician heal thyself.” So they go on corrupt and corrupting one another. Men hear of the threatened evil, but care for none of these things. They have no concern in the matter; they look on such as would impress their minds with the coming danger as dyspeptics, troubled with groundless suspicions and fears.

But it is not merely *indifference* that prevails and sheds its blasting and mildew over the prosperity of the church. This defection is ever

accompanied with a bitter and persecuting spirit. "Then shall many be offended, and shall betray one another, and shall hate one another." *Shall betray one another.* This is not a persecution from outward enemies, but from secret foes, who have crept into the sacred enclosure. The church never loses either truth or holiness by the persecutions of avowed enemies; but she suffers loss of both by wolves in sheep's clothing. Who have been the most unrelenting persecutors? Surely they that slew the prophets. And they were professors. It is probable that half the persecutions which Christians suffered under the emperors of Rome, was instigated by the Arians and other heretics. We need not point to Popery. And who are the persecutors in our day? They are false professors who have publicly professed a creed which they do not believe, or will not practice. Read the outrageous slanders and violent proceedings of the New School men in the General Assembly against their own church.

Lest some humble christian should be too much dejected in mind by a consideration of the low state of the church, that we have here represented it to be in, at this time, it is proper to observe that in all this confusion and falling away of professors, the true believer has nothing to fear. "The Lord knoweth them that are his." Those who forsake the truth, no matter what may have been their professions, never saw its true glory and importance, or felt its saving power. "They went out from us that they might be made manifest, that they were not all of us." Besides God will in his own set time arise and have mercy upon Zion; and that time may be nearer than many suppose. His promise is that "at evening time it shall be light." But it should be remembered that when he brings deliverance to his church it will be in the way of leading her into all truth. She will then go forth by the footsteps of the flock; she will enquire diligently for the old paths and the good way. Then shall the saints take pleasure in the stones, and favor the dust of Zion. (Ps. cii. 14.) They will no longer esteem any revealed truth a small matter. They will not deny their profession by a contrary practice.

It was proposed to answer the objections of the *Christian Magazine*, but this article is growing to an unreasonable length, and besides it would be an insult to the understanding of the reader to offer any reply to such objections, did not experience teach us that multitudes seem willing to take any thing in the form of religion however puerile or even ridiculous it may be; therefore we shall be very brief.

1. "The Associate Reformed Church does not deny Secession principles." This is precisely what we had asserted; so far from denying them, she *professes* but does not *practice* them.

2. "We hope there are few of our brethren in the Associate Church, who concur in Mr. Webster's doctrine, that Secession principles consist in nothing but singing David's Psalms, and holding close communion." We hardly know which most to admire the folly or presumption of this statement. Let the reader cast his eye back to the extract in which Mr. McLaren finds this doctrine, and see if he can find any such thing in it. If his readers really believe him, they are certainly to be pitied. And I can see no reason why such a statement is made unless Mr. McL. goes on the supposition that we are not under obligation to keep the whole law. "He that keepeth the whole law," says divine inspiration, "and yet offendeth in one point is guilty of all." Singing an inspired Psalmody is a part of the law; and consequently a part of Secession principles; therefore he who sings human composes is guilty of all, and has, "in practice" denied Secession principles. I hope the reader will understand this reasoning; but I have no hope that I shall be able to make myself understood by the editor of the *Christian Magazine*.

The reader is requested to turn back to the head of this article and read

the next two sentences, and then examine the extract from which they purport to be taken, and see how much resemblance they bear to each other. Indeed I could not have supposed it possible to crowd so many perversions and misrepresentations within the compass of eight or ten lines, as are here contained, had I not seen things of the same kind before, from the same quarter.

3. "The attachment of the Associate Reformed Church to a Scriptural Psalmody is unshaken, Mr. Webster's *judgment and sentence* to the contrary notwithstanding." We have no doubt, that her *attachment* is just as *unshaken* as ever it was. She never would, and will not now depart from a Scriptural Psalmody, only when her ministers have a desire to show their skill and orthodoxy to some of those congregations where a human Psalmody is used.

As to the last part of the sentence, I suppose we are to take that for one of his "little veins of satire," of which he is so fond, and of which he sometimes gives us information, lest we should carelessly overlook them, and lose their beauty.

ART. VI. *Miscellaneous Items.*

OBERLIN INSTITUTE.—A writer in the Salem (Mass.) Landmark, gives the following information respecting the Oberlin Institute, located in Lorain County, Ohio, in which Rev. C. G. Finney, who has obtained so much renown for his *New Light, New Measures and Fanaticism*, is Professor of Theology.

"The President of the Oberlin Institute, Rev. Asa Mahan, had but just entered upon the duties of his office, when he publicly ridiculed and stigmatized the study of the classics. He admitted the necessity of studying the Greek language, in order that the scholar might read the New Testament in the original. Such was the effect of his denunciation, that a *general bonfire* of Latin books was made by the students. The Professor of Languages, Rev. Mr. Waldo, finding it impossible to acquiesce in the views of the President, and of the Trustees who sustained the President, resigned his office. A letter from him, containing a comprehensive view of the case, now lies before me. It bears date, Oberlin, Aug. 5, 1835.

A recent catalogue of the Institute gives the course of study. From this, it appears, that a miserable pittance of Greek, Latin, and Hebrew, constitute the requisition of languages. In regard to the other features of the course of study, I will only say, that no genuine New England scholar will be found, who would anticipate any very splendid results from the prescribed plan of education at Oberlin.

I had known of schools and academies in which both sexes have been taught; but I never before knew the like of what is a material part of the system of this Institute. The catalogue for 1835, has the names of 203 males, and 73 females. Of these last it is said—"They board at the public table, and perform the labor of the Steward's Department, together with washing, ironing, and much of the sewing for the students." "They attend recitations with the young gentlemen in all the departments."

Think now of this picture, from the published catalogue of this Institute! *Males and females all take their meals at the same tables in a Common Hall; and all attend recitations together in all the departments!*

I have been informed by those who know whereof they affirm, that changes are made from time to time in the order of sitting at table, so that the advantages of this intermixing of the sexes may be secured to all alike. An eye-witness assures me of the fact; which has also been reported in my hearing by men of the highest character for credibility.

It is true that the catalogue says of the young ladies, "Their rooms are entirely separate from those of the other sex, and no calls or visits in their respective apartments are at all permitted."

I waive any further particulars. Much more I could state as matters of fact and subject of serious consideration. But I cannot refrain from adding, that all or nearly all the favorite views of our wisest and best men, from the landing at Plymouth to the present moment, have been treated contemptuously at Oberlin. I speak advisedly. Our general system of education, our manner of religious instruction and influence, in

fact, every thing in our institutions of learning and theology in which we have been accustomed to repose confidence, as a means of substantial and permanent good, has been repeatedly subjected to the severest invective and ridicule by members of the present Faculty of the Oberlin Institute."

DOCTRINES OF THE CHURCH OF ROME.—There has been much enquiry of late as to what are the doctrines of the church of Rome, in reference to the duty of confessors in the case of flagrant crimes coming to their knowledge. The following quotations from Dens' Theology, state the theory, and the infamous conduct of a priest at Cork, when summoned as a witness upon a trial for murder, which will be fresh within the memory of our readers, and will illustrate the practice. Truly Dens has not been circulated in vain.

Q. Can a case be given in which it is lawful to break the sacramental seal? **A.** It cannot be given, although on it should depend the life or safety of men, or even the destruction of the State, &c.—**Q.** What then, ought a confessor to reply when interrogated concerning truth which he knows, from sacramental confession alone? **A.** He ought to reply that he does not know it; and if necessary should confirm the same with an oath.—**Objection:** In no case is it lawful to tell a lie; but that confessor would tell a lie, because he does know the truth. **Answer:** I deny the minor; because such confessor is interrogated as man; now he does not know that truth as man, although he may know it as God; so says S. H. q. c1, art. 1, ad. 3, &c.—**Q.** What if it be directly asked of the confessor whether he knows it from sacramental confession? **A.** In this case he ought to answer nothing (so Stey. cum Sylvio) but the question is to be rejected as impious; or he might even say absolutely, not relatively, to the proposer of the question—"I know nothing about it," because the word 'I,' restrains it to human knowledge."

We spend not a syllable of indignation upon these demoralizing, and worse than Pagan doctrines. Only let the reader remember that they are the avowed code of the Papal priesthood.

It is amongst the strange anomalies of the human mind, that the gross superstitions of Popery do not convince all persons of common intelligence within its pale of its absurdity; unless, indeed, we suppose that they are convinced already, and that they confirm to its rites merely for secular convenience just as Mr. O'Connell went down upon his knees in the streets, to flatter the delusions of the blind multitude, in order to secure votes at the hustings. Can any thing be more monstrously absurd in the superstitions of a Hottentot or New Zealander, than making the Virgin Mary a Field-marshal? Yet what Papists would venture to question the sobriety of the following recent proclamation:—"Army of the King, Don Carlos V.—Royal Decree.—The most holy Virgin de los Dolores having been declared by me Generalissimo of my troops, it became my duty, from motives of veneration and piety, to distinguish with the title of Generalissimo the Royal standard, which bears for its device this august image; and in consequence I ordain that this august and royal standard be not lowered before any person, not even before me; and that the same honors and salutes be rendered to it as to the holy Sacrament. Given at Estella, this 2d August, 1835.

"I, the King."

London Chris. Obsv.

ART. VII. Notices.

TO THE READER.—In the extract from "The Christian World Unmasked," there is a passage which seems to favor the opinion that CHRIST is only offered to *sensible sinners* and that none others have a right to accept of him. This opinion has been long since justly discarded by the generality of Calvinistic divines. It is a precious truth, that a free and full offer of salvation is made to mankind *indiscriminately* wherever the gospel comes; and that co-extensive with the offer is the warrant to embrace it. "Hearken unto me, ye stout-hearted, that are far from righteousness; I bring near my righteousness; it shall not be far off, and my salvation shall not tarry." "Who-soever will, let him come and take the water of life freely."

TO CORRESPONDENTS.—The communication signed, "A Seceder," though containing some excellent thoughts and suggestions, is judged unfit for insertion in its present shape. When this correspondent shall send us his proposed "Plan for the improvement of the West," together with his name, it will receive due consideration, and if thought to be of sufficient importance, it will find a place in the Monitor.

THE
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,

AND

EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

APRIL, 1836.

ART. I. *Remarks in relation to the Baptized Youth of the Church.*

[Being the substance of a Report made by Presbyterian appointment.]

It is a fact of very frequent occurrence in our times, that persons who have been baptized and brought up under gospel ordinances make no distinct public profession of religion. Many are wilfully ignorant of the distinguishing principles of the church to which they belong. Others, who have been painfully instructed, and cannot be classed with the ignorant, do not feel sufficient interest in the matter to come to any decision, whether those principles are true or false. They have other things in their eye, to which practically at least they attach higher importance.

The fear of becoming unfashionable hinders some. Others are entangled by legal principles and erroneous views. And not a few who are truly convinced in their hearts of their duty, regard the restraints of a holy life with dread; they are loath to part with their favorite sins,—they fight against their own convictions and at length overcome them.

From these and similar causes, a great many baptized persons in several denominations make no public profession. This is a prevailing sin in our day. And it is one that deeply affects the interests of the visible church. It is with her as with all other communities—in ordinary circumstances her increase and continuance must be by the accession of those who are brought up within her. And if these accessions do not take place congregations must first dwindle, and then after struggling for a while, unsuccessfully against the growing evil, become extinct. In their place a generation will likely succeed, who may be emphatically said “to know not the Lord, nor the mighty works which he hath done;” brought up under the external light of the gospel, yet constantly opposing the convictions of its truth and authority, they must eventually be “past feeling.”

These things are of fearful import and ought deeply to affect the friends of Zion. If barrenness was regarded under the law as a curse, how much more this which is spiritual. It indicates the departure of the Holy Spirit, whose teaching and remonstrances have been rejected, and unequivocally threatens particular churches with extinction. “The ground that has been often rained on and bringeth forth nothing but briars and thorns is nigh unto cursing, whose end is to be burned.”

But while we lament and complain of this growing and portentous evil, it ought to be enquired, whether we and our fathers are not in some respect

and degree its guilty *cause*, and whether it is not our own ways that are correcting us. Have we done our duty? The means and opportunities of instruction are improved, and increased to us, above what they have been in any preceding period of time. Have we availed ourselves of them, in training up the youth? God still keeps covenant and mercy for them that fear him. His promises remain true. His word stands firm. "If a child is trained up in the way that he should go, he will not depart from it when he is old," and, "the hand of the diligent maketh rich." He, therefore, is clear and just in this matter: Ours is the blame.

I would enquire *First*, have parents and guardians done *their* duty? "The promise is to you and to your children." When we take hold by faith of any special promise, God will certainly fulfil it, (reserving the time and manner in his sovereign hand.) Have you sincerely and earnestly taken hold of the promise just mentioned? (Acts ii. 39.) To you it is entrusted to lay the foundation and make the first impressions on the young mind. If this part is ill done, or not done at all, it is impossible for the utmost diligence of others to make up the loss of it. Have you applied yourself to this duty with constant prayer, and persevering diligence? Do you make good and earnest endeavors to co-operate with ministers and elders to enlighten the mind and impress the hearts of the children? If you do this in theory, or by doctrinal instruction only—if your example be cold and indifferent as respects spiritual things and all life and zeal about worldly matters—all endeavors will be unavailing. *This* I apprehend is one cause why so many persons baptized make no public profession—the worse than heartless example of professors generally.

When children see parents and other professors to be very serious and devout on the sabbath, but on every other occasion devoted to the world—eager to get gain and grow rich—full of conversation and care about it, we may preach and teach what we please, they will draw their own conclusions: and probably this, that they are as good as those who profess religion: nor ought it to be any matter of wonder.

Second, Let me ask the Ruling Elder to see that he has done what appertains to him, in this matter. To the eldership in a particular congregation is committed the exercise of government and the administration of discipline. It may be a question with some, whether the discipline of the church ought to be applied to the case of baptized persons neglecting to make a public profession of religion? And for the sake of clearness, I would divide this into two questions, and give a brief answer to each of them. *First*, Has a session jurisdiction in the case? *Second*, Would it be for the edification of the body in present circumstances, to put the discipline in full force in such a case? To the first, I answer in the affirmative. There may be no express command for it, but if it can be proved by good and necessary inference, it ought to be esteemed sufficient. It is said of Abraham—"For I know him, that he will command his children and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord to do justice and judgment." (Gen. xviii. 19.) It will be admitted that his household was the church at that time. All in it were subject to his command. The end of his command was that the way of the Lord, or all instituted worship might be kept up. From which it is not difficult to infer that if they had neglected to do so, their conduct would have been deemed censurable. For a command that may be transgressed with impunity is void. Parents are solemnly bound to "teach their children diligently these things," (Deut. vi. 6,) meaning all the statutes, commandments, and judgments. Whence it may be inferred that children, when they come to understanding are *as much* bound to put "these things in practice," and failing to do so are censurable. "Three times in the year all thy males shall appear before the Lord thy God," (Exod. xiii. 15,) viz: at the feast of the Passover and unleavened bread, at the feast of the

first fruits, and at the feast of ingathering. If any male stayed behind, who was capable of attending, he was surely guilty of disobeying a divine command, and therefore censurable. And although it would not be easy to determine in all cases, who *could* go, yet we find the blessed saviour going with his parents at the very early age of 12 years. (Luke ii. 42.)

From this it may be inferred that as soon as a baptized person is capable, with understanding, of keeping our New Testament Passover, the Lord's Supper, it is his duty; and if it is his duty the neglect of it must bring him liable to the discipline of the church. Christ claims "little children" as belonging to the gospel kingdom, and therefore they must be entitled to its privileges, and subject to its laws; they must be bound to confess him before men, and to obey his dying command as soon as they have knowledge sufficient. The ordinance of baptism itself implies the same thing. It implies "our engrafting into Christ and partaking of the benefits of the covenant of grace and our *engagement to be the Lord's,*" surely that is an engagement to own and confess him publicly as our Lord, and to obey his commands, and observe his ordinances as soon as we are capable of doing so, or it is nothing at all. Our Book of Discipline makes no discrimination between baptized persons and others. It says, (page 42,) "All baptized persons being members of the church, as well as communicants, are under her care and subject to her government and discipline." And in my view it is in this particular fully sustained by the forecited scriptures. To me then the jurisdiction of a session, in the case of a person who has been baptized, neglecting to make a public profession, when he is in circumstances to do it, is clear. This much in answer to the first question. But it is not so easy to give a clear and sufficient answer to the *Second*, viz: Whether or not it be for edification in present circumstances?

But that I may attempt it, I would observe, that there are sundry difficulties in the way of immediately and directly censuring *every* baptized person who does not make a public profession.

When this shall be tabled as a charge against a man, it would require to be in evidence that he possessed the requisite qualifications—the knowledge—the deportment—and some measure of conviction that he would be a welcome guest at the Lord's Table. If he has no degree of this conviction, he is doubtless in a fault some where, but not surely for standing back while his mind continues in that state. And without participating in that ordinance a profession is incomplete. Sometimes the deportment of such persons is so plainly scandalous that there would be little or no difficulty in putting it in proof, and then if a session have access to deal with them, they are in duty bound to censure the scandalous conduct. But sometimes their deportment is of an indistinct anomalous character, which is far from satisfactory, and yet is extremely difficult, or rather impossible, to proceed judicially against one part of it more than another; or it is so ambiguous or fortified by specious pretences, that there is no way of coming at a proof. If a person is ignorant he may be censurable for neglecting the means of instruction, but not for standing back from the Lord's table, from which the officers of the church are in faithfulness bound to shut him out. Hence it appears that the proper effect of discipline, if applied at all to persons in these circumstances, would be to *bar them from making a public profession*, and when it happens, as it often does, that they have themselves no desire or purpose of such a thing, to enter process and judicially declare this, would appear to me perfectly nugatory,

If it could be proved that a person possessed all the requisite qualifications in an ordinary measure, it would be right, abstractly considered, for a session to censure him for not making a profession; but then *a want of*

access to deal with such, would often be found as a difficulty in their way. This particular application of discipline has been so long out of use, that very few know that this class of persons are subject to it all. The most part of baptized youth think that a session have nothing to do with them, until they are pleased of themselves to apply for admission into full communion. And some parents even are found entertaining the opinion, (although very erroneously,) that their children ought to be let alone to form their own religious creed, and that it is some sort of infringement on their natural rights to endeavor to bias them in favor of their own profession, although it is acknowledged to be according to truth, and although this very thing was in the vow which they made at baptism. Such parents it is to be feared, until they be better instructed, would oppose the application of discipline to their sons and daughters.

And this is not all. Many of the youth are so regardless, profane, or wicked, that it would be casting pearls before swine, and exposing the ordinance to ridicule and contempt to attempt to apply discipline to them. And it is much to be suspected that the number of those who would submit to this remedy would be small indeed.

But again, supposing that the majority would submit, a session would find it extremely difficult to preserve any reasonable appearance of *impartiality*. I suppose it will be conceded, that it would be fairly impracticable to bring up *every one*, but to pass over some and take hold upon others would not be capable of easy explanation, and particularly to those immediately concerned. Moreover it would be impracticable to be uniform as to *the time* of calling such persons to account. Some attain to a competent measure of knowledge at an early period, and others not till farther advanced, consequently there must be a corresponding difference of the times at which they would become censurable. But why one should be censured at the age of eighteen and another not perhaps till thirty, could not be satisfactorily explained. Upon the whole it does not appear that it would be at present for edification to libel baptized persons for not making a public profession.

What then? Does the eldership stand clear in this matter? Have they done all belonging to their office that is practicable towards remedying this evil and preventing its recurrence? Before an answer is given, I would ask them to consider whether all the duties of their office be of a judicial character? Have they nothing to do, but what they do as a Court? This has been so long a time nearly the amount of what they do, that I fear some will think there is *nothing else* appertaining to them. But are they not called "Bishops," (Phil. i. 1,) and "overseers," (Acts xx. 28,) which is the same original word *ἐπισκοπος*, and does not Paul connect with this character the duties of a shepherd, viz: "to feed the church of God," and Peter (1 epistle v. 2,) enjoin the same upon them—"Feed the flock of God which is among you?" If they are to feed the flock, the lambs cannot be neglected without a cruel criminality. In order to feed, they must be *among* them and visit them particularly.

When children have finished with school, there is generally need for some pains to be used to keep their desire for knowledge upon edge and to give it proper direction. In better times the elder of the quarter did this. He made his acquaintance with them, he gained their confidence, he provided them with, or directed them to suitable books, he was ready at the very nick of time with a friendly but weighty admonition or advice. Would not this course agree with the work of an "overseer?" It would certainly give him abundant access in his individual capacity, to deal with the mind and conscience of the youth on the matter of a public profession, as the case might require, and put him in a situation to "strengthen the diseased—to heal that which is sick—to bind up that which is broken—to bring back that which is driven away—to seek that which is lost—and to

feed that which standeth still." These things certainly appertain to the elder as a part of his official duty. And if they are neglected, I see not how he can clear himself.

Nothing which he can do as a member of the court can compensate a congregation for the neglect of them. Nay more; his judicial duties are by such neglect rendered less acceptable, and far less effectual, and it has almost come to this, that the people have nearly the same emotion whether it be an elder or a constable that approaches their dwelling—their object is so much alike.

Third, Let me ask the minister of the gospel whether he has done *his part*, to train up the Baptized to make a public profession? Does this subject have its proportion of frequency in the pulpit? Have the people sufficient light upon it? It would appear to me that they have not. That the baptized are proper subjects of discipline, is simply stated in our Book of Discipline and not in our testimony at all. And I presume that there are many of the people who do not know that this book is any part of our public profession, and that many more do not know that such a book exists. The minister, on this account, ought to be more frequent and painfully pointed in his public instructions. Are the vows of baptism sufficiently explained? Does he catechise the young sufficiently on this subject? Are they personally dealt with in family visitation as opportunity is afforded?

I would respectfully suggest, for the consideration of the ministry collectively, whether some means could not be devised to check this growing evil and ultimately to remove it.

Little indeed is to be expected from means, where indifference, impiety or atheism prevails; but the use of appointed means is our duty, the result of them belongs to God. I consider, that *ignorance* of the scriptures and of divine things, is the prolific cause of the evil we complain of. Knowledge is not always accompanied with saving power, nor with such a measure of conviction as will force to the outward performance of duty; still it is the appointed means; and until a person be *fully* instructed, there is room to hope that when he is so, he will do a christian's part. Religious instruction is always opposed by inherent depravity; and much painful and persevering diligence, with prayer, must be used before it can be overcome—but when it is seconded in its opposition by a profound indifference to all discrimination of doctrine, earthly mindedness, impiety, profanity, and a host of kindred vices from without; more than common exertion on the part of the church must be made before that a common measure of knowledge can be secured.

The above I apprehend to be the present state and strength of opposition which the principles of our profession have to meet in their way to the mind and heart of our youth.

The question for consideration is this—are the means and exertions used to teach the principles of the Associate Synod, *in due proportion* to this opposition? I will answer so far as I have seen, that in many places they are not. They are not equal to the exertion of former days, when it was more difficult and painful, and when opposition was much less.

Many parents of our communion are content with the mode of daily instruction, which is adopted in the place where they reside, in which the scriptures are rarely any part. Yet all the time that can be allowed for the instruction of the children is spent in that way, and religious education is either overlooked altogether, or left to depend on contingent means. In better times the knowledge of the scriptures was a leading object of early education. Three-fourths of the time and the pains were expended for its attainment. They were read, they were committed to memory, they were conversed about, and the simple truth was applied with ef-

fect to the direction of the young thought—Timothies many were then to be found “who knew the scriptures from a child.”

In the second reformation period, this matter was deemed worthy of the grave attention of the General Assembly of the church of Scotland, and they placed the day-school under the supervision of Presbyteries. Is it a subject of less importance now? Is it not worthy of the attention of our Synod? Can they be absolved from their solemn obligations without passing so much as one act on the subject? Ought they not as a body, to inquire into the plan of religious instruction presently pursued, whether it be in itself calculated to secure—1st, A thorough acquaintance with the scriptures—2d, To preserve a sufficient knowledge of the history of the reformation—and 3d, to communicate the peculiar principles of the Secession entire to posterity; and if upon sober inquiry it is found to be utterly deficient, can they do any thing more needful at the present time, or more beneficial to future ones, than to devise such a plan, and then to use their influence and authority to bring it into uniform operation?

ART. II. *Medical Writers.*

The Principles of Christian Philosophy—containing the Doctrines, Duties, Admonitions, and Consolations of the Christian Religion. By JOHN BURNS, M. D. F. R. S. Regius Professor of Surgery in the University of Glasgow, &c. &c. First American edition. Philadelphia, 1838, pp. 372.

It is not our purpose in this article, to notice medical works except so far as they are connected with the principles of religion, intending more particularly to notice the writings of medical men devoted exclusively to the subject of religion. Of the physicians who have written for the good of posterity, or to get a name in the world, few have advocated the cause of Christianity, compared with those who have taken pains to show that they disbelieved its doctrines and despised its precepts. Of the latter class we will only mention Dr. Darwin, of the last century, and Hartley and Coward, who preceded him, because most of the opinions of more recent sceptical physicians are probably taken from them. Coward, in a work entitled “Thoughts on the Soul,” maintains that the soul is material and mortal, defending his theories with great zeal. Darwin seems delighted in informing his readers that his notions of religion were vague and unprincipled. His philosophy of the mind has the exceptionable characteristics of Dr. Hartley, besides being more complex and less consistent. How widely astray from true reason and philosophy will man go, when he departs from that *law which converts the soul*, and the *testimony that makes the simple wise!* Ovid, in another age had changed men into trees and plants, and Lord Monboddoo supposed them to be originally monkeys. Darwin transforms his flowers into human beings, with all the feelings and passions of humanity.

It is with pleasure that the mind turns from error and folly, to contemplate the character of such men as Boerhave, Haller, and others that might be named. Boerhave was a bright example of christianity, making a profession of the truth, and walking in the practice of it. Notwithstanding his talents and acquirements, few, who have inferior attainments, possessed his humility. Nothing is more boasted by the admirers of chemistry, than that they can by artificial heats and digestion, imitate the productions of nature. “Let all those heroes of science meet together,” says Boerhave, “let them take bread and wine, the food that forms the blood of man, and by assimilation contributes to the growth of the body:

let them try all their arts, they shall not be able from these materials to produce a single drop of blood, so much is the most common act of nature beyond the utmost efforts of the most extended science." Though Boerhave wrote exclusively on subjects pertaining to his profession, yet he endeavored to give ardor to virtue and confidence to truth.

Haller, who was scarce inferior to Boerhave, wrote several moral essays, religious pieces, and a few odes, much admired in Germany for poetry, elegance, and sublimity. But it is unnecessary now to do more than mention men, whose characters have been so long established, who have given dignity to their profession, and to whose lives the medical student may still look back as best deserving their emulation. It is cheering to the christian, to see in our own time, some resembling these benefactors of the human race, both in their love of christianity and skill in the medical profession.

Those who have read the *Memoirs of Dr. John Mason Good*, written by Dr. Gregory, could not have failed to be struck with the similarity of his character to that of Boerhave and Haller. A portion of the spirit of his maternal uncle, John Mason, [author of a treatise on self-knowledge,] seems to have descended to him. It appears that in his earliest years, he had doubts concerning the objects of the christian faith, but for several years before his death, he seems to have derived his chief happiness and consolation in contemplating the riches of Divine Grace, as displayed in the work of redemption. He shewed his benevolence and public spirit, by giving his active support to the church, missionary, and to the Bible society; to the former, he devoted himself with the utmost activity and ardor. His piety exhibited itself in his intercourse with his patients; for in prescribing for an intricate disease, he was in the habit of praying for the Divine direction; on administering a medicine himself, he was known frequently to utter a short ejaculatory prayer. Is it not to be regretted that this spirit is not more universally felt? Too many physicians trust to their own skill, and too many patients, like king Asa, seek to the physician and not to the Lord.

The medical works of Dr. J. Abercrombie, have received much applause from physicians every where. But it is for his other works, that the mass of general readers are chiefly indebted to him, and to which he owes his celebrity. His "Inquiries concerning the intellectual powers and the investigation of truth," and his treatise on the "Philosophy of the Moral Feelings," though not voluminous, are luminous and weighty. The first has already been taken as a text book in several of the higher literary institutions in our own country. The latter, if possible, excels it in plainness and perspicuity. Both have been eulogised by the leading reviews. The Quarterly says, "His style is simple and unambitious, and without being devoid of ornament or power, and on those occasions especially, when he touches on those great questions of faith and hope, it raises into an eloquence which cannot fail to touch the heart. The manner, indeed, in which he points out the practical application of his subject to the interesting topics of education, morality, and religion, gives a charm to these volumes, which we look for in vain in similar works." "Without formally assuming the character of moral or religious lectures, he has made his works auxiliary to the most sacred of all sciences. He has made it clear that sound metaphysical philosophy is not a knowledge which puffeth up; that on the contrary its legitimate tendency is to chastise the arrogance of human wisdom, and to conduct us to that wisdom which is from above, and which is pure and peaceable, and rich in all the fruits which can strengthen up the soul unto eternal life." He might almost be called, by way of eminence, the orthodox philosopher.

But we have already detained the reader too long from the work we

we proposed more particularly to notice. In any work now written, devoted to the explanation and defence of the doctrines of Christianity, little that is new as to matter need be expected. The subject being of so great importance, it has enlisted the services of good men in all ages, and we have reason to bless God that he has enabled so many of his servants to defend the precious truths of the gospel against its adversaries, by their writings. It is an improvement in the writing of the present age, however, that much matter is compressed into small compass. This is not universally the case; there are verbose writers now as well as formerly. Yet there is an improvement in this respect since the day of Owen, Baxter, and Howe, whose valuable works with the exception of a few treatises, can scarcely be waded through by the generality of readers. "The Principles of Christian Philosophy," is valuable as containing so much instruction both in truth and duty, in so small a compass.

The author commences with this first great principle, "That man is created for a future state," which he illustrates from the fact of the misery to which mankind are liable, from the desire of every creature after happiness, from the vanity and uncertainty of all earthly enjoyments, and the certainty of death. He asserts the first great principle of philosophy to be, that this life is only a prelude to another, that christian philosophy teaches how this came to be, enables us to look into futurity, and rejoice in the bright prospect which it unfolds. He next briefly notices the history of man—his creation in innocence—his fall by breaking the covenant made with him—the curse and its effects, and of the immediate revelation of the gospel to him—"By the interposition of Jesus, the Son of God, another world, another state, far excelling that which Adam lost, was purchased." He next proceeds to speak of the means by which a future state of happiness is procured. "In the Scriptures we are clearly informed of the way in which this new world was procured, and man saved from the punishment of sin. We bless God, that in this our dark and ignorant state, he hath been pleased, at divers times and in sundry manners, to grant us a revelation of his will respecting us, and full intimations regarding every thing which is essential to our salvation. This revelation and these intimations are contained in that most inestimable book called the Bible, which all wise and good men acknowledge as the word of God, and as the only certain source of information in religion. We there learn that Jesus the Son of God undertook the salvation of the human race, in a way that neither men nor angels could have conceived, and that devils themselves could scarcely have been so presumptuous as to suppose. This method consisted in nothing less than his undertaking to become a man, and to bear the punishment due to men. This was twofold, the death of the body and the death of the soul, that is, its banishment from God, its privation of all enjoyment. He accordingly did die for our sake, and was forsaken of God in our stead. His gracious offer was accepted, and no glory, no happiness, man is hereafter to enjoy, can be too great to repay the mighty price. This great this astonishing event, the incarnation and vicarious suffering of the second person in the Trinity, was equally with the fall of Adam, foreseen and arranged in the eternal councils of the Godhead, before the creation of the earth. Therefore, in one view, we may look upon this world as called into existence, in order to be the place where Christ should display and magnify the power and glory of God. For, all other events that ever have occurred, since the foundation of the world, or which shall happen, even till the end of time, shrink into nothing when compared with the history of redemption. Alas! that any man—that all men, should think so little of that which involves a world's fate, of that in which they are so deeply interested." "The moment man fell, Jesus began his mediatorial office, which was,

new in heaven, and beheld with astonishment and praise by all the angelic host. From that instant, man could no longer approach to God, nor did God communicate with man but through the intermedium of Jesus. This mediatorial agency of the Son of God, has existed from that time, and shall endure until the termination of all things, when the glorious work of redemption shall be accomplished, and the last saint be gathered from the earth." He next proceeds to the consideration of the sacrifices under the Old Testament, shewing them to be a lively representation of the great and ultimate sacrifice. We will transcribe his notice of the sacrifice of Cain and Abel, as his views seem to be judicious, and somewhat new. "At a very early time we find a memorable evidence of the intention of sacrifices, in the history of Cain and Abel. Cain in a self-righteous spirit, offered unto God the fruits of the earth, as a token of thankfulness for food and raiment, and an acknowledgement of his providence, but virtually denying any need of a propitiation for sin. Abel brought the firstlings of his flock, giving their life for his own, and presenting their blood as a vicarious expiation. The answer of God to Cain is decisive: "If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted?" How important was this to Cain, and how instructive to us! Let those who deny the necessity of an atonement; those who trust in their own righteousness, or in the mercy of God, placed in opposition to his justice, reflect on the declared terms of acceptance. If such men do nothing but good, shall they not be accepted? but if they do not, it behoves them to consider the sad alternative; and one who may be supposed to know the matter well, has declared, "there is none good, no not one."

The author next proceeds to the consideration of the great sacrifice which Christ "offered to put away sin."

"Three important points are to be attended to in the history of Jesus. The first is, that during the whole course of his life here, he continued in a state of unspotted innocence and perfect obedience. This he did in our name and behalf, performing fully that which Adam failed to do. He submitted to be tempted of the devil, that he might withstand that to which our first parents yielded. He was subjected to the ordinary temptations of life, being in all points tempted as we are; yet, in all, he maintained spotless purity, his soul being filled with love to God, hatred to sin, a supreme desire to fulfil the divine law, to do the work of his Father in heaven, and to promote his honor and glory. From first to last, he maintained that perfect obedience, pure and holy thoughts and desires, those sentiments and inclinations, exactly belonging to his situation, so that no part of the law or the will of God was broken or disregarded. He acted, then, as Adam ought to have done, in order to continue in paradise. The second point in the history of Jesus, is, that he submitted to death also, in our name and behalf, thus enduring that punishment which was due to us, death of the body, and being forsaken of God. The divine nature could not suffer, but his human frame suffered in an extreme degree, and his soul sustained an agony of which we can have no conception, when he made it an offering for sin. The third point is, that Jesus declared that if he went not away, if he did not die, the Holy Spirit would not come to his disciples, and without the communication of the Holy Spirit, Christ had appeared in vain. The sufferings of Jesus must never be considered without remembering the promise of the Spirit, for Christ delivers not only from the punishment of sin, but also from its tyranny, destroying in the heart of man, by his Spirit, its love and power." "The three fundamental doctrines of Christianity, therefore, are, the atonement, imputed compliance with the whole of God's law, in a perfect degree, and regeneration." The remainder of this chapter gives a most affecting view of the sufferings of

Christ, the agony in the garden, which caused him to sweat great drops of blood, and on the cross, which convulsed all nature. The passage, however, is too long to be quoted, and would suffer by abridgment.

He next inquires more minutely into the means of salvation. In answer, we are informed, that ' Jesus has ascended into heaven, to plead for us, and present himself as our sacrifice, propitiation, and intercessor, on the terms of a covenant, well ordered in all things, and sure. He sends forth his spirit to sanctify the individual, and unite him to himself, so that being one with him, he becomes interested in all that Christ has done, and, therefore, is accepted by the Father, even as Christ is, who is his head, and the well beloved son of the Father.' After proving the imputation of Adam's first sin to his posterity, and the consequent death of their souls to every holy principle, and that, therefore, they have need to be made alive again, he proceeds to speak of how this is done. His views of the operation of the Holy Spirit differ widely from those who imagine they can cause a revival of religion by mere human means, and that it is in the power of man to convert himself. " The Spirit does not act, merely by suggesting arguments to convince, or by presenting motives to man, as a free agent, as some have imagined, but by changing the heart and sanctifying the desires. Did the Holy Spirit operate, merely, by presenting arguments, I can conceive that the same arguments might have been presented by one man to another, and that we might have been saved without the interference of the Spirit at all. But He not only does present motives and inducements, but, also, awakens the dead mind, kindles new desires, and gives a new existence." He thus speaks of the extent of the atonement. " We know that the atonement made by Christ, is infinite and unlimited in its value, and, abstractly considered, is adequate to the redemption of the whole world. But it no more follows, that the virtue of the atonement should be exercised, to its full competency, than that the power of the Almighty, should in a single case, be put forth to its full extent. In every instance the display has been just as much as, and no more than the wisdom of God saw meet, for the purpose to be served; but, as that which is infinite cannot be bounded, so, in no case, has the power of God been manifested to its utmost limit. Now, although the value and virtue of Christ's work be infinite, yet, it does not follow that all are saved by it." " Both reason and revelation contradict the opinion that Christ saves the impenitent, or made a propitiatory sacrifice for those who perish." " There never was, and never could be any contingency, respecting the number, the names, or the safety of those, who, united to Christ, and forming his spiritual body as a church, become interested in, and identified with, all that he did as their head and representative. Blessed ground of hope and security!" " The scripture is to be considered, as containing a system of information divisible into two heads: the one relates to the will and affections, to the moral conduct and active powers; the other refers to the conduct of God, and his agency in the salvation of men. A limited view of the passages of scripture, relating to these two heads, must give rise sometimes to opposite opinions, and a comparison of texts without keeping this in view, would make one appear to be in contradiction to the other. In one place for instance, it is said, " come unto me;" and in another, " no man can come unto me except the Father who hath sent me draw him." The one is directing what God required of man. The other speaks of what God does respecting man. Thus it is easy to reconcile those passages which explicitly state the doctrine of election and free grace, with those which inculcate the necessity of efforts of the human mind. All the doctrines of the gospel are intimately dependent on each other. The foundation of the whole, is placed on the depravity of the heart of man, or original sin, which is proved to exist, from the nat-

ural consequences of the fall of our first parents, from the declarations of scripture, and from the personal experience of every man, as well as from the history of mankind in all ages. On this is built the necessity of an atonement, of justification, of regeneration or sanctification, of adoption by free grace, and of election, which is merely a branch of the doctrine of grace."

(To be concluded.)

ART. III. *Lectures on Theology.* By the late Rev. JOHN DICK, D. D., Minister of the United Associate Congregation, Greyfriars, Glasgow; and Professor of Theology to the United Secession Church.

(Concluded from page 305.)

We shall next advert to Dr. Dick's sentiments with respect to the promises, and to enable our readers to form their own judgment of the author's views upon this interesting subject, we quote the following passage: "The promises are distinguishable into two classes, absolute and conditional. An absolute promise is one, the performance of which is suspended upon no condition, and is to be expected solely from the faithfulness of the promiser. Other promises are conditional,—I mean that they suppose some action, or course of action, as necessarily preceding the performance, some previous state of mind in the person upon whom the blessing is to be bestowed. The promise of salvation is not made to all who hear the gospel, but to those alone who believe it. There is a difference between the publication and the making of a promise. The publication simply and generally announces the fact that there is such a promise; the making of it respects individuals, and declares that upon them the promised good will be bestowed. The promise of salvation is published to all, but the persons to whom it is made are specified in the following words,—'He that believeth shall be saved.' From zeal for the doctrine of free grace, some have been betrayed into the mistake of representing the promises in general as absolute, and have not attended to the difficulty in which they involve themselves. If their view of the promises were correct, every man to whom they are addressed would have a claim to salvation, as a promise of pardon to all the criminals in a kingdom would entitle them all to life and liberty. It is idle to say, that they will all be saved if they believe, for this is to retract what has been affirmed, or rather, is to maintain a self-contradictory proposition, that the promise is at once absolute and conditional. If God had promised to save all men, without specifying any condition, or term, or qualification, or previous state of mind, his faithfulness would require that they should all be saved without a single exception. But a conditional promise may not be performed without any impeachment of his truth, since the cause of its non-performance is not a failure on his part, but on the part of men." (Vol. ii. pp. 7, 8.)

We read this passage with much surprise, and with deep regret. We shall not, however, charge Dr. Dick with all the erroneous notions which are either expressed or involved in this extract; for we are aware that some of them are disclaimed by him in other parts of his lectures, but we must say the language is exceedingly unguarded,—a fault, we acknowledge, with which this writer is very rarely chargeable. Did we not know that the Doctor was a sincere friend and able advocate of the doctrine of grace, we should from this passage have inferred that he was a decided opponent of that doctrine. The language and the reasoning are exactly such as might have been expected from the pen of an

Arminian or Neonomian. We only notice at present, that the promise of salvation addressed to sinners in the gospel is here represented as being *conditional*, and we have the authority of the Doctor himself for affirming that the use of this term is unsafe, and ought to be avoided. The sense in which he employs the term is explained in a subsequent lecture, and that we may not seem desirous to take advantage of the unhappy phraseology employed in one solitary passage, we shall give another extract upon the same subject, in which the Doctor explains his views more fully, and, it may be presumed, with the utmost precision of language, as he is professedly censuring the language of others. "I request you to observe," he says, "that on this subject there is a want of correctness in the language which is frequently employed. There is a way of talking of absolute promises, as addressed to sinners in the gospel, which, although it recommends itself to the inattentive, by seeming to exalt the grace of God, is not agreeable to truth. As an absolute promise must without fail be performed, it will follow that, if the promise of regeneration, which is suspended upon no condition, was made to sinners without distinction, they should all, at one time or another, be brought into a state of salvation. The conclusion is unavoidable; but as none of us would choose to acquiesce in it, we must reject the premises, and hold that this absolute promise is not addressed to sinners in general, but to the elect alone, or rather, is a sort of promissory prediction of what God purposes to do in reference to those who were redeemed by his Son. If there are any other absolute promises—and in this class may be reckoned the promises of the unchangeable love of God to his people, and of the constant inhabitation of the Holy Ghost in their souls—they are made to persons who are in covenant with God by faith. No absolute promise can be made to a sinner, simply considered as such. Other promises suppose some qualification of the person to whom they are made, or some work to be done by him before they are performed. Such promises some call conditional; but if condition is understood to mean that which gives a just title to the promise, we must say, that all the promises of the covenant of grace are unconditional, there being no such thing as merit of any kind, even in the saints. If, however, the term merely signifies something which precedes the enjoyment of particular blessings, it must be acknowledged that many of them are conditional, although the use of the term ought to be avoided. The remission of sins is not promised to every man, but solely to him who believes; nor eternal life to persons of every description, but to those alone who are pure in heart, and persevere to the end. Yet even these promises are free; because if faith and holiness are previously required, these qualifications are the subject of other promises, which absolutely depend upon the faithfulness of God. They are resolvable into the promise of regeneration, which we have seen is absolute with respect to the elect." (Vol. ii. pp. 451—458.)

Shall we conclude from this passage, that, in the opinion of Dr. Dick, the promise of salvation through Christ is not addressed to sinners indefinitely, considered as such, but only to those who possess certain qualifications; or, in other words, that the promise of God in the gospel does not afford to sinners a sufficient warrant to trust in Christ for salvation, but that they must look to some previous qualification in themselves, must comply with certain terms, or perform certain conditions, in order to entitle them to lay claim to the promise? The language here employed seems unavoidably to lead to this conclusion, yet it is quite inconsistent with the Doctor's system of theology, and with his express declarations in other parts of his work. He distinctly teaches that God offers salvation to all in the gospel, and that every sinner is authorized to believe in the Saviour. "Every descendant of Adam," he says, "is at liberty to

claim an interest in the common salvation, the most illiterate, the meanest, the most unworthy. All are made welcome to Christ, both by himself and by his Father. The universality of the offer is a proof of its freeness; which is further manifest from the consideration that no conditions are prescribed, no equivalent is demanded, nothing is required but an acceptance of the gift." (Vol. iv. pp. 82, 83.) We ask again, shall we conclude from the above extracts, that the promise of salvation is restricted to the elect or to believers? We would not willingly wrest the Doctor's words, or draw strained inferences from his expressions; but does he not explicitly affirm, that the promise of regeneration is not addressed to sinners in general, but to the elect alone; that the promise of salvation is published to all, but the persons to whom it is made are believers? What does this amount to, but that the gospel, which is a free promise should not be preached to sinners? That, though it may be preached *before* them, it ought not to be preached *to* them? For, if God does not promise them salvation, what warrant have the ministers of the gospel to make an offer of salvation to sinners as such, and invite them to accept the gift? "Take away the promise out of the Bible," says one, "and you take away the gospel." If, then, the promise is not addressed to sinners, what sort of a gospel remains to be preached to them? If the promise of salvation is merely published, but not directed to all who hear the gospel, what is there to warrant and encourage faith? Is not the unlimited and unconditional offer of the Saviour, and the promise of salvation in him, the proper formal warrant that sinners have to believe in him for salvation? Where shall we find a foundation for faith to rest upon without God's word of promise? In short, if the promise be not directed to sinners as such, believing is a thing impossible. But while we cannot help considering the conclusion, that the gospel, though it may be preached *before*, ought not to be preached *to* sinners, fairly deducible from the language employed in the extracts we have given, it seems we must not impute this unscriptural notion to the author; for he elsewhere declares it to be in direct opposition to many passages of Scripture, and particularly to the commission of Christ to the apostles. (Vol. iii. p. 251.)

In fact a confusion of ideas appears to run through the whole of this unfortunate passage, and it is impossible to reconcile it with the author's declared sentiments in other places, or even to reconcile one part of this individual passage with another. We say, there is a confusion of ideas, for the purpose is confounded with the promise of God; or, in other words, the obvious distinction between the promise of God, as made to the elect in Christ from eternity, and as addressed to sinners in the gospel, is not attended to. The promise of eternal life through Jesus Christ may be considered as it was made to Christ from eternity in the covenant of grace, and to all the elect, as his spiritual seed, in him; and, in this view, it is no other than God's unchangeable purpose concerning their salvation, and the accomplishment of it to every one to whom it was made is infallibly sure. But the promise may also be considered as it is proposed and directed to mankind sinners in the gospel dispensation; and, in this view, it is the means which God is pleased to employ for the execution of his unchangeable purpose, and it is proposed and directed unto many who shall in the event come short of it; because the accomplishment of it is not to be attained but by means of faith. We have said also, that one part of the passage is irreconcilable with another, because it is affirmed that the promises are not absolute, and yet it is admitted that they are not conditional, in any proper sense of the word, and that the use of this term ought to be avoided. We know of no medium betwixt absolute and conditional promises, they must be one or the other; and, in our opinion, the great promise of salvation, and all the promises in the covenant of grace, are

absolute, because every thing which is necessary to the sinner's salvation, without a single exception, is freely promised. Indeed, the Doctor allows that "the promises are free in this sense, that nothing is required but that we embrace them." (Vol. ii. p. 82.) And who ever asserted that the promises are absolute in any other sense? The acceptance of a promise is undoubtedly necessary, not only to the enjoyment of the promised blessing, but also to render the obligation of the promise complete; but the acceptance can with no propriety be called a condition of the promise; for a condition is something in the promise itself, upon which, even after the promise has been accepted, the performance of it is suspended. Had the Doctor merely intended to teach that there is a certain order in which the promises are fulfilled, and admitted, as he actually does, that the qualification which must precede the performance of some promises is the subject of other promises which absolutely depend upon the faithfulness of God, we should have readily concurred with him. But then we would ask upon what grounds does he charge certain writers with using incorrect language, when they speak of absolute promises being addressed to sinners? Does not the statement now made exactly coincide with the views of these writers? Do they not affirm that "there is a condition of order and connexion between one covenant blessing and another; they being like so many links of a chain closed within each other;" and that "there is not a conditional promise in the Bible, but what is reductively absolute; because both the thing promised and the condition of it is contained in the womb of the absolute promise?"*

Leaving it to others to reconcile Dr. Dick with himself, we shall attend to some of the positions which he lays down. That an absolute promise must without fail be performed—that the performance of it depends exclusively upon the faithfulness of the promiser, he expressly affirms. Now, this position is, we maintain, directly at variance with Scripture. Many examples might be adduced to shew that faith may be necessary as a means of enjoying the benefit of an absolute promise; and that such a promise may be made to a number of persons indefinitely, many of whom may come short of it through their own unbelief, without any failure of the faithfulness of the promiser. We shall only refer to the promise made to the Israelites of the land of Canaan. This promise, as it is recorded in Exodus iii. 17, is absolute and unconditional, "I have said I will bring you out of the affliction of Egypt unto the land of the Canaanites," &c. This promise was given to the children of Israel, as a nation, to be relied upon by them as good security for their introduction into and possession of that good land. But the far greater part of that generation, despising this security, and persisting in their unbelief, never saw the promised land. That the promise was given even to those whose carcasses fell in the wilderness, cannot be doubted by any who read and own the authority of the Scriptures; for God himself declares, even with respect to them who were not permitted to enter into the promised land because of their unbelief, that he "swore to make them dwell therein." (Numb. xiv. 30.) Was it then any impeachment of the Divine faithfulness, engaged for the accomplishment of the promise, that the unbelieving Israelites were not permitted to enter into the promised land? To affirm this would be impious; yet it had some appearance of a breach of promise, and, therefore, when the Lord threatened to make their carcasses fall in the wilderness, he said, "Ye shall know my breach of promise." (Numb. xiv. 34.) This evidently implies that a promise had been made to them, but through unbelief they should never experience the accomplishment of it, and thus, in their case, there would be a *seeming*, though not a *real* breach of it. Does not this clearly evince that an absolute promise does not depend exclu-

* R. Erskine, Sermon entitled the Pregnant Promise.

sively upon the faithfulness of the promiser; but that many of those to whom it is made may, through unbelief, come short of it?

Another position which the Doctor lays down is, that no absolute promise can be made to sinners, considered as such. The reverse of this is sufficiently evident from the address of the apostle Peter to those who had killed the Prince of life: "The promise is unto you, and to your children and to all that are afar off, even so many as the Lord our God shall call." (Acts ii. 39.) The promise here meant was undoubtedly the promise of the remission of sins, and of all spiritual blessings in Christ Jesus. The apostle exhorts his hearers to be baptized for the remission of sins; and he adds this reason, "For the promise is to you." But the promise could not have been a good reason for their receiving baptism as signifying and sealing the remission of sins, unless it was a promise of that comprehensive blessing. "The remission of sins is not promised to every man," says Dr. Dick, "but solely to him who believes." We ask, were they believers to whom the apostle said, "the promise is unto you?" Were they not rather the most atrocious sinners, even the crucifiers of the Lord of glory? "Him," says he, in the preceding verse, "ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain." They were indeed "pricked in their hearts," but they did not "believe with the heart," and the apostle told them that the promise was unto them, as a warrant and encouragement to their faith. True, remission of sins cannot be actually received unless the sinner embrace the promise by faith. But this is not inconsistent with the absolute nature of the promise, for the freest promise, or the most unconditional gift, cannot be possessed, without being accepted. We do not admit that "a promise of pardon to all the criminals in a kingdom would entitle them all to life and liberty." On the contrary, we assert that a king's promise of pardon to a company of rebels cannot profit any of them but such as accept of it. If any one of them despised the royal clemency, and persisted in his rebellious practices, the promise would be of no avail to him. No man, however, could, on this account, call the royal promise conditional, for no man would think of representing the criminal's acceptance of the promise as the condition of his enjoying the benefit of it. We only add, on this subject, that every gospel hearer is commanded to believe in the name of Christ, otherwise unbelief would not be their sin. Now, the promise, with respect to the persons to whom it is directed, must be as extensive as the command; these two are inseparably connected together, so that every one who is commanded to believe has a right to the promise, as the immediate ground of his faith. To separate the promise from the command, is to separate what God has joined together, and, in effect, to command men to build without a foundation.

Faith having a close relation to the promise, we might have anticipated that Dr. Dick's views of the latter would have an influence upon his views of the former. Accordingly, we find that he excludes an assurance of salvation from the essence of faith. We can only afford room for the following sentences: "When the question is proposed, whether assurance is of the essence of faith, it is necessary, before we return an answer, to know what is meant by assurance. If it mean a full persuasion of the truth of the Divine testimony, to whatever subject it relates, we answer, that it is essential to faith. But if assurance mean an explicit assurance of our own salvation, we deny that it is of the essence of faith." (Vol. iii. p. 311.) We object to this statement of the question, for it suggests the idea that the assurance of salvation, which, it is pleaded, belongs to the essence of faith, rests upon some other ground than the Divine testimony, whereas, those who embrace this opinion uniformly assert that the assurance of faith rests entirely upon the faithfulness of God in the gospel testimony. The Doctor seems to speak of an assurance of our own salvation, as equivalent to an

assurance of our gracious state; and afterwards he plainly discovers that such is the meaning he attached to the phrase.—Having observed that an apostle exhorts Christians to “make their calling and election sure,” he adds, “The exhortation implies, that they may not be assured of the goodness of their state, for no man would be exhorted to seek what he already possesses, and consequently, that this persuasion is not found in every believer, as it would be if it belonged to the nature of faith.” (Vol. iii. pp. 313, 314.) But this persuasion is a very different thing from that which they intend by an assurance of salvation, who maintain that this assurance belongs to the essence of faith. The assurance of which they speak includes no other consideration of the person’s own state, but that he is a guilty condemned sinner, standing in absolute need of a Saviour; and is founded, not upon his possessing the works and evidences of a gracious state laid down in Scripture, but solely upon the free offer and faithful promise of God in the gospel. They contend that there is an assurance of salvation in the direct act of faith, as, in that act, a person, without reflection upon any previous act or exercises, rests immediately upon the grant or promise of the gospel for his own everlasting salvation. This is surely a very different thing from the person’s knowledge of his being already in the faith, or in a gracious state.

It is admitted by Dr. Dick, that “a full persuasion of the truth of the Divine testimony, to whatever subject it relates, is essential to faith;” and, we readily grant, that faith is a belief of the Divine testimony. Wherefore, in determining whether an assurance of our own salvation belongs to the essence of faith, it is necessary to ascertain what the Divine testimony comprehends, for it is manifest that faith must correspond to the testimony upon which it rests. If that testimony promises salvation only to them that have already believed, as the Doctor alleges, then it is clear, that a person must be assured of his faith, before he can have any assurance of salvation. But if that testimony includes not only a revelation of Jesus Christ, but also an unconditional promise of salvation through Christ, addressed to sinners of mankind indefinitely, as we affirm, then a person cannot truly believe the Divine testimony, without being in same measure assured of his own salvation. When the matter of the testimony is something good to be done or given by the testifier, how is it possible for a person to believe the testimony, without an assurance that the testifier will do as he has said? And since the matter of the Divine testimony is everlasting salvation, to be bestowed on us by the testifier, surely the belief of that testimony must include an assurance that salvation will be bestowed on us in particular; which assurance, according to the measure of faith, will be either strong or weak, in a lower or higher degree. It may be objected, that the promise is directed to no particular person by name, and that therefore no one has any warrant to assure himself that he in particular shall be saved. We reply, that the promise is addressed to all sinners in the visible church, in a general indefinite manner; and though no particular person is named, yet it is directed to all, without distinction, under such names and characters as are applicable to all. Every sinner who hears the gospel is therefore warranted to believe the promise with special application to himself, and does not really believe it, unless he is assured of salvation to himself in particular, upon the free and faithful promise of God. In short, we maintain that a free promise of salvation through Jesus Christ is addressed to the chief of sinners, and when a sinner believes the promise, in believing, he is, in proportion to the measure of his faith, assured of salvation by Jesus Christ.

That there is an assurance of salvation in the direct act of faith, was undoubtedly the doctrine of our Reformers, and Dr. Dick admits that this doctrine was maintained by the founders of the Secession; but he labors

to disprove the correctness of the definition of faith, supported and vindicated by them in their Act concerning the Doctrine of Grace. The length to which this review has already extended prevents us from following him in his reasoning respecting that definition. Indeed, we may allow that less objectionable terms might have been employed, and we should not have deemed it necessary to enter our dissent, had the Doctor satisfied himself with merely objecting to the phraseology they used, had he not also rejected the doctrine, which they so ably vindicated. But he completely surrenders the cause—a cause for which a Marshall, a Hervey, a Boston, and a host of writers in the Secession, so strenuously contended.

Dr. Dick appeals to the Confession of Faith, as supporting his own views, and condemning those of the founders of "the religious society" to which he belonged. But we say, as they did, that the passages referred to speak of the assurance of sense or reflection, not of the assurance which is in the direct act of faith. It is described as being "founded upon the divine truth of the promises of salvation, the inward evidences of those graces unto which these promises are made, the testimony of the Spirit of adoption witnessing with our spirits that we are the children of God. This infallible assurance," it is added, in the words quoted by Dr. Dick, "doth not so belong to the essence of faith, but that a true believer may wait long, and conflict with many difficulties, before he be partaker of it." (Conf. chap. xviii. § 2, 3.) One has only to read these two sections in connexion, to be convinced that nothing is here determined with respect to the assurance that is in the direct act of faith, and that writer cannot be acquitted of unfairness, who quotes the latter section as expressing the opinion of the compilers of the Confession upon this subject. Their views of "saving faith" are given in a preceding chapter, where they assert that its principal acts are "accepting, receiving, and resting upon Christ alone for justification, sanctification, and eternal life, by virtue of the covenant of grace." Now, we maintain that receiving and resting upon Christ for eternal life, necessarily imply that appropriating assurance which is founded upon the Divine testimony, and for which we plead, as essential to faith. "This faith," they add, "is different in degrees, weak or strong,—growing up in many to the attainment of a full assurance." (Conf. chap. xiv. § 2, 3.) It is not affirmed that faith differs in many as to *assurance*, but as to the *fulness* of assurance. The language plainly intimates, that a weak faith has a weak assurance, and a strong faith a strong assurance. How could faith grow up in any to a *full* assurance, if there were not *some* assurance in the very nature of faith? To whatever degree any thing may increase, it certainly can never, by growth, acquire another nature.

The manner in which Dr. Dick introduces the above quotation from the Confession of Faith, must appear very strange to those who know the deference shown to that public standard by the Doctor, and "the religious society" of which he was a member. Referring to the definition of faith adopted by the founders of the Secession, he says, "Although adopted by our fathers, it is contrary to the doctrine of our standards, to which only we are bound to conform." Unquestionably the Doctor was not one of those who regarded the compilers of the Confession as almost infallible oracles. He speaks of being *bound to conform* to that confession; but did he, in fact, "firmly and constantly adhere to the whole doctrine of that Confession?" They would greatly err who should, in their simplicity, draw this inference, apparently so native, from the words now quoted. And, in another Lecture, he gives us to understand, that he only conformed to the Confession when it coincided with his own notions. Having represented the Confession as inconsistent with itself, he boasts, "that while the Church of Scotland holds the Confession without explanation,

the church to which we belong has cleared herself from this inconsistency, by expunging from her creed every expression which imports the power of using compulsory measures in religion." (Vol. iii. p. 471.) We have extracted this sentence, with no intention of entering into the controversy to which it refers, but merely for the purpose of shewing, that the Doctor's words must be understood in a somewhat vague and ambiguous sense, when he speaks of being "bound to conform" to the Confession of Faith. We have only to add that the doctrine that assurance belongs to the direct act of faith, was embraced by the founders of the Secession; that this doctrine has been supported and taught, so far as we know, by the whole of that body, until a very recent period; that the work now before us is the first we have met with, produced by a minister in connexion with that "religious society," in which this doctrine has been openly rejected; and that, notwithstanding the unceasing efforts of another late worthy member of that society, to vindicate and diffuse abroad this important article of "gospel truth," we are afraid that it will soon be lost sight of, if not openly impugned, by many of their successors.

We had marked a few other passages for animadversion, but we must desist. And, though we have felt ourselves bound to censure some sentiments in these lectures, yet, in concluding our remarks, we must renew our expression of the high estimate we have formed of the work as a whole. The greater part of the lectures are unexceptionable, in regard to doctrine, and most attractive, in point of composition. We have derived much pleasure from the examination of it, and cordially recommend it to the careful study of candidates for the sacred office, and of all who wish to peruse a well-arranged, comprehensive, and concise system of theology.—*Presbyterian Magazine.*

ART. IV. *The Christian World Unmasked.*

(Continued from page 313.)

We now proceed to another point of faith, and a choice one too, very savory and nourishing to a true believer; St. Peter tells us, that *faith purifies the heart*: (Acts xv. 9,) and St. John affirms, *This is the victory, whereby we overcome the world, even our faith*; (1 John v. 4,) and he tells us what he means by the world, even *the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life*. (1 John ii. 16.)

Come, Sir, bring your face to the gospel-glass; and handle this point well, like an old grazier. Does your faith overcome the *lust of the flesh* making you victorious over your palate, and over outward pollution, and inward uncleanness?

Does your faith overcome the *lust of the eye*, and keep your heart from gasping after more wealth, more preferment, or more honors; *Having food and raiment, have you learnt therewith to be content?* (1 Tim. vi. 8.)

Does your faith overcome the *pride of life*, and prevent your being charmed with a lofty house, rich furniture, genteel equipage, and splendid raiment? Does it make you sick of earthly vanities, and draw your heart to things above?

Speak, Sir, and speak honestly. If you are a slave to these matters, and a quiet slave, you may keep your faith; Satan will not steal it from you. His own sooty cap is full as good as your rusty bonnet. The devils do believe and tremble, but are devils still.

One point more, Sir, and we have done. Faith is not only intended to *pacify* the conscience, and *purify* the heart, but also to *rescue* the mind from our earthly troubles. Our passage through life is attended with storms:

we sail upon a boisterous sea, where many tempests are felt; and many are feared, which look black and bode mischief, but pass over. Now faith is designed for an anchor, to keep the mind steady, and give it rest; even as Isaiah saith, *Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace, whose mind is stayed on thee, because he trusteth in thee.* (Isa. xxvi. 3.)

Precious promises, suited to our wants, are scattered through the Bible; and divine faith will feed upon the promises, looking unto Jesus to fulfil them; but human faith can reap no profit from them. Let me suppose you in distressful circumstances, and while musing on them with an anxious heart, you cast a look upon a distant Bible. The book is fetched and opened, and this passage meets your eye, *Call upon me in the day of trouble, I will deliver thee, and thou shalt glorify me.* (Ps. l. 15.) Here you view a gracious promise made by a faithful God, and made without limitation or condition, directed unto every one that reads or hears it, applicable to every time of trouble, and requiring *only* prayer of faith for deliverance. Yet, Sir, it is possible this blessed promise might not even draw a prayer from you; perhaps it gains a little musing, and the book is closed. Or if it should extort a feeble cry, the prayer does not ease your heart, nor fetch deliverance, for want of faith.

You know the word of Jesus, *All things whatsoever ye shall ask in prayer, believing, ye shall receive.* (Matt. xxi. 22.) But for want of faith, your reasoning heart will ask, "From whence can this deliverance come?" What is that to you Sir? God keeps the means of deliverance out of sight, on purpose to exercise our faith; but promises to *make a way for our escape*, though we can see none. (1 Cor. x. 13.)

Or perhaps you may surmise, "This promise was not made for me; I am not worthy of it." Sir, God's promise is not made to compliment your worthiness, but to manifest the riches of his grace in Christ Jesus. Did you mind how the promise runs? It is not said, "Glorify me *first*, and afterward I will deliver thee;" which would be making man's worthiness a foundation for God's blessings. But he says, "I will deliver thee, and then thou shalt 'glorify me.'"

Faith considers all the promises as freely made to supply our wants, and rests upon the Lord's faithfulness to fulfil them; and when a promise is fulfilled, adores the mercy, and glorifies the Lord for it. In this way, and this only, he gets some hearty rent of praise. Such free deliverance wins the heart, and binds it to the Lord, and makes obedience cheerful.

I know a man, who spends his income yearly, because he has no family; as little as he can upon himself, and the rest upon his neighbors. He keeps no purse against a rainy day, and wants none: Jesus Christ is his banker, and a very able one. Sometimes by sickness or unforeseen expences, he gets behind hand, and greatly so. At such times, he does not run about among his earthly friends to seek relief, but falleth on his knees, and calls upon his banker, saying, "Lord I am in want, and thou must help me. Here I bring thy gracious promise; look upon it, Jesus. It says, *Call upon me in the time of trouble, I will deliver thee, and thou shalt glorify me.* Lord, I call, and thou dost hear; I believe, and thou art faithful: be it now unto me, according to thy word." Such prayers, he said, never failed to bring supplies: some, from those who cared for him; and some, from such as did avoid his company. For Jesus Christ has every heart and purse in his own hand; and often makes a raven feed his prophets, or makes the *earth to help the woman*, to shew his finger clearly in such deliverance.

Scripture promises are real bank-notes of heaven, and the riches of believers, who do not live on stock in hand, but traffic with this paper-currency. Where divine faith is found, it takes the notes to Christ's bank, and receives the cash. But human faith cannot traffic with this paper: it reads the notes, and owns them good, but dares not take them to the

skies for payment. No faith can act on God, but that which comes from God.

Prayer of faith, exercised with perseverance, surely brings deliverance ; if not immediately, yet at a proper season ; and till deliverance comes, the *mind is stayed on God, and kept in perfect peace*. Faith picks the thorns out of the flesh, and takes the rankling pain away, before the wound is healed.

Truly, Doctor, now you make me thoughtful. I begin to see my *rusty bonnet*, and confess it would fit a fiend's head, as well as mine. My faith will not produce the precious fruit you have mentioned. It brings no peace, passing all understanding ; affords no real victory over the world ; and yields no sweet relief in time of trouble. It picks no thorns out of my flesh : it must be counterfeit. My support in trouble arises from my purse, or from my friends, and not from faith. Yet I cannot comprehend how a mere reliance on God's promise can charm away our grief, and set the heart at rest before deliverance comes. This seems a charm indeed !

So it is, Sir, and a most delightful charm ; yet not fanciful, but real, having good foundation in our nature. Where divine faith is given, it will act on God, as human faith will act on man, and produce the same effects. A case will make my meaning plain.

I suppose you, as before fallen into great distress, and a lawyer's letter is received, bringing doleful tidings, that your person will be seized, unless your debts are paid within a month. While the letter is perusing, an old acquaintance calls upon you, sees a gloom upon your face, and asks the cause of it. You put the letter in his hand : he reads, and drops a friendly tear. After some little pause, he says, "Old friend, I have not cash at present by me, but engage to pay your debts, before the month is out." Now, sir, if you thought this person was not *able* to discharge your debt, or not to be *relied* on, his promise would bring no relief, because it gains no credit. You have no faith in him. But if you knew the man was able, and trust-able, his promise would relieve you instantly. A firm reliance on his word would take away your burden, and set your mind at ease, before the debt was paid.

Well, Sir, if a firm reliance on the word of man, has this sweet influence on the heart, a firm reliance on the word of God will have the same. Why should it not ? God's word serveth as much credit surely as the word of man. He is as able to perform, and as faithful to fulfil his promise, as your neighbor. *No one ever trusted in him, and was confounded*. And where the *mind is stayed on God, it will be kept in perfect peace*, before deliverance comes. Such may say, with David, *God is our refuge, therefore we will not fear, though the earth be removed, and the mountains carried into the midst of the sea*. (Ps. xlv. 1, 2.) Or with Habakkuk, *Though the fig-tree should not blossom, nor fruit be in the vine ; though the olive too should fail, and the fields yield no meat ; though the flock be cut off from the fold, and no herd be found in the stalls, yet will I rejoice in the Lord, I will joy in the God of my salvation*. The prop of God's faithful word cannot break ; and an human heart resting firmly on it, never can sink. And men might learn to feel their unbelief, for want of this support in trouble. The prop stands ready on the king's high road, to support all weary passengers ; but they have not faith to lean upon it, else they would find rest.

In speculation, it seems as easy to trust a faithful God, as trust an upright man : but in practice, it is found otherwise. When trials come, men cannot trust a faithful God, without divine assistance ; so trust him, as to cast their burden on him, and obtain his perfect peace. Here the charm of faith ceaseth, because there is no faith to charm.

If, in time of trouble, some prospect of deliverance is afforded by an

human arm, men often put a cheat upon themselves, and talk of trusting God, while they are only leaning on a human shoulder. Remove this earthly prop, and take away all human prospect of relief; and the man cries out, "What must I do? I am undone." He cannot rest upon God's *naked* word, nor seat his heart upon the solid chair of promise, without some human stool beside.

Faith is just the same thing now it was in Abraham's day, *who, against hope, believed in hope*: (Rom. iv. 18.) He had no human prospect of an heir, and yet expected one, relying wholly on God's *naked* promise. And a *naked* promise is the *whole* support of divine faith now. Jesus Christ will admit no partner for our faith. He is worthy of full credit and expects it; and we must either look to him *alone*, or look to be confounded. He will be all, or nothing.

Nay, Doctor, now you press too hard upon Jesus Christ. He is a very good Saviour, to be sure; but we must not put upon him neither. What! lay all the burden of salvation on him? This does not seem reasonable, nor is using him handsomely. So, he must do all the work, and I must stand by, as a lazy thief, to see it done. No, no, Doctor, I shall not make a packhorse of my Saviour; but would use him with good manners; and, whilst I look for great things from him, will try to do a something for myself.

Sir, the best manners you can shew towards superiors, is to do as you are bid; and not gainsay their orders, by a wilful pertness, nor an ill-timed modesty. You honour Jesus by employing him as a *whole* Saviour; and you rob him of his glory, and excite his indignation, when you steal a portion of his royal sceptre, or his priestly censor, or his prophet's staff from him. He is appointed for a Saviour, not a scanty, but a full one; and he never does his work by halves. The work creates no hurry, and is found no burden. He speaks, or wills, and it is done. Do not therefore compliment him with your idle manners, but obey his orders, which are these: *Look unto me, and be saved, all the ends of the earth, for I am God, and none else*, or nothing less, and therefore able to save. (Isa. xlv. 22.) Jesus does not beg of you to look a little to yourself, and the rest to him; but commands you to look singly unto him, for heavenly wisdom to direct you, for heavenly peace to bless you, and for heavenly grace to sanctify you. And he has left a faithful word for your encouragement, that *whosoever believeth* (or trusteth) *in him, shall be saved*; saved from spiritual darkness, and from the guilt and power of sin.

You talk of looking to yourself, which bespeaks some confidence in yourself; but Jesus has pronounced a curse on every *human* confidence. Hear his awful declaration, *Thus saith the Lord, Cursed is the man that trusteth in man*; (in any thing human, in himself or in another); *he shall be like the heath in the desert, and I shall not see when good cometh*. But take the blessing too and may it reach your heart. *Blessed is the man who trusteth in the Lord, and whose hope the Lord is; he shall be like a tree planted by the water, which spreadeth out its roots by the river, and does not regard when drought cometh, but its leaf is green, and it never ceaseth yielding fruit*. (Jer. xvii. 5, &c.)

If your eye is *single*, directed *wholly* unto Christ, you will be full of light and peace; but if your eye is *double*, peeping upon Jesus, and squinting towards man, you will be full of darkness, and be at length confounded.

The life of faith is called *the fight of faith*; and truly called so. For where divine faith is given, it is seldom exercised without a conflict in the heart, which loves an earthly refuge, and dreads a *naked* promise; dearly loves a human prop, and always seeks some wooden buttress to support God's iron pillar.

On this account, men dare not singly trust in Christ's *atonement* for

for their peace, but clap their feeble shoulder to his cross, to strengthen it; nor dare they rest on Jesus' *grace*, to make them holy, but call up human arms to slay gigantic lusts within; nor can they trust in Jesus' *guidance*, to make them wise unto salvation; but call the wisdom of the world in, an utter night piece, to chase away the world's darkness.

Many yet are so obliging, as to let the Saviour have a share in the work of man's salvation; but Jesus does not thank them for this condescension. He rejects that faith which does not centre in him *only*, and rest the heart *entirely* on him. He wants no partner, and will admit of none: nor were he worthy of the name of Saviour, if salvation was not *wholly* from him.

Hear what he says of himself, *I have trodden the wine press alone: I looked, and there was none to help; therefore mine own arm brought salvation,* (Isa. lxiii. 3, 5.)

Hear what a prophet says of him: *Behold! the Lord God will come with a strong hand, and his arm shall rule: he shall feed his flock like a shepherd; he shall gather the lambs with his arm; and he shall carry them in his bosom.* (Isa. xl. 10, 11.) Where you may observe all partners are excluded from this work. The Lord Jesus, who is called the *Lord God*, shall act the part of a shepherd, and lay down his life for his sheep; and by treading the wine-press *alone*, shall make the atonement *himself*: then he will *gather* the flock, and *feed* the flock, and *carry* the flock home *himself*. Jesus Christ does not help you to help yourself; but he does the whole work himself; *his own arm shall rule.*

Iudeed where men are quickened by the Holy Spirit, and well convinced of their sinfulness and helplessness, they are now enabled to use the means of grace properly, and must use them diligently, but the *whole work* still is in the Saviour's hand. He must guide the understanding by his spirit into all saving truth; he must bring his blood-bought peace to the conscience; he must tame the tempers, sanctify the affections, and make us cheerfully disposed for all good works. Our business is, to watch and pray; and it is the Saviour's office *to work in us to will and do*. What will and power he gives, we may exercise; and nothing more: he only can increase it, who first gave it.

Paul says, *It has pleased the Father, that in Christ Jesus* (in his human nature, as a temple) *all fulness should dwell.* (Col. i. 19.) *All fulness* of wisdom to direct us, of power to protect us, of grace to pardon and sanctify us. And this *all-fulness* is treasured up in Christ, the head, to be communicated to the members of his body. Whatever wisdom, strength, peace or righteousness are not received from this store-house by faith, are spurious, a mere tinsel ware, which may glitter much, but has no value.

Paul says further *Christ is all and in all.* (Col. iii. 11.) He is possessed of an *all-fulness*, that he might be, not *something* only in our wisdom, strength, peace, and righteousness, but *all* in every thing, and *all* in every person; *all* in the Greek, as well as the barbarian; *all* in the scholar as well as in the rustic.

And St. John says, *We beheld Christ's glory, full of grace and truth; and out of his fulness have we all received, even grace for grace.* (John i. 14—16.) Where the apostle shews, that a believer's business is to receive supplies of grace out of Christ's fulness.

Doctor, I cannot comprehend that Jesus Christ must be all in *wisdom* to a scholar, as well as to a countryman. If human learning will not help to make us wise unto salvation, of what use is it, and wherefore do we value it? My landlord is reckoned a monstrous scholar: he has been at Cambridge, and travelled abroad, and talks French at a wonderful rate. He is always at his books, and makes eclipses when he pleaseth. We hear, he put in four into Dyer's almanac the last year. One day he took

me into his study, and shewed me all his learning. Bless me! what a sight! more books by half upon his shelves, than I have bullocks in my pastures! And they seem well handled; for I did not spy a mouldy book in his study, except an old Bible which lay drooping in a corner. I suppose it was his grandfather's. Now, Doctor, does it not seem likely, that my landlord must get more Christian knowledge from his vast gilded heap of books than I can get from a plain single Bible?

Human science, sir, keeps men out of mischief, trains them up for civil occupations, and oft produceth notable discoveries, which are useful to the world; but never can lead the heart to Jesus Christ, nor breed a single grain of faith in him. They who know most of *human* science, and have waded deepest in it, know the most of its vanity, and find it vexation of spirit.

The heavenly oracles declare, *the wisdom of the world is foolishness with God*; (1 Cor. iii. 19;) and tells us, *not many wise are called to possess the gospel kingdom*. (1 Cor. i. 26.) And surely God would never brand the wisdom of the world as folly, if it had the least tendency to make men wise unto salvation.

It will, I think, be found a certain truth, that when human science is cultivated eagerly in a Christian country, the study of the Bible always grows neglected; and that immorality and infidelity spread their branches equally with human science: and that a learned nation, when arrived at the highest pitch of human science, is just become ripe for slavery, and doomed to *perpetual* bondage; witness Egypt, Greece and Rome.

Bible-knowledge, fetched in by prayer, and watered well with meditation, makes the mind humble and serious: but human science lifts men up, makes them *vain in their imaginatious, darkens the foolish heart* still more, and thereby drives them farther off from God. The present age is no bad comment on the following scripture, *The world by wisdom knew not God*. (1 Cor. i. 21.)

Solomon gave his heart to seek wisdom,, and knew more of the secrets of nature than any man; yet he found no real profit from this study, but calls it *vanity, and a sore travail which the sons of men are exercised with*. (Eccles. i. 13, 14) This is left on holy record, to direct us what to think of human science: and they, who laugh at the direction, may chance to weep at last, as Grotius did, and repeat his dying lamentation:

Pray, Doctor what was it?

Why, sir, as he lay lamenting on his death bed, calling himself the *poor publican*, mentioned in the parable, and wishing he might change conditions with *John Urick*, a poor but devout man, some that were present, spake to Grotius of his great industry and learned performances, and spake of them with admiration; to which he replied, with a sigh, *Heu! vitam perdidit operose nihil agendo*; Alas! I have squandered my life away laboriously in doing nothing.

The learned Selden, also, his antagonist, was very much of his mind, when he came to die.

Sir, if you would learn wisdom in the school of Christ, Paul affirms, *You must become a fool, in order to be wise*. (1 Cor. iii. 18.) A crabbed lesson truly, to be learned by a scholar! and a mighty *strange* expression, yet exceeding proper for a scribe, to wake him from his fond delirium, and fetch him to his senses: he needs such amazing language, to make him pause, and gaze about for a meaning. It is a block thrown in his way, to stop his vain pursuit: or brush his shins if he advanceth. It tells a scholar, he must go empty unto Jesus, and see himself a fool in heavenly science; as much in daily want of a teacher here, as an idiot is of some director in his worldly matters.

The master of the school speaks the same kind of language to his scho-

lars, *Except ye become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven.* (Matt. xviii. 3.) The Saviour's *little child*, and the apostle's *fool*, instruct us how to seek heavenly wisdom; not by drawing it from human brains, or heathen folios, but by meekly going unto Jesus, as a *little child* to be taught; or as a *fool* to be made wise.

What, then, you ask, must we cast away the languages, and throw aside the Bible? By no means. Read the word of God with care, and in its native language, if you can; but read it too with prayer; and not with prayer only, but with heart-dependence upon Jesus, while you read. Put your eyes into the Saviour's head, while you look upon his book; and when his head directs your eyes, you will have light enough.

Scribes in every age have been much akin to the Jewish scribes, cavillers at Jesus, and rejecters of his doctrine. They are too wise to be taught, and too lofty to sit down at the feet of Jesus. *God will teach the meek his ways.* (Psalm xxv. 9.) *And the wayfaring men, though fools, shall not err.* (Isa. xxxv. 8.) *But the Lord turneth wise men backward, and maketh their knowledge foolish,* (Isaiah xlv. 25;) yea, *taketh the wise in their own craftiness.* (1 Cor. iii. 19.)

Sir, this subject has been often on my thoughts, and much might be said upon it; but this little shall suffice, which perhaps may set all Ephesians in an uproar about their goddess; and make them cry out vehemently as before, *Great is Diana of the Ephesians.*

Indeed, Doctor, I am willing to become a convert here; for the grazier is no scholar, yet endued with common sense. And if scholarship is needful for a Christian, it seemeth *hard* that the poor, who are much the largest part, should be barred from it unavoidably. And it seemeth also *strange*, that the poor should be found and declared the chief subjects of the gospel kingdom. But, Doctor, if Jesus Christ has all the stores I need, and is in heaven, how must I get at him? Astronomers, they say, by a wooden pipe, will spring up to the skies in a twink; and tell as many pretty stories of the stars, as if they had them in their pocket. I am a gross, unwieldy man you see; and being born without wings, dare not venture on a flight towards the skies; can you help me to a ladder which may conduct me thither?

Yes, sir, you may meet with such a one in Genesis, (xxviii. 12.) whose foot was resting on the earth, while its top was in the skies. Jacob saw the ladder in a dream, but Jesus gave the vision, to represent himself. The ladder foot, resting on the earth, bespeaks his human nature; as the ladder top, fairly fixed in the skies, denotes his divine nature; and he stood upon the ladder to point out the emblem. At the incarnation of Jesus, this ladder was truly set up; and much intercourse was then carried on between the family above and the family below: therefore angels are described as descending and ascending on the ladder. And, sir, if Jesus Christ may represent himself by a *door*, why not also by a *ladder*? Jesus explains the riddle, when he tells Nicodemus, *No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man, who is in heaven,* is now in heaven by his divine nature, while his human nature like the ladder's foot, rests on earth. (John iii. 13.) Again he tells his disciples, *Where I am, there shall ye be also.* (John xii. 26.) He does not say, where I shall be, there shall ye be also: but where I now *am*, even in heaven by my divine nature, there shall also my servant be. (See also John vii. 34—xvii. 24.)

Doctor, this vision of Jacob may be a very suitable emblem; but I fear it will not help me to the skies. A visionary ladder may serve a light-heeled angel, but will not suit my heavy corpse. I shall certainly miss the rounds, or they will break and let me drop; and a fall, only from the moon, would make lamentable work with my carcase. Therefore, unless you can provide me with another ladder, I must e'en grovel still on earth.

But, does it not seem strange, that angels should wait on men? I do not wait on my servant Tom, though he is my fellow creature. Indeed, this service of the angels oft amazeth me.

Sir, God's two families of angels and men, seem by the covenant of grace to be brought into one; and to bear a joint relation to a common head, Christ Jesus. Man, one branch, was cast out of order by the fall of Adam; and angels, the other branch, were in danger of falling, as appears by the ruin of their fellows. Both the families are now brought under one head, and the two branches grafted into a common stock, Christ Jesus. Henceforth, they receive all supplies *immediately* from this new head. In him they all unite; on him they all depend for peace and safety. By him angels are preserved from committing sin, and men redeemed from sin committed; through him, angels receive a confirmation in glory, and men obtain admission into glory.

This seems to be St. Paul's meaning, when he says, *That in the dispensation, (of grace manifested) at the full (or proper) time, God (ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι) hath gathered up again, into one head, even Christ, all things which are in Heaven, and which are on earth.* (Eph. i. 10.) Hence, *the whole family in heaven and earth, (being thus united in Christ) are named from him.* (Eph. iii. 15.) And as angels are the *chief* or higher branch of the family, they become waiting servants on the lower branch, according to Christ's command, *Whoever will be chief among you, let him be come your servant.* (Matt. xx. 27.)

It is not wonderful that angels wait on men, when the Lord of angels came from heaven to wait himself upon them, and to die for them. And this should teach superiors to pay the utmost condescension and the kindest offices to all beneath them. Angels perform this waiting service with cheerfulness, because there is no pride in heaven: that foul weed only groweth upon rotten dunghills.

(To be continued.)

ART. V. *A Letter from Theological Students in Scotland.*

[We copy from the Christian Intelligencer, the following letter from the Theological students of the United Secession Church, to the Society of Inquiry of the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Dutch Church. Our readers doubtless will regard it as possessing a character sufficiently *liberal*, even for the latitude of these United States, and the young gentlemen from whom it emanated as nearly ready to burst from "the limits of sectarian inclosures," shake off "the spirit of narrow minded bigotry," leap over "the hedge of little peculiarities," no longer "regarding the minutest forms," but "restored to pristine excellence by a return to the liberalities and charities of the gospel"!]

UNITED SECESSION, Divinity Hall, }
EDINBURGH, 14th Sept. 1835. }

DEAR BRETHREN—Your very interesting and friendly epistle has been received. It was read at the last meeting of our Society, and received with unanimous approbation and christian sympathy. Agreeing with you in these enlarged sentiments which you express, of the propriety and the duty of Christians extending their charities and co-operation beyond the limits of sectarian inclosures or national territory, and of communicating effectually with all "who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity;" we concur cordially in your invitation to frequent and regular correspondence. As nothing has tended more to mar the beauty and efficiency of the Church of God, than that spirit of narrow minded bigotry; which has induced many of her sects to hedge themselves round with little peculiarities, and to refuse all fellowship with those who differed from them, even

regarding the minutest forms; so nothing will contribute more effectually, to restore her pristine excellence than a return to the liberalities and charities of the gospel. Accordingly we unite with you in hailing every return to this spirit as a token for good. And we are confident that while the question with many in former times has been "How shall we differ?" the grand question for the future will be "How shall we agree?" We are particularly gratified at the anticipations of an annual epistle from you, Dear Brethren, as you dwell in a land recommended to us by a thousand agreeable associations as regards the past, and by many delightful anticipations as regards the future. When viewed politically, and still more, when contemplated in its religious aspect, America is looked to by every christian philanthropist as the scene of the most extensive and interesting experiments. On the religious state of your country, therefore, and on its political condition as far as it effects the interest of the church, we shall always be glad to receive information.

We observe what you state regarding your system of Theological tuition, and so far as we are able to judge, we think it must be an efficient one. We trust the chair for ecclesiastical history and church government, will have the effect of maintaining among you the principles of Presbyterianism in all their purity and vigor. Standing as it does, between the two extremes of Episcopacy and Independency, it seems to unite the advantages of both, without the evils of either.

Our friend and former fellow student Mr. Lillie, will probably have informed you of the nature and amount of theological instruction which we were accustomed to enjoy. A beneficial change has been effected upon our system since his departure from Scotland. The number of our professors, which were formerly two, has been increased to four. Professor Balmes, for Systematic Theology, Professor Duncan, for Pastoral Theology, Professor Brown for Exegetical Theology, and Professor Mitchel for Biblical Literature. The present number of our students is one hundred and twenty-five, and our term of study is five years, or five sessions of eight weeks. During the recess of the Hall our education is under the direction of our respective Presbyteries, and by them we are subject to frequent examinations on Theology and Church History, besides delivering before them occasional lectures and sermons. Connected with the Hall there is a Theological society for the reading and criticising of discourses, a Voluntary Church Society for advancing the principles of Voluntaryism, and a Missionary Society which meets weekly during the session, for prayer and other exercises, and collects annually a considerable sum for missions.

Your valuable table of American religious statistics has gratified us not a little. It is pleasing to contemplate the spirit of intense activity, which animates America in her religious as well as her political concerns. It was a noble example of the power and expansiveness of christian benevolence when you determined to plant a sabbath school in every American hamlet and to give a bible to every house. And that pledge so admirably and speedily redeemed, will animate you, we trust, to still sublimer efforts. Let us remember, dear brethren, that our "field is the world," and that the spread of missionary enterprize must never cease, until idolatry and superstition have become the themes of history.

It is our peculiar privilege and our highest honor, that we have been born so near the millennial times, that some of the beams of the latter day glory have been permitted to shine upon your path, and that to us (to Americans and to Britons) has been entrusted the conveyance of the oracles of truth, of the message of mercy to all the benighted and idolatrous regions of the earth.

We lament with you the luxuriant growth of heresy which you tell us has of late arisen among you, threatening to mar at once your uni-

ty and efficiency. Besides the cause which you assign as partly accounting for this melancholy circumstance, it is probably owing, to a great extent, to a spirit of daring and reckless speculation. This unsanctified tendency has in past times, rent the church of Europe asunder; and now, if the spirit of God restrain it not, it seems destined to inflict unspeakable injury on the churches of America. The indulgence of such a spirit is highly irrational. The fact is that all the doctrines have a practical aspect, and it is not, therefore, from the heights of speculation, but from the point of practice, that it is most natural for the enlightened and humble christian to contemplate. It is one of the proudest distinctions of our religion, but which these men appear to condemn or overlook, that while other systems are easiest in theory, it is easiest in practice. Here, indeed, all difficulties of christianity end. Whatever difficulties have been suggested with regard to it, are purely speculative, and have commonly owed their origin to men who had no mind to practice the religion they opposed. None, who, with intelligence have, brought christianity to bear on life, have ever complained that they discovered any blanks in its action, or any of their wants unfurnished. O, brethren, yield not to the influence of such a spirit. Cultivate the humility which is opposed to it, and earnestly contend for the faith once delivered to the saints. We trust and hope that, by the blessing of God, this temporary spread of error and breach of harmony will be seen to be short lived.

We feel grateful to our divine King and Head that our church yet remains free from all infection of heresy. There is not a single pulpit in the secession church, from which the doctrines of Pelagius or Socinus, or even of Arminius would be tolerated. The pulpits of the establishment worship, though in many instances filled by men who neither approve nor promulgate Evangelical Christianity, are (probably in the main through the influence of Dissenterism) more frequently filled by orthodox ministers than they were accustomed to be. The two great circumstances, however, which distinguish the religious aspect of the churches of Britain, are the progress of Voluntaryism and the increase of the spirit of missionary exertions. In reference to the former, though it is not progressing with all the rapidity that sanguine minds anticipated, it is advancing as speedily as those who know the obstinacy of prejudices, and the power of self interest, could reasonably expect. The advocates of Voluntaryism have not been backward with petitions to government, their energies have hitherto been chiefly directed to the illumination of the popular mind. The beneficial change produced upon our Legislature by the passing of the Reform Bill has rendered this step the wisest. Henceforth, whenever the enlightened and virtuous of this nation determine on the propriety of any measure, that measure must speedily triumph. Conversions to the voluntary principle are being daily effected, and one of the most virtuous and influential and celebrated of Scottish laymen (James Douglas, of Cavers) has lately declared himself a Voluntary. A large and talented portion of the press is with us, and in every newspaper and magazine throughout the kingdom the question is attracting more or less of attention. The spirit of the age, too, is with us—that spirit, which, rejecting the mere commendations of antiquity, tries every thing by the simple test of its utility. Above all, dear brethren, God is with us, both in the statutes and predictions of his word, and this one fact emboldens us to proceed in the face of calumny, of opposition, and not unfrequently of worldly interest, to hasten by every effort in our power the return of the church's liberty.

As regards the spirit of missionary exertion, we delight to inform you that it is decidedly on the increase. In our own body, home missions are conducted on a very extensive scale, and much more efficiently than they were accustomed to be. A number of our stations have of late ma-

tured into congregations and now enjoy the blessing of a stated ministry. The attention of our synod has for some years been directed to Canada, and in that interesting field we have now nine missionaries receiving our support and superintendence. Jamaica too, has become the scene of our missionary activity, and in that to us peculiarly interesting scene of labor, we hope soon to see a flourishing band of our missionaries actively engaged in educating the negro. A change has of late been effected in our missionary tactics, from which we anticipate the most gratifying results. Though the missionaries are sent out under the direction and control of our supreme court, they nevertheless, go as the missionaries of one congregation. From this one congregation they draw their support, and with it they are instructed to hold a very frequent intercourse. Thus a mutual sympathy is kept up between the individual congregation, and the missionary; and the spirit of benevolent enterprize acts and reacts beautifully between them. We notice your interesting statement respecting Mississippi, and the time may yet come when our missionaries shall go forth to labor there also. What has contributed to propogate and increase missionary spirit in the midst of us, has been the establishment of meetings in all our churches to receive intelligence regarding the success of this sacred cause in various quarters of the world, and to solicit the abundant aids and influences of the Divine Spirit upon those devoted men who have gone forth to the conversion of the heathen.

Finally, dear brethren, farewell. Far distant as we are from each other, it is a reflection truly and intensely delightful, that to both there is one God and one Father, that we are all embarked in the same great cause, and serve all that Heavenly Master, in the multitude of whose ransomed ones shall be numbered "many from all kindreds and peoples, and tongues."

And now, dear Brethren, peace be with you, and love with faith from God the Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ.

in the name of the Society,

JOHN N. PEDEN, Secretary.

ART. VI. *Timely Commentary.*

"Of these things put them in remembrance, charging them before the Lord, that they strive not about words to no profit, but to the subverting of the hearers."—2. Tim. ii. 14.

It is a great sin to agitate the church with a controversy about *words*. Such a contention is unprofitable to those engaged in it, and equally so to those who merely witness it. But the evil is not merely negative. It is positively injurious. It subverts the hearers. When certain great truths of the Gospel have, from time immemorial, been held, and expressed in the same words; words well understood, and always associated with the same ideas: words which by Scripture and long usage, are sanctioned, as the appropriate vehicles of the ideas which they have uniformly expressed; it is injurious to introduce new ones, and strenuously contend for them, as better adapted to convey the ideas professedly held. No profit can accrue from it. It moreover tends to subvert the faith of the hearers, by effecting a corresponding change in their opinions, or at least throwing them into doubt and uncertainty. New words are commonly but pioneers to new doctrine. We are exhorted to "hold fast the *form of sound words*." This we cannot do, if we let them drop, and adopt new ones.

The history of the church abundantly shows that in all ages, those who introduced, and advocated erroneous doctrines, found fault with and opposed the accustomed, and well understood phraseology in which the true doctrines were expressed: while at the same time no change in the doctrines themselves would honestly be avowed. Paul tells Timothy that Alexander the copper smith, greatly withstood his words (2 Tim. iv. 15.) The advocates for new words may say that they are good words and fair expressions of the mind of the sacred writers: and very plausible explanations may be given, but Paul, writing to the Romans says, (Rom. xvi. 17, 18.) "Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them that cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them. For they that are such, serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly, and by *good words* and *fair speeches* deceive the

hearts of the simple." Hence the same Apostle tells the Ephesians (Eph. v. 6.) "Let no man deceive you with vain words." Here then we see that such words are vain, of no profit; and that they subvert the hearers by deceiving them. Many are deceived by this course, and led to believe that the difference is only in words. The Apostle and elders had to caution the churches against such, (Acts xv. 24.) They say, "We have heard that certain which went out from us, have troubled you *with words*, subverting your souls."

These new words are not understood by the people, and thus they are deceived and not edified. "So likewise ye, except ye utter words easy to be understood, how shall it be known what is spoken?" (1 Cor. xiv. 9.)

Now while the opposers of error in these days, feel convinced and every where profess, that they are contending for principles and doctrines; the propagators of error, profess to differ from them only in words. The former cannot be silent while great doctrines are at stake: this can not in reason be expected of them. The contenders for mere words should listen to the injunction of the Apostle, and cease to strive for words. Such strife for mere words causes divisions in the church. The orthodox believe that they differ with their opposers in more than words; even in essential doctrines, while the latter profess to differ only in words; Which in justice and reason, should yield?

Bickersteth, in his "Christian Student," speaking of the boasted improvements professed to have been made by the divines of the English Restoration and Revolution, observes that,

"The improvements which these excellent men introduced, by no means compensated for their defects of evangelical statements, and their keeping in the back ground the peculiar doctrines of the gospel.

"The danger of giving up scriptural expressions, and changing for those we think less offensive, is very great, and the presumption very daring. Witsfus speaks justly against the over-refined delicacy of giving up phrases of Scripture for our own fancied smoother and more judicious expressions.

"Robert Hall observes, with his accustomed terseness, 'If it be replied, Why adhere to an offensive term when its meaning may be expressed in other words, or at least by a more circuitous mode of expression? The obvious answer is, that words and ideas are closely associated, and though ideas give birth to terms, appropriate terms become in their turn the surest safeguard of ideas, insomuch that a truth which is never announced but in a circuitous and circumlocutory form, will either have no hold, or a very feeble one on the public mind. The anxiety with which the precise, the appropriate term is avoided, bespeaks a shrinking, a timidity, a distrust, with relation to the idea conveyed by it, which will be interpreted as equivalent to its disavowal.' We would press this point because of our strong conviction of the many evils of giving up Scripture phraseology. The thing escapes with the term, or is deepened or otherwise in the impression of its importance according to the strength or weakness of the term employed to designate it. What words did Paul use to preach the gospel? 1. Cor. ii. 1, 4, 13. The original cast of the truth of Revelation, naturally seems to require a corresponding originality in the mode of expression through which they are communicated, in order that the ideas intended to be conveyed by them, may as far as possible be precise and determinate."—*Presbyterian*.

ART. VII. *Miscellany.*

The Lawfulness and Necessity of Creeds and Confessions—A Sermon by Rev. WILLIAM J. GIBSON, Pastor of the Ninth Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia.

This sermon is well deserving of an attentive perusal. The sentiments contained in it are scriptural, seasonable and in general happily expressed. We hope it will be a means of effecting much good in the church to which the author belongs. It is pleasing to witness a presbyterian minister, especially at such a time, boldly standing forth in defence of the venerable, but shamefully despised standards of his own church. And were all the orthodox ministers connected with the General Assembly to pursue a similar course, and exert themselves, according to their several abilities, in maintaining the cause of truth, their church would soon become purged of heresy, and her present distracted state, which has chiefly been induced by a disbelief in "the Lawfulness and Necessity of Creeds and Confessions," would soon be healed. The following is a specimen of Mr. Gibson's style and argument.

"Finally. The opposers of creeds have always been heretics.

"I know this may be termed the invidious argument, but it is of no less weight and consideration in the present controversy. Search the history of the church from the time of the first heretic of any note, to the present times, and you will find without a single exception, that the opposers of creeds have always been heretics! They never opposed creeds until creeds were opposed to them! Creeds have always been insurmountable barriers in the way of the successful propagation of heresy, and until they

are removed, or fall into disrepute, the heretic can never hope to succeed in removing the landmarks of truth. Does not this constitute the strongest of all arguments in behalf of creeds? If the truth is of any importance, and above all, if it is the instrument in the hand of the Holy Spirit of the sanctification of the people of God, ought we not to embrace and appreciate the only means of maintaining truth, and the only security against the introduction of heresy. The prevalence of heresy is only retarded by the adherence to our sound and scriptural creeds, and the removing of them will be as the opening of the floodgates to every system that is dangerous in doctrine, and unscriptural in practice. Creeds are the first object of assault to every heretic, and when this is successful, more than half his work of desolation is accomplished. It is a startling consideration, and ought to arouse every friend of truth, that the opposers of creeds have *always* been heretics! No man in any age of Christianity that could possibly by any liberality of construction be termed orthodox, was ever known to array himself in opposition to sound and scriptural creeds—or to the principle of a creed, apart from the consideration of its orthodoxy."

MORE UNION.—A circular has been published in Massachusetts, proposing union of action in the promotion of Sabbath School instruction, in which we find the following passage; "what a delightful sight to see Methodists, Baptists, Congregationalists, Episcopalians, *Universalists, &c.*, all joined in amicable deliberation upon this holy and engrossing subject!" The Editor of the (Unitarian) *Christian Register* of Boston, in referring to this liberal scheme of union remarks:

"It binds together by the bonds of sympathy and love the disciples of a common Master, who, under other circumstances, are too apt to think that they show the sincerity of their faith, by the zeal they display in the cause of their own sect, as able and constant partisans."

We must confess that we cannot keep pace with such a march of religious improvement; but it is not improbable that some in our Church may yet discover that Unitarianism, and Universalism, are merely "errors of the head and not of the heart," and may be admitted as holding with us for "substance of doctrine" provided they are not accompanied by "viciousness of life."—*Presbyterian.*

Sacred Music.

A respected friend has sent us the following extract from the 35th letter of Doctors Reed and Matherson's "Visit to the American Churches," with the hope that the first criticism it contains may not be wholly useless. The evil of which they complain, is not—we are sorry to say—confined to a single denomination, but seems to be regarded with favor, in too many of our churches. We presume that a majority of its advocates will not openly contend, that the congregation should not join in the songs of Zion, yet the manner in which this part of divine worship is frequently conducted, renders it apparently,—at least—an act of temerity for any, except the scientific choir to join in it. The result has been, that in this particular, many of our churches have become mere concert rooms, where a few are liberally remunerated for their vocal performances, and an act of solemn devotion is converted into a matter of musical taste.

Religious Intelligencer.

Extract from the thirty-fifth Letter of Doctors REED and MATHERSON'S Visit to the American Churches.

"I have, I believe, already described the usual order of public worship; it is in the four principal denominations, most pleasantly like our own. I have nevertheless, something to observe on its manner. The singing generally, and universally with the Congregationalists, is not Congregational. It is a performance entrusted to a band of singers, more or less skilful; and as such, may sometimes afford one pleasure, but as an act of worship, it disappoints you greatly; at least if you have been accustomed to the more excellent way. You have the sense of being a spectator and auditor; not of a participant; and this is destructive of the spirit of devotion. With its best execution, it is not half so fine as the concurrent voices of a thousand persons, pouring forth their grateful sentiments in holy psalmody; and in its lowest estate, it is poor and chilling indeed. A good sermon is often made, or marred by the hymn. I fear many a one has been sadly marred by it in New England. I recollect on one occasion, before sermon, that beautiful hymn of Watts', "Come Holy Spirit, heavenly dove," &c. was sung. There were some seven hundred people present; but the hymn rested with six or seven persons in the gallery. The last line of each stanza was left to the female voices. At the line, "And our devotions die," to give the dying notes the more effect, it was left to one voice. The young woman kept her breath and diminished her tones as long as she could, and then turned round on her companions and smiled.

On another occasion, which was a special meeting of prayer and exhortation for the conversion of the world, I inquired of my brethren, uniting with me in the service, whether we could not close with the fine doxology, "From all that dwell below the skies," &c., and the Old Hundredth tune? "Most certainly," was the cheerful reply.

It appeared, however, that there was another party to be consulted. Our wish was conveyed to the singers; and the singers sent their respects, saying that they could not sing it, as they were prepared with another piece. The consequence was, that a solemn service was closed, and sadly cooled down by a performance in which none could join, in which none were meant to join, and in which none cared to join. Much laudable attention is now paid to the psalmody of the churches; and one may hope that it will lead to a preference of congregational singing; as finer in taste, and as essential to an expression of common worship. To be so it must cease to be professional; for the professors will seek to exclude the people. It must be steadily considered as an act of worship, in which all should unite; and the maxim must be,—that display is not worship. I am persuaded the Congregational body suffers much in comparison with others, from the want of this. Their music, when well executed, may be attractive, but it is not edifying; it may suit heterodoxy, and help it; but it is not a suitable medium for warm affections and universal praise. It is also a strange departure from the practices of their fathers. The Puritans and Presbyterians are renowned for a common delight in the exercise of worship; and many a hill-side rung with the solemn melody of their united praises."

Funeral Among the Natives.

On Wednesday, the 11th of March, the obsequies of Betsy McKinzie, oldest daughter of old *Mama*, were performed on the Island at present occupied by the retainers of that once wealthy and respectable family. This island, in the days in which the unholy traffic in slaves was carried on here, was the entrepot of the surrounding country, and became the residence of the rich. Since the hydra has been dislodged and driven from this section of the country, it has been converted into a cemetery. Knowing the dignity of the family of which the deceased was a member, we concluded the pomp, (or rather mummery,) would be correspondent, and therefore at the time appointed, repaired to the scene. Arriving there, the first object which struck our vision, was one from which our civilized sensibilities recoiled—the body was in a coffin, considerably too much contracted in dimensions, to admit the top to go down to its proper place. Our readers can fancy the only method by which it could be attached to the sides; and that method was eventually resorted to. The grave was dug in a house covered with thatch, and enclosed on the sides with mats, in which the corpse also was placed, on an elevation raised by the earth from the excavation. Shortly after our arrival, the ceremony commenced; the dancers were in one group, and the mourners in another. The former performed their part, by marching in regular processions through the town, displaying and firing muskets; making a circuit each time of the house containing the body, and dancing, or rather dodging to the most inharmonious sounds to which the term music was ever prostituted; at the same time writhing their whole frames into every contortion and gesticulation of which they were capable. The dancing procession consisted partly of very ancient women, and among the latter, was one over whom, in our opinion, a hundred rainy seasons have howled their thunder, who displayed a degree of animation and muscular vigor, that was truly astonishing. We were almost led to conclude that the old matron had discovered the philosopher's stone, that the alchemists so anxiously but vainly sought.

Near the house, in front of that containing the corpse, Far Gay, (noted for juggling abilities,) was submitting a number of women to trial in the following ceremony; each woman was provided with a small stone, or pebble, and into a brass kettle placed in the midst, each was separately made to throw her pebble, pronouncing in the act this invocation: "If I kill this woman, (alluding to the deceased,) God must kill me just as I throw this stone into this kettle." This ceremony has reference to a belief existing among all the African tribes along this part of the coast, that no rich person dies by the visitation of God: their death is always the result of the evil machinations of their own domestics, political rivals, or other interested persons. This being done, the pebbles were, with all due form, placed in the head of the coffin. The deceased was then harrangued, but what the orator said, not understanding the language, we were unable to comprehend; we were however afterwards told, he exhorted her to take vengeance on her murderers. Every emphatical word of the orator was responded to by a stroke on the breast of the deceased, (the lid of the coffin being off,) with a stick which, when the harrangue was over, was placed in the coffin. A razor was next brought and placed between the cloths that enveloped the body; with which, we were told, she would inflict death on the person that witched her. After this, a sheep was immolated, and held while bleeding alternately over the grave and the body, until both were pretty well stained. Powder was next put in requisition, and ignited on the body. The eulogium was then pronounced in recitative, which gradually melted into a tolerably solemn dirge. The performer occupied so much time, that others who were anxious to participate in the honor of officiating became weary, and manifested considerable impatience; a deep growl, however, from Far Gay, brought the orator to a close. Far Gay immediately commenced and occupied the remainder of the time allotted to

this part of the ceremony. On being informed that the body would not be deposited until the rice for the deceased's dinner was ready, we stepped to the house of mourning. There we saw a dozen women ranged in columns on the ground, pouring forth the most bitter lamentations, writhing and twisting the muscles of their faces, with evident labor, in order, if possible, to discompose their lachrimaries, and cause an egress of "eye water." This scene afforded us the most conclusive evidence of the difference between mourning and grieving. Old Mama wept without any difficulty; her tears were the overflowing of a heart big with grief; those of the others, were the result of the contrivance of mercenaries procured for the occasion; or of domestics who endeavored to please the mistress, by thus expressing their attachment to the daughter; but who, no doubt, wept as many on such occasions, in other and civilized sections of the earth, weep that their masters have just died. Rice being ready, we were notified that the deposit was about to be made, and repaired to the spot. A bowl of rice saturated with palm-oil and neatly served up, was placed in the head of the coffin; the top was then put on and the whole lowered in the grave. Four men jumped on it, who, with those on the outside, commenced throwing the earth with their hands, and in a few minutes the excavation was completely filled up. As soon as the earth was all placed on the spot, the dancing tribe was called in: and they performed their part by dancing to the music, following each other in a circle, and crossing the grave about midway. This mode of dancing was in a few moments abandoned, and resort had to another, unusual at least in the civilized world, which was by kneeling and accompanying the discordant beat of the drum, by regular and well timed pulsations of the hands on the ground, until the place that covered the newly-deposited tenant showed no indications of having been lately disturbed. Five or six muskets heavily charged, were then fired over the spot, and the mummery closed by placing a cotton string diagonally over the whole length of the grave, and which, Far Gay endeavored to persuade us would inevitably catch the person that witched the deceased.

It is really to be lamented that these poor deluded people are so ignorant, as to be thus imposed upon. That the great mass of them believe this string possesses a magic charm, we have no doubt; consequently, whoever hereafter should be accused by the headmen of the death of this woman will by general consent be found guilty. In such cases, evidence is never thought of: simple accusation, by any one, is conclusive evidence; that some one will be accused before three months have rolled away, we have no doubt; and woe be to the person, if he should not be able to purchase a commutation of punishment, perpetual slavery will be the inevitable consequence. Thus the artful and designing headmen keep the people in ignorance that they may the more easily dupe them.—*Liberia Herald*.

QUERIES addressed to Y, the author of an article in the February number of the Religious Monitor, on the nature and extent of the obligations assumed in religious covenanting:

1. Can any circumstance, end, or motive lower the standard of moral obedience; or can the law, for any reason, ask less of the saint than it does of the sinner?
2. Does God now covenant with man to receive an obedience less holy than that which he required in the first covenant?
3. What kind of failure in the performance of moral duty, is that at which God is not angry?
4. Does God's withholding that grace necessary to perform perfect obedience, excuse the believer from performing it?
5. Is there any moral difference in the obligation of the law, in the hands of Christ, as Mediator, and as God in his essential character?
6. In what sense does moral impossibility free any person from an obligation to render perfect obedience to the Divine law?
7. In what sense does the believer, in covenanting, recognise the perfect holiness of the Divine Law?

W.

QUERY.—Your correspondent Y thinks that in vowing or covenanting we ought not to vow perfect obedience. Will he or some other of your able correspondents, tell us *what we are to leave out*? The Lord is our strength promised—that is perfect. The Law is the rule and measure of our obedience—that is perfect. Perfect holiness is the design of all gospel ordinances, and if our vow is not to stand in harmony with these, he is bound to tell us what we are to *leave out*.

G.

A correspondent very properly suggests, that, as there is no obligation assumed in Covenanting different from that assumed in making a profession of religion, and that as the usual mode of stating the question is calculated to excite, in some minds, a prejudice against the duty of Religious Covenanting, it would be better to have the question stated in the following terms—"What is the extent of the obligation assumed by persons making a public profession of the name of Christ?"

THE
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,

AND

EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

MAY, 1836.

ART. I. *Medical Writers.*

(Concluded from page 331.)

The third chapter considers "what is required of us, or rather, what we are enabled to do that we may obtain salvation and possess the world to come." The view he gives of the doctrines of faith and repentance agrees with the standards of our church and consequently we believe with the word of God. Nevertheless he seems to depart from them so far as to place repentance before faith. "The first thing required of us is repentance." When he comes to discuss the doctrine of faith, however, he makes it equal in point of time. "Faith in Jesus Christ, is naturally an attendant on 'repentance from dead works.' There can be no true faith without repentance, and there can be no true repentance without faith. These two acts of the mind are coeval, though not equal in their operation. There may be much sorrow for sin, strong desires to turn to God, when there is little faith discernible; but still this principle of faith has even at first an operation. For it is difficult to conceive a christian repentance without some hope of acceptance, and there can be no hope without a saviour." Although the subject is deeply interesting, yet we must be limited in our quotations, giving but one more passage on this subject. "But although belief in Jesus, and reliance on him be necessary to salvation, yet faith is not the cause of our salvation, nor the condition on which we are saved. Faith is an act* of the mind, as well as benevolence to man, or love to God, and fallen man can no more be saved on account of his faith, as a thing meritorious, than he can be saved by fasting. He is not to be saved without faith, but he is as little to be saved on account of it. He is saved by grace, that is by favor or mercy. This mercy gave him a saviour, this mercy granted him repentance, communi-

* Although he here defines faith to be an act of the mind—he can by no means be said to agree with the opinion of some modern New Lights, who have discovered that it is not a principle—but simply an act of the mind; and is itself imputed for righteousness. Barnes' Notes on the Romans, p. 94. The author was probably less careful in the selection of the terms he employed, from his not being conversant with the controversy to which the new divinity has given rise, as many orthodox divines spoke of faith as a "condition of the covenant of grace," before the controversy on the Arminian doctrine was agitated. The author in other places correctly defines faith to be a principle. "There are different degrees of faith, but the principle itself is essential to a christian. Some are represented as being full of faith, others as possessing it only as a grain of mustard seed. But in whatever degree it exists, its nature is the same, and its effects are similar. It ruleth in the heart, it operateth on the thoughts and actions, it is a *living principle* in the mind of man." "It is to the soul what life is to the body." "We can no more begin faith, than we can communicate life."

cated to him faith, and all the blessings obtained through Christ. Salvation is a free gift to man, but it is procured by Jesus. He is the mean, salvation is the end, but to us the gift is free." "Perhaps the first reproach of the convert, and the last sorrow of the dying christian, is, that he has so inadequately estimated, and so little honored, the work of Christ." "The ends for which man was created, were to glorify God and enjoy him forever, and every thought and action, ought to be directed to these ends."

The remaining chapters in the book are taken up with the consideration of the several duties under these heads. *First*, "Personal duties." *Second*, "Relative, or those we owe to others." *Third*, "Duties to God."

The chapter which treats of the personal duty of improving our time is well written and impressive. We cannot refrain from giving a short quotation. "We are to be diligent in the improvement of the mind especially in heavenly wisdom. We are not to be listless or inactive, but are even to gather up the fragments of time, and employ every portion in a useful way. The mind, indeed, as well as the body must have some relaxation, but no more is to be allowed, than is necessary to recruit and preserve its vigor. Merely a change of mental operation is relief, and there is no opinion more false and dangerous than this, that the mind, to be recruited, must be indulged in frivolous pursuits. It cannot always study and investigate, but it can relax, and yet be invigorated, by indulging in imaginations beneficial to mankind, or by devotional reflections. No man will pretend to maintain, that after secular cares and duties, or after some hours spent in study, the mind shall be more relaxed by indulging in vain, and frivolous, if not directly sinful imaginations; or by the gratification of selfish or vicious passions, than by a train of thought, embracing the happiness of others, or promoting our love to God. Neither has any man ever yet proved, that the mind is better relaxed and subsequently invigorated, by reading works addressed solely to the imagination, and whose tendency is to dissipate every serious thought, and inspire sentiments, or desires, of a doubtful, if not positively of a vicious nature, than by the perusal of books of piety or science."

In speaking of relative duties, he insists much on the duty of love to our neighbor. Shewing that it is the spirit of Christ. "Like Christ we are not merely to love the good, but all mankind. We are to promote the true happiness of the sinners though we hate the sin. If this had not been the disposition of our Lord, man had never been redeemed. He from divine, and infinite love came into the world to save sinners, to seek those who were lost, to lay down his life for those who had broken all his laws."

The third chapter treats of the duty of gentleness and meekness—a consequence of love, and fruit of the Spirit, "He who is thoroughly meek will be gentle and kind to all men. The christian is polite from principle; for true politeness consists in being gentle, obliging, and refraining from whatever can hurt the feelings of others."

The twelfth, and four succeeding chapters, respect those duties which are peculiar to the relation in which we stand to one another, as husband and wife, parents and children, masters and servants, magistrates and subjects, pastors and flock. "The first relation to be considered, is that of husband and wife—that, in which Adam and Eve stood, and received the blessing of God." Another duty is conjugal affection "let every one of you in particular so love his wife, even as himself, and the wife see that she reverence her husband." "Husbands love your wives, and be not bitter against them;" "giving honor unto the wife as unto the weaker vessel." "Wives submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as it is fit in the Lord." The duty of the husband is to love, cherish, comfort and

provide for his wife. The duty of the wife, is to love, solace and encourage her husband amid his cares and trials, yielding to his authority as given by God. When there is perfect and mutual love, there will be no desire to exert authority, on the one part, no occasion for it on the other. Doubtless God hath made the wife subject to the husband, and she who resists and disobeys, breaks the commands of God. But the husband, also, hath received an injunction to cherish the wife, and not to be bitter against her. He is not to exercise unreasonable authority, or to control, for the pleasure of receiving obedience. He must give an account for every harsh word, every breach of love, every temptation his conduct may afford to diminish the love and respect of his wife. Besides these duties it is binding on both, to promote each others progress in religion, and to assist one another in their pilgrimage to that better country where they hope to dwell. The more perfectly that this duty is performed, the greater will be the advantage of the connexion, and the higher will the happiness be, which results from it. Were this practical, we should hear of no unhappy marriages, no domestic quarrels, no indifference or disaffection. Matrimonial misery results from an imprudent union at first, and the neglect of this duty afterwards. Those who are "unequally yoked together," who have chosen a partner for life, without religion, must not be disappointed, if marriage should prove unhappy. Those who marry from the impulse of a transient passion, or, from motives of interest, must not wonder, that marriage does not realize their expectations of happiness.

He who marries for money, has no cause to complain if he obtain nothing else. He who marries a woman without education, or, what is worse, without common sense, must not be surprised if, instead of a comfort, he meet only with a trial of his patience." The relative duties of parents and children are next noticed; on which we shall give but one short extract. Happy would it be for the children of religious parents, if these directions were more frequently attended to. "Before dismissing this subject, I may just advert to the advice to be given by a parent, to his children, in the choice of a profession, and in the prospect of marriage. In both of these, let him be actuated by a desire for the solid happiness and eternal benefit of his children. Let no prospect of temporal prosperity, no temptation of riches, or honor, ever lead to the recommendation of any plan which might ruin, or even endanger, the spiritual hopes of his children."

The last chapter under this head, which treats of the duties of the ministers of God and his flock, is so important, that we cannot refrain from quoting almost the entire passage.

"The ministers of God, and their flock are connected by a spiritual tie. To the pastor is committed the preaching of the everlasting word, and the instruction of the people in the means of salvation. He is responsible for the consequences, and God himself hath solemnly declared, that he will require the souls of his flock at his hand. He undertakes a very dangerous office, and will do well to consider the consequences. He is a minister of Christ, a successor of the Apostles, and if he preach any other doctrine than they preached, it is at his peril. He is to shew them their natural state, to convince them of their guilt, and lead them to that Saviour, who alone can redeem them. Cold themes of morality, can do little good in any respect, but none at all in rousing sinners, and bringing them to the fountain opened for sin and pollution. The duty of a clergyman is, to make himself well acquainted with the word of God, to pray for the aid of the spirit of wisdom and understanding, to satisfy himself how his own soul is to be saved, and to recommend that method to others, which he himself is honestly resolved to trust to, for his own salvation. He is neither to preach a dead faith nor the efficacy of works, but a living faith, and the fruit which proves that Christ dwells in the soul. His first and

only object is to save sinners, for that was the object of his Master, and he is to do so by bringing them to him. He must earnestly endeavor to convince men that they require a Saviour, for if they do not, surely the Son of God had not consented to die for them; and he must shew them that Jesus is the only Saviour, the way, the truth, and the life. If he feel not this himself, he cannot teach others; if he do, he will enforce the doctrine of the cross. Let him teach dilligently, studiously, and with fervent prayers, prepare his exhortations and discourses, and let him preach them earnestly and plainly. I can conceive no greater mark of folly, and a weak judgement, as well as a cold heart, than a man bestowing all his attention to what may be called stage effect. How miserably, in general, do these orators fail. Their affectation, their attempts at sublimity, at pathos, at action, excite the pity of every man of taste. He who is aware of the importance of his subject, never can have his attention fixed on attitudes, and modulation of the voice. He who mounts the pulpit to preach Jesus Christ, loses all thought of himself. He goes not there to exhibit himself. He goes to call sinners to salvation, to preach repentance and remission of sins, through the infinite mercy of God, and the atonement of Jesus Christ; to call them from the vanities of time to the glories of eternity." "He will so blend doctrine with practice, that the connection of the one with the other may never be forgotten. Whilst he constantly maintains Christ to be the vine, he will also uniformly prove, that those who abide in him must bring forth fruit. He will not be satisfied with preaching the gospel in the pulpit, but will be careful to discharge all other duties of his office. He will visit the sick, instruct the ignorant, encourage the weak, comfort the afflicted, excite the faithful, relieve the poor, and set, in himself, an example of love to God, love to man, faith in Christ. I know not language sufficiently powerful to express the value of a christian ministry. The most elevated flight of the imagination, cannot reach the high and responsible station of one of the humblest ministers of Christ. He is sent in Christ's stead:—awful thought! He is sent, as a special messenger, from Him who died for the sins of men. He is sent with the promise of an accompanying spirit. He is ordained to promulgate the glad tidings of salvation to the guilty. Coming in the name of Christ, he ought to feel the force of what he says, "The spirit of the Lord God is upon me." The commission is from Jesus himself, and the subject of the message is, that this same Jesus died to save sinners. In the contemplation of the greatness of the subject, and the awful responsibility which devolves upon him, it is not surprising that the mind should, for a time, sink under the apprehension, that no man is sufficient for these things. But the promise of the spirit comes to his aid, and in proportion to the illumination of that spirit, and the grace given to behold the mystery of reconciliation, will be the earnestness of his labor; and from morning to night, from the beginning to the end of each successive year, he will point, with unceasing solicitation, to the cross of Christ. Jesus, in all his love, his obedience, his sufferings, and his free grace, must be the perpetual end and object of his ministration. His public services, and his ministration from house to house, in the season of dangerous gladness, and in the days of adversity, are indeed a transcript, however faint in impression, of the life and conduct of our Saviour on earth.

If such be the character of a christian minister, what ought to be the rejoicing of a Christian people? Ought they not to prize, above all things, this precious gift of God, and give to this man of apostolic labor, all the spiritual encouragement and affectionate support in their power? It is the duty of the flock to esteem their pastor, to encourage him in his work, to aid him in his endeavor to promote the success of the gospel, to respect and honor him, as having the rule over them, to supply his wants

freely ; to be charitable to his failings, not given to censure him ; to be diligent in the improvement of the blessings they enjoy under his ministry ; and to join with him in prayers, and in active endeavors for the reformation of manners, the propagation of the gospel, and the advancement of the kingdom of Christ."

As this article is already longer than we intended it should be, we cannot notice the two remaining chapters, treating "Of the duties men owe to God," and "Of the admonitions and consolations afforded by the Christian religion." Of these we may say generally, there is much important instruction to be derived from them. And although we may not agree with every thing which the author has advanced, yet we think his views in the main judicious and correct. And we cannot but feel grateful that he has redeemed the time, gathering up the fragments not devoted to his professional business, and given the Christian public a work so replete with instruction, and characterized by a strain of so fervent piety. And though we do not agree with the author in his views of the Dissenters, in his predilection for the established churches of England and Scotland, in their present state; yet it is gratifying to us, and must be to every friend of truth, to find that there are still some in those churches who are so zealous in defending many important truths. If the majority of members in those churches had been as sound in the faith as the author of this treatise seems to be, there would have been less ground for secession.

A.

ART. II.—*A supplement to the paper headed "immersion—not the scripture mode of baptism."**

MR. EDITOR,

If the reasoning in my preceeding paper be correct, as I am persuaded it is, it would seem to supercede any further argument on that point—but a friend has since suggested to me, that so much stress is laid, by the advocates of *immersion*, on another scripture expression which occurs in two passages, that it may be proper to advert to it, in order to show its true meaning, which I trust will also be found to yield as little support to the doctrine of immersion, as those which have already been examined. And notwithstanding the apparent *truism* of the terms, it will be found, that an unscriptural doctrine or practice, however plausible, never can be supported or proved by scripture.

The expression to which I have reference is, "buried with Christ by baptism." It occurs, Rom. vi. 4—and Col. ii. 12.

The passage in Romans and the immediate context read thus: "So many of us as were baptized into Christ Jesus, were baptized into his death. Therefore we were buried with him by baptism into death; that, like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall also be raised in the likeness of his resurrection." The other, (Col. ii. 10, 12,) reads thus: "And ye are complete in him which is the head of all principality and power; in whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ: buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him,

* We insert this paper, not because it contains any better reutation of the argument of the Baptists, than the remarks by BARRIZO on the same subject, but because it is more full, and because, independent of its bearing on the Baptist controversy, it is useful for edification, on account of the evangelical matter which it contains.—[Ed. Rzt. Mon.]

through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead." In these passages the Baptists take the expressions "*buried with him by baptism,*" and *buried with him in baptism,* to indicate the mode of baptism. The gist of their argument seems to be this—"that there ought to be a similitude between the sign and the thing signified; and consequently that baptism should be performed in such a way, that, being covered with water, there might be a resemblance of Christ's burial; and by being lifted up out of the water, a resemblance of his resurrection. Therefore, according to this argument, baptism not only signifies the using of the means of cleansing with water, but the mode, namely, *immersion,* or as it were, buried in the water."

To this it may be answered, in general, that in no other instance does the nature of a sacramental sign require an analogy between the thing done, or the sign, and the thing signified, otherwise than by the divine appointment. Accordingly the eating of bread and drinking of wine have no natural tendency to signify Christ and the benefits of his death. But by the divine appointment, the bread and wine are made to signify the body and blood of Jesus Christ. And our receiving of them, according to the divine institution of that ordinance, is made significant of our participating of the benefits of his death. So it is in baptism. If any other external sign had been instituted, to signify the same blessings, we should have been as much obliged to have made use of it, as we are of water. Therefore, we may conclude, that the apostle by these expressions, does not refer to our being buried in water or taken out of it, as a natural sign of Christ's burial and resurrection: but only of our having communion with him in his burial and resurrection.

But for sake of their respective contexts we shall briefly examine the passages separately. In the passage in the Romans, why is it necessary, our opponents may be asked, to attach a literal meaning to the word *buried*, rather than to the word *planted*? They are both used in the same context. Their literal significations are equally plain—and the inspired writer seems to lay as much stress on the one as on the other. The expression in v. 5, speaking of the believer's *being planted* together in the likeness of Christ's death, is a beautiful metaphor, in which the apostle compares Christ, who died and was buried and rose again from the dead, to a plant which, being covered or inserted in the earth, germinates in due time. What external sign do our Baptist friends find pointed out by this expression? And surely they are as much bound to understand this in a literal sense, as the other. But the truth is, they are both equally figurative expressions, setting forth the exercise of that grace, or rather those graces received by a faith's union to Jesus Christ. On the former expression, the judicious Scott, very appropriately remarks—that "the apostle, by his introductory question, most emphatically shews, that all who have been baptized into the name and religion of Jesus, had received the sign, and made the profession of communion with him, and conformity to him in his death; that, in virtue of his dying for their sins, they should die to all sin, and have done with former unholy indulgencies, pursuits, habits and connexions. This profession was equivalent to "being buried with Christ" "as dead with him." Christ's death, which preceded his burial, terminated his subjection to the law, on account of the sins of his elect imputed to him; the law could no longer take hold of him, for the only hold it ever had of him, was on account of sin imputed to him; his burial was a manifestation of his death—the believer's baptism then is a sign and seal of his participation in the benefits of Christ's death, and denotes that he is, or should be, dead to the law and to sin.

Mr. Scott, further adds on this passage—"great stress has been laid upon the expression, "buried with him by baptism into death," as proving that baptism ought to be performed by *immersion,* to which the apos-

tle is supposed to allude. But we are also said to be "crucified with Christ," and *circumcised* with him, without any allusion to the outward manner in which crucifixion and circumcision were performed: And as baptism is far more frequently [and he might have added, directly,] mentioned, with reference to the "*pouring out*" of the Holy Spirit; and as the apostle is evidently treating of the inward meaning, not the outward form of that ordinance; no conclusive argument is deducible from the expression, shewing that immersion is *necessary to baptism*, or even apart from other proof, that baptism was generally thus administered."

In the other passage, there is a succession of figures, designed, in different ways, to illustrate and enforce the same fact. Verse 11th, "In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision *made without hands*, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ." That is, in putting off the old man, you are circumcised without hands; the work is effected by the Holy Spirit—you are born again, which is spiritual circumcision. "Circumcision, is that of the *heart*." This renewing of the Holy Spirit, consists in putting off the body of sin, renouncing sin, and reforming the life. And thus we are "buried with him in baptism." As the burial of Jesus Christ, gave evidence that he had really died, having yielded up himself a sacrifice for sin; so we in our spiritual circumcision or baptism, show ourselves to be really dead to sin, having crucified the affections and lusts of the flesh. As Christ, when buried, was dead and separated from the world; so in regeneration the child of God, or true believer is separated from sin; and the dominion which sin formerly had over him is dissolved. He becomes a new creature, having put off the old man—he is buried from the sinful indulgencies and pursuits of the world.

The death, burial and resurrection of Christ, are not only causes of the death of our sins, our putting off the old man and becoming new creatures; but they typify and represent this great change. Thus we trust we have exhibited the true meaning of these passages, as it evidently appears from their connexion with their respective contexts. And in which we are sustained by a large majority of the most learned and judicious commentators, both ancient and modern. And here I might rest the question. But men are so prone, to hold on to a favorite doctrine, or prejudged sentiment, that they will never give up an argument, which has however reluctantly been pressed into the service, while they can protect it with even a shadow. But to show that these passages will not afford even a shadow of support to the cause of our Baptist friends, we remark further:—That,

In these texts, there is no more reference made to the water of baptism, than there is to the knife of circumcision, in the 11th verse in the context of the latter passage. The writer is speaking of that baptism, and that alone, in which we "are risen with Christ, through the faith, which is the operation of God." This certainly can be nothing less than *spiritual* baptism, or regeneration; for the most violent advocate for immersion, or burying, will not pretend that this, necessarily, is connected with "faith;" he will allow that it is *possible*, at least, for a person to be immersed or buried in *water*, and yet not have "the faith which is the operation of God." If he allow this, which he necessarily must, then these texts afford no support to his cause. It cannot be literal baptism, or baptism with water, which is spoken of in these passages.

Were not this the fact, nothing could be inferred respecting the *mode* of baptism. It would then only signify, that as Christ was buried and separated from the world, so in baptism, we are buried and separated from a world of sin. The absurdity of pleading for a literal construction of this figure will appear by applying the same principle to other figurative expressions. The same apostle says, (Gal. ii. 20,) "I am crucified

with Christ." Would any person infer from this, that Paul had been led to Calvary, nailed to the cross, and pierced with the soldier's spear? Even a Baptist must see the necessity of understanding this term figuratively; and would be at no loss to see that the term is used in the same sense that it is, Rom. vi. 6, "Our old man is *crucified* with him." Again, in the immediate context of one of the passages, (Col. ii. 11,) Christians are said to be "circumcised in Christ." Is this to be taken in a literal sense; or would any one infer from this that all Christians undergo the bloody rites of the Jews? Christians are also said to be "partakers of Christ's sufferings," (1 Pet. iv. 13.) Are all christians, therefore, betrayed by Judas, spit upon, buffeted and crowned with thorns, &c.? Examples need not be multiplied. Every reader of the scriptures knows they are abundant. Yet were our Baptist brethren consistent with themselves, all these expressions must be taken in a literal sense; and they should practice accordingly. They should hold that all worthy communicants are crucified, because the sacrament of the supper represents the sufferings and death of Christ:

John the Baptist said of Jesus, "He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire," (Luke iii. 16.) On the same principle of interpretation which the advocates of immersion apply to the above passages to make them support their theory, they should also apply this literally, and make use of material fire in the administration of baptism, as we are told the Hermians and Selucians of the second century did. They re-baptized, those who had been baptized out of the sect, *and drew them through the fire*. Herculian, quoted by Clemens Alexandrinus, says, "Some applied a red hot iron to the ears of the baptized." Their conduct may appear more absurd, but is really nothing more than an application of the same principle of interpretation to another passage, as immediately in connection with the subject of baptism, as those which we have been considering. For if the expression buried with Christ, &c. has any bearing on the subject of the mode of baptism at all, it must be from the literal interpretation given to the word *buried* [Ταφω]. And even here our Baptist friends are compelled to be inconsistent with their own plea of interpretation, and thus destroy any argument this text would afford them, even on their own plan. They should continue "buried" three days, according to the time Christ lay in the earth. Should any object and say that this would drown them; the Baptists, on their plan of interpreting figures, would have an answer ready, and prove by the same text that drowning was the very design of baptism: "We are buried with him by baptism into his death." We are not merely buried, for this is only a part, any more than sprinkling; but we are buried to death, "buried into his death." The expression, then, goes as far to prove that drowning is as essential to the right administration of baptism, as that immersion is—for if *burying* in the expression, must be understood to signify immersion, burying into his death should surely signify drowning. And thus the same passage that would command burying, would command drowning, it would command "death." What possible likeness can there be between a *living* person, plunged for a moment under water, and a *dead body* lying three days and three nights in a grave in a rock whose mouth was closed with a great stone, and securely fastened and sealed!

J. P. M.

ART. III. *Defection of the United Secession Church with respect to Psalmody.*

MR. EDITOR,

The following remarks have been suggested by a statement, which you made in your March number, at the foot of page 314. If you deem them worthy of your notice, they are at your service.

That the United Secession Church in Scotland has been charged with a designed ambiguity of expression, not only on psalmody, but also on covenanting, the descending obligations of the covenant and free communion, is well known to every one who is in the least acquainted with the documents of that church, and the complaints which have been made and published against her. In the joint committee for the drawing up of the Basis, even at that early stage of the business, this designed ambiguity of expression was discovered by certain individuals, who failed not to charge them with it, and remonstrate against it. But I do not intend taking up your time at present by proving the above mentioned charges respecting covenanting, federal obligations, and open communion, as it is likely you may hear from me about these afterwards; I shall for the present confine myself chiefly to psalmody. You are aware that previous to the time of the union, the Burgher Synod were in the habit of celebrating the praises of God with human compositions, by making free use of the paraphrases and hymns, while the General Synod never countenanced such a practice. And when preparations were making for the two bodies being united, the Burgher maintained their point manfully and successfully for the free and unlimited use of the hymns, the practice of occasional hearing and occasional communion with orthodox christians of other denominations, as many of them had been in the habit of doing, without ever having been called in question; while the Anti-Burghers, who were in the habit of condemning such practices, *for the sake of peace and union* dropped their testimony, and left truth to lie bleeding in the streets. This afforded great pleasure and satisfaction to those who wished to follow the fashions and changes of the times; but it grieved those hearts who were looking upon the signs of the times in a different light; and the reckless manner in which many disregarded their former profession, their ordination vows, and the fearful consequences which were likely to follow. The consequences which they feared would follow such high handed measures, I am sorry to say have been sadly verified, in the loose and latitudinarian spirit which prevails among them. But for the further confirmation of your statement, that "they have been charged with designed ambiguity on the subject of psalmody," I shall give you an extract from "The reasons of non-accession unto the union," drawn up by men who had every opportunity of knowing their sentiments and their practices, and who were most willing to join with their brethren, if they could have done it with a clear conscience and without violating their ordination vows: "By the union the worship of God is corrupted by introducing hymns and paraphrases of human composition in the duty of praise; and it adds greatly unto the evil, that those compositions are sometimes couched in language so equivocal as to present error to the mind as readily as truth, and in several instances are tainted with gross Arminian errors, which no ingenuity can explain away, or render safe to be employed in divine service, either by the learned or unlearned. There can scarcely be a greater mistake than to suppose, as many have done, that our controversy with the Union Church is confined to the point of continued covenant obligation. No doubt we consider this, in its application to the covenanted reformation of the Church of Scotland, to be a point of great importance; and in our dealings with the General Associate and Union Synods, we may have given the greater prominence to it, from the consideration, that if we gained this, we

gained every thing else ; every piece of defection being a departure from that measure of conformity to scripture which our church have attained, and solemnly engaged to hold fast. But as when ancient landmarks are removed, other depredations usually accompany or follow those removed, so has it happened here. Besides the defects which appear on the face of the Basis, we proposed to them, to the General Synod, that it is deficient in another respect, viz. in totally overlooking, or dropping, some important matters which ought to have been settled in a Basis of Union; and we were proceeding to move certain additional articles for the purpose of supplying in some measure the defect, when, in defiance of common form, and the principles of freedom of discussion, we were violently prevented from speaking. One subject to which we wished to call the Synod's attention, was that of public worship. It is a curious feature in this Basis of Union, that the immediate object of religious association, namely, the worship of God, is quite overlooked. The Directory offered itself for consideration, as naturally as the Confession of Faith, and indeed was mentioned in the overture ; yet its title appears in neither editions of the Basis, which is admitted, we believe, to contain all that church's terms of communion. We stated, for substance, in our reasons of protestation, that even supposing the directory to be too minute, some regulations should have been made about worship ; and particularly since it is known, that the two bodies differed in practice as to singing hymns of human composition, or what are called paraphrases, some settlement should have been made in the Basis on the subject : that it appeared to us no easy point to settle, whether any, or what additions should be made to the divinely appointed psalms. We further stated, that, although we had then no suspicion of any design on the part of members of either Synod, inconsistent with doctrinal orthodoxy, yet as a sense of duty impelled us to say, that through inadvertancy, hurry, and restraint of free discussion perhaps, we were afraid it had happened, that in this matter former zeal for purity of doctrine has not been discovered. It has been alleged that the paraphrases and hymns contain some dangerous sentiments. This should have been, at least, enquired into ; and as we insisted it should yet be enquired into, we could not be expected to discuss the subject, or bring forward all our difficulties. We just referred unto the doctrine that "our present actions, good or bad, shall fix our future fate," Paraphrase 51. That our good works fix our fate, and in the same way as our bad works fix it, viz. meritoriously, is a very different doctrine from that of the passage of scripture proposed to be paraphrased. It only teaches that every one shall receive the things done in his body, *according to* that he hath done, whether it be good or bad ; as in other passages we are said to be judged *according to* our works. We also referred unto the third hymn, in which we are taught, "That timely grief for errors past, shall future we prevent." And the Saviour's sufferings are represented as only something thrown into the scale to give sufficient weight to our sorrows : "Then see the sorrows of my heart, ere yet it be too late ; and hear my Saviour's dying groans, to give these sorrows weight." We added that even should ministers judiciously avoid singing such passages, we could not help thinking that the collection being advanced to the high honor of being sung in common with the book of Psalms, such veneration must be felt for the whole, as will greatly tend to facilitate the imbibing of an erroneous sentiment by the unwary. In this manner we reasoned with the General Synod. How were we grieved and confounded to hear the committee, in their answer, defend the above doctrines ; and the Synod vote an approbation of their answers as sufficient to take off the force of the reasoning ! A note intended to be as short as possible, is not the place in which we can attempt fully to express our feelings, yet we cannot but grieve for her who was once the

faithful city, and say, How has the gold become dim! It seems to us that by that judgment, they have opened a door for much loose and dangerous doctrine, on the ground of a sinner's acceptance with God." Passing over what they say about the committee vindicating the paraphrase, and putting an arbitrary meaning upon the language used, they go on to state, "Good and evil works are put upon the same footing, in the action of fixing. The assertion is not about the public declaration of our fate, (an idea consistent with the apostle's words) but the fixing of it. Now it is evident that the sinner's fate is fixed, or he is condemned strictly and in justice upon the ground of his deserts, for "the wages of sin is death," but eternal life is a gift: "the gift of God is eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord." Need we say, that if heaven be a gift, it is grace that fixes the believer's fate, not works: "By grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God." We have been taught that the believer's fate is fixed by his justification in the day of his union with Christ. But does not the expression in the paraphrase naturally suggest, that the state of both saints and sinners remains to be fixed at the general judgment, and that their works operate alike in both cases? On the other passage we need not say much, as we were informed, after the decision (in the General Synod,) that the Associate Burgher Synod had not given it their sanction. No wonder: it represents a sinner standing on the verge of eternity, putting the awfully important question how he should appear when God sits in judgment upon his soul. The answer is, "timely grief for errors past shall future wo prevent." God is said to have told the troubled soul this. This then, is the formal plea which the sinner is directed to use; our grief is therefore represented as the formal ground of acquittal; but the sufferings of the Saviour are admitted to make up the weight of that grief, which might be otherwise deficient. Therefore the atonement is mentioned in the last verse in full consistency with this as preventing despair; because of course it comes in to make up the weight. This is all the view which it may have of mercy. How different is this from the scripture doctrine, that the Saviour has fulfilled all righteousness as a surety, that justice by him is satisfied, God reconciled, the sinner being just called to receive the gift of righteousness by faith, while repentance to be genuine, must flow from faith working by love to him who first loved us; and although a duty, does not justify us as a work, but is a promised blessing. But we cannot help thinking there is something here still worse than toleration of error. The committee justified the hymns and paraphrase, as already stated, and the Synod formally approved of their answer as sufficient to remove all objections. Now we objected to their being used as a part of sacred psalmody. They therefore not only found them as harmless, but proper to be used in the praise of God; which must imply that they found their matter and expression so excellent as to be fit for directing and delighting the soul in the noblest exercises; so precious as to be imprinted upon the memory, and endeared to the heart, by frequent repetition, by being associated with versification, with music, and with all the sweet solemnities of the most elevating part of the worship of the sanctuary; so valuable, in short, as to be worthy to supplant occasionally the psalms dictated by the divine spirit." There are other paraphrases which are used by the Union Church, to which they found similar objections, as calculated to convey erroneous sentiments, but which they say, "The United Secession Church however swallows the whole." I fear I have already trespassed too much upon the room you offered for communications such as this, and shall omit many important extracts which I intend to make. I shall therefore only give you at present one more: "The above are a specimen of the poetical and unfair representations which even the paraphrases give of scripture doctrine, and the erroneous

notions they are calculated to teach, which are "suffered" by the United Synod, not less than by the judicatories of the Established Church. From the whole it is too evident that forbearance is extended in the Union, not only to covenants and covenanting, but also to what is usually called doctrine."—The use of these hymns is now become so common, that few in that church complain much about them; for many of those aged, intelligent and pious people who mourned of this and of other changes have now gone to their rest. The rising generation wished for a change, unwilling to be behind their neighbors; and they are getting changes upon changes with a vengeance. But to be more particular, I must state a fact, though not generally known, is no less true and melancholy, that the United Synod tolerate the singing of *Watts' Psalms and Hymns*, in various places of worship under their inspection. This, you may say, is only what might have been expected, when the rage for fashion and improvement was so prevalent among them, and when they could judiciously tolerate human composition at their very commencement. If any one should doubt my statement, (for I think I am correct if my senses did not deceive me,) let him cross the Atlantic in one of the packets for Liverpool, and inquire for the United Associate Congregation under the inspection of the Rev. Dr. Stewart, and I am certain he will be satisfied; or let him write to the Doctor and inquire, if there were not certain individuals in his church not four years ago who complained of him baptizing privately, and dispensing that ordinance to children whose parents were not members of the church, and of using *Watts' songs* in public worship; and if, when those who complained of his conduct carried it before the Synod, whether that reverend body did not screen the Doctor, or recommend that they should "quash" all matters in dispute, and go home and agree. Or if it were not too far for him to go, who may be sceptical about my statement, he might take a turn by Manchester, Carlisle and Newcastle Presbyteries, and hear and see, and enquire carefully whether they have not tolerated in many of the new settlements in England, *Watts' Psalms and Hymns*, and on some occasions the use of the *flute and violin*, to assist their public religious devotions? It may be said that these are practices to which the English Independents have been long accustomed, and that it could not be expected they would lay them soon aside; besides, it is a matter of no essential importance whether they sing the *songs of Zion* or not, providing the gospel be preached to them in purity; we should therefore make it a matter of forbearance, for it is one of the non-essentials. This I grant is the popular and easy way of proceeding with this, and many other important matters in which the glory of God, the purity of the church and the salvation of souls are deeply involved. But those churches that either judiciously or practically tolerate such deviations from the faith once delivered unto the saints, call them by what name soever you please, have no right to lay claim for holding Reformation principles, as witnessed for by the fathers of the secession, either in this or in the land of our fathers. Better would it be for them to strike their colors at once, and hoist to the mast head banners by which their real principles might be known, and then no stranger would be in danger of being deceived as to which nation they belonged. As the ministers who come from the Union and Relief Church seem to trouble you less by asking admission into your communion than into others; I have been at a loss to know whether it be that those churches which received them so readily, are more allied to them in sentiment and practice, and trouble them less with examining them about testimonies, close communion and hymn singing. However, I find many of them are not over-much burdened with consistency, as I find them dropping into more popular societies, as they find it answer themselves. Such changes as these may not have caused much exertion, or sacrifice,

as they may have been permitted to move into the General Assembly, or Dutch Churches, *occasionally* to show off their abilities and brotherly love, and liberal sentiments; another move, and they were removed entirely. Now, sir, I conclude by saying that the above remarks prove satisfactorily to my mind, the truth of the statement made in your Testimony, page 41. "In agreeing with the Basis, they neglected a necessary testimony against singing hymns of human composition in divine worship."

VINDEX.

ART. IV. *The Christian World Unmasked.*

(Continued from page 345.)

But, sir, if, Jacob's ladder does not suit your purpose, another may be had. My master was a carpenter; he built the skies, and coming down to earth, he took a trade adapted to his work above. He can provide you with another ladder, decked with golden rounds of faith, by which you may ascend up to his seat, and fetch down needful stores.

That is good news, Doctor; for I am growing weary of my own ladder. It has been fifty years in my possession, and never raised my heart a single step above the earth. I am just as anxious about the world, as I was; and find no more desire to pray, than I use to do; and as for peace, passing all understanding, I know no more how it tastes, than of old hock or French Burgundy. Pray, inform me, of what materials your ladder is composed; and how it differs from the common human one, which every country carpenter can make.

True Christian faith, sir, is of divine original. It does not grow upon the fallows of nature, nor in the garden of science: neither spruceness of wit, nor solidity of judgment, can produce it. An astronomic eye, though vaulting to the stars, cannot reach it; and a metaphysic head, though wrapped deep in clouds, cannot ken it. It is no endowment, or acquirement of nature, but *the gift of God*, (Ephes. ii. 8;) and wrought by *the operation of his Spirit*. (Col. ii. 12.)

Human faith is only human assent to the word of God, which may be quickly given; so the shield is forged at a single welding, and believers sprout up hastily, like mushrooms. Thus a proselyte, who takes a *new creed*, becomes a convert instantly; he needs but turn about, just as the wind of fancy blows, and this is called conversion. But he may turn a protestant, a churchman, a methodist, a baptist, a deist, and be zealous too at every turn, while the wind blows, yet never turn to God.

This human faith, sprouting from an helpless mind, can produce no heavenly fruit; but leaves a man just as it found him. Hence it is vilified, as well it may; and none but madmen dream of being saved by this human faith. It takes a quiet lodging in the understanding, and sleepeth there; and being *only* lodged there, a devil may and does possess it.

Doctor, you deal mainly with the devil; but I cannot blame you. Pulpit-lips, like pulpit-cushions, are chiefly lined with velvet. Amazing reverence is shown to Satan in a pulpit; it seems the privy closet of his highness. We never hear his name or habitation mentioned in a modern sermon; which makes some people fancy, that the devil sure is dead, and that hellfire is quite burnt out. Nay, I am told, that Jesus Christ did put the devil's name into his short prayer, and called him the *evil one*, but some roguish body wiped his name out from our English translation. However, let that matter pass, and tell me something more about believing. If faith is not a mere human assent to the word of God, what is it Doctor?

Divine faith, sir, takes in this assent to the word of God, but takes in more abundantly. It is described in scripture, by *coming to Jesus* for help, *looking to him* for relief, *flying to him* for refuge, *resting on him* for support, and *feeding on him*, as our heavenly bread. Which expressions not only suppose a credit given to his word by the understanding, but a full reliance of the heart upon him to fulfil his word. The exercise of faith layeth chiefly in the *heart*, as St. Paul testifies, *With the heart man believeth unto righteousness.* (Rom. x. 10.) Thus faith is not a mere credit given to the word of Jesus, but an *heart-trust* reposed in him : and therefore called believing *on* him.

The miracles, recorded in the gospel, shew the nature and the use of faith ; they tell a sinner, what his business is with the Saviour and how he must go to him.

Some came to Jesus for the pardon of sin, and *received* a pardon ; others brought diseases, and were healed. Each bodily complaint, brought to Christ, was an emblem of some spiritual disease in our nature, which needs an healing, and can be healed only by the spiritual physician.

The *manner* also of applying for a cure, is not recorded as a matter of mere history, but an example for imitation. Every one, who went and got a cure, calls on you, sir, to go and do likewise. This matter is important ; all are much concerned in it, and a few remarks upon it may be needful.

When the patients went to Christ, they plead no *worthiness* to recommend them. They do not come to *buy* but *beg* a cure. They carry no money in their caps, and bring no merit in their mouths, to purchase blessings ; but come as *miserable* creatures, and in a *worshipping* posture, to obtain an act of mercy.

So must you go unto Jesus, if you hope to speed ; feeling yourself a *miserable* sinner, *worshipping* the Saviour, and seeking mercy to relieve your misery. Though in heaven, Jesus Christ is near you, round about you, always within call ; and when your wants are felt, you may go and be healed. Real beggars are relieved now, as aforetime ; for *Jesus is the same, yesterday, to-day, and forever* : but he turns sham beggars from his door with indignation, just as we do ; beggars, who can make a brawling of their misery, and feel none.

Again, the patients come to Jesus, not as miserable creatures only, but as *helpless* ones, quite unable to relieve themselves. Some had tried human means ; and some had wasted all their substance on those means ; but finding no relief, they come at last to Jesus, and seek a cure from his hand *alone*. Blind Bartimeus does not dream of putting one eye in, while Jesus puts the other : nor does the leper hope to help the Lord to scour away his leprosy. The patients, who applied to Jesus, expected *all* their help from him.

So must you apply, if you expect relief : not vainly dreaming of a power to help yourself, and idly complimenting Jesus with a prayer for help : not hoping you may couch one eye by human wisdom, while Jesus tries to couch the other ; not boasting you can heal some leprous spots yourself, while Jesus scours away the rest. Such haughty beggars meet with no relief from Christ : he will be *all* or *nothing*.

Again the patients came to Jesus, not only as miserable creatures and helpless, but as *believers*, who thought him able to help, and *expected* help from his mercy. The matter of *believing* was of the utmost consequence ; and therefore Jesus usually asks a patient before a cure, *Believest thou that I am able to do this ?* Or tells him after a cure, *thy faith hath saved thee.* And this was said to inform the attending crowd, that faith procured the blessing. For though a patient's misery and helplessness brought him unto Christ, it was faith alone that obtained the blessing. The patient got what he wanted, by a firm reliance on the power and mercy of this divine physician : *thy faith hath saved thee.*

Even so it is now, sir; if you desire help from Jesus, you must not seek to him with a vain opinion of your own *worth* to recommend yourself, nor of your own *power* to help yourself, but must place your *whole* dependence on his *mercy* and his *power* to save you. Your *whole* expectation of pardon must be from his *blood*; and your *whole* expectation of holiness from his *Spirit*. He *alone* must wash you, and he *alone* must *work in you to will and to do*. And if *your eye is single*, singly fixed upon Jesus, he will shew himself a Saviour, and fill you notably with heavenly light and peace.

When you pray to Jesus Christ to save you from the guilt and power of sin, remember, sir, he asks you by his word, the same question now, which he asked aforesaid, *Believest thou that I am able to do this?* Not you and I together; no: but believest thou that I, I without you, I *alone* am able to do this? And till you can answer this question truly, and say, "Lord, I do believe it," your petitions will draw down no blessing.

Many prayers are made, and meet with no success. The petitioners continue slaves to evil tempers and affections, because their petitions are not offered up in faith. Such heathen prayers never reach the skies, but are dropped in a church on Sunday, besomed out on Monday by the sexton, and applied with other rubbish to refresh some bald grave.

Lastly, when patients came to Jesus, miserable, helpless, and believing, they never would and never did depart without a cure. Sometimes they were neglected at the first application; and sometimes much discouraged by a seemingly rough answer, but at length their request was granted. And when any met with much discouragement before they gained a blessing, they were dismissed, not with huge encomiums on their honesty, sobriety and charity, (very needful things in their proper place, and might belong to the patients) but they were sent away with rare commendations of their faith: *O woman great is thy faith! be it unto thee even as thou wilt.* (Matt. xv. 28.)

And so it is now, sir. All that seek to Jesus Christ, with a due sense of their misery and helplessness, and with a single trust on his power and mercy, will obtain what they seek. They may wait awhile at mercy's gate, and meet with some discouragement: but at length it will be opened. The mourners will be comforted with pardons, and weary sinners will find rest unto their souls. Thus the promises, which are only gazed on by others as a fine picture, prove an heavenly feast to them. By faith they are possessed and enjoyed, as they were intended; which brings abundant praise to God.

Once, sir, I went to Jesus, like a coxcomb, and gave myself fine airs; fancying if he was something, so was I; if he had merit, so had I. And sir, I used him, as an healthy man will use a walking staff, lean an ounce upon it, or vapour with it in the air. But now he is my whole crutch: no foot can stir a step without him. He is my all, as he ought to be, if he will become my Saviour; and bids me *cast (not some but) all my care upon him.* (1 Pet. v. 7.)

My heart can have no rest, unless it leans upon him *wholly*, and then it feels his peace. But I am apt to leave my resting-place, and when I ramble from it my heart will quickly brew up mischief. Some evil temper now begins to boil, or some care would fain perplex me, or some idol wants to please me, or some deadness or some lightness creeps upon my spirit, and communion with my Saviour is withdrawn. When these thorns stick in my flesh, I do not try, as heretofore, to pick them out with my own needle, but carry all complaints to Jesus, casting every care upon him. His office is to save and mine to look for help.

If evil tempers arise, I go to him, as some demoniac; if deadness creeps upon me, I go a paralytic; if dissipation comes, I go a lunatic; if darkness clouds my peace, I go a Bartimeus; and when I pray, I always go a leper, crying as Isaiah did, *Unclean! unclean!*

If but a little faith is mixed with my prayer, which is too often the case, I get but little help; and find the Lord's word true, *according to your faith it shall be done unto you.* And St. James rebukes me sternly, *ask in faith, nothing wavering, else you shall receive nothing from the Lord.* (James i. 6, 7.)

Thus the miracles instruct me how to go to Jesus; and every miracle explains the meaning of that general invitation, which Jesus gives to sinners, *Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.* And, sir, unless you come in this appointed way, you will find no more relief from the king of Israel, than from the king of Poland.

Indeed, Doctor, we have nothing to trouble us in our parish, besides family cares and bodily infirmities. The vicar's chief complaint is about his large family and scanty income; and the old clerk's weekly moan is about his rusty voice, which cannot rear a psalm without a woful outcry. On Sundays we march to church in our best clothes, and are decently seated in pews, which are swept every Christmas. Aged people look grave enough, but the young ones stare about them, and are peeping at every one who steps into the church; for we keep dropping in all prayer time. And during the sermon, which is soon despatched, some listen, others giggle; and when the weather waxes warm, a few are half awake, and the rest are fast asleep; which proves they have no burden. This is our parish way of going unto Jesus Christ; and as for your's, Doctor, it seems more suitable for thieves and harlots, than for honest folks.

Sir, if it suits a thief and a harlot, it will suit you all exactly. You are robbing God of his service daily, which is the worst of robbery, and yet but little heeded. You defraud your Maker and your hourly benefactor of his worship and obedience, and cannot feel your infamous ingratitude. If a villain takes away your property or good name, you raise an outcry presently: but though you daily rob God of his service and his honor, you can wipe your mouth and think no harm is done. Your heart too is full of uncleanness; no harlot's heart need be more unclean; and your eye is full as wanton as your heart. Oh, sir, you feel no pain from sin, because your eye is not couched to see your malady, nor your conscience yet alive to feel your danger.

In a Christian land, men become Christians by profession. And while the life is decent, and the church attended, all things pass off mighty well. But it happens, these genteel professors are the very troops of Ezekiel's army, before it was quickened; covered well with plump flesh and fair skin, yet no breath was in them; ranged well in rank and file, bone comes to his bone; and at a distance seem a famous army, but on a near approach are all dead men. No life is found among them, because the Holy Spirit had not breathed upon them, (Ezek. xxxvii. 7, 8.)

So it fared in the prophet's day; and so it fareth now. A Christian army still appears, with many decent soldiers, of kindly flesh and skin; and, when exercised at church, are ranked well in order; bone comes to his bone, and a *noise* of prayer is heard, but no breath of life is found, no presence of the Lord bestowed, no quickening aids imparted, no cheering consolations granted. It proves a dead scene of worship, conducted like an undertaker's funeral, with cloudy face, and yawning entertainment.

It is not strange, that men reject the gospel, when they find no heavenly comfort from it, and are told they must expect none here. Who will labor in a service, where he meets with constant drudgery, and no refreshment? Who can bear to be much in prayer, unless he finds divine communion in it, which is divine refreshment? And who will daily read the word of God, unless he finds it daily food? Take the food away, the Spirit's application, and we soon grow weary of the bible, and the spider weaves his web upon it. Nor is this the worst of all; for some, who live

upon the altar, now begin, like Eli's sons, to kick at the sacrifice; and in a mighty rage of zeal for the Father, would strip his dear Son of divinity, and trample on his blood. When this becomes general, we may expect that Jesus Christ will sweep the church-lands, as he swept the abbey-lands, out of his vineyard; and make our Sion, once a praise in the earth, to become an hissing and an execration.

Well, but Doctor, I am not yet satisfied, that Jesus Christ must *work all our works in us*, (Isa. xxvi. 12.) and be both *author and finisher of salvation*. What, cannot I help to make myself a Christian? Is the *government* so wholly *laid upon his shoulders*, that he must do all? You know the old proverb, and proverbs are next to gospel, "Every tub must stand on its own bottom." I would not undervalue Jesus Christ, nor yet disparage myself. At a dead lift I would ask his help; but his arm and my shoulder should act together, and thus raise the sack upon my back.

Sir, your whole *help is laid on him, who is mighty to save, and saves to the uttermost*. He says, *Your strength is to sit still*: (Isa. xxx. 7.) and instructs you, by the similitude of a vine and its branches, that all the spiritual life and fruit of a believer is derived from him. Jesus Christ is both the root and stem of this vine: the visible stem may denote his human nature; and the invisible root, producing that stem, his divine nature; and believers are branches of this vine. Now, sir, as all the branches of a vine receive their *birth, growth and nourishment*, their wood, leaf and fruit *altogether* from the vine; so all believers receive their *birth, growth and nourishment*, their *life, faith and fruit*, from Jesus *altogether*. And, sir, if this similitude be good for any thing, it proves your will and power are good for nothing; good for nothing but to make a Christian monkey, who will ape a true believer by his chattering: but his tail and tricks, lewd or pert, betray the monkey still. (John xv. 1, &c.)

A branch is nothing, and can do nothing, without the vine; if separated from the vine, it dies immediately: believers too are nothing, and can do nothing, without Christ; he is their all in every thing; and if they could be separated from him, they would die a spiritual death directly.

Formerly, when I had asked help in prayer, instead of looking for that help, and relying on it, I strove to help myself, and stripped to fight my adversary. Many of these battles I have fought, but never gained any credit by them. My foe would drop his head sometimes by a blow I gave him, and seemed to be expiring, but revived presently and grew as pert as ever. I found he valued not an arm of flesh, but made a very scornful puff at human will and might. Often when a fire broke out in my bosom, the water I threw on to quench it, only proved oil, and made it burn the faster. The flame of anger would continue in my breast, till its materials were consumed, or till another fire broke out. One wave of trouble passed off, because another rolled on, and took its place. One evil often drove another out, as lions drive out wolves; but in their turns, my bosom was a prey to every wild beast in the forest. Or if a quiet hour passed, it proved but a dead calm; my heart had no delight in God, a stranger yet to heavenly peace and joy.

At length, after years of fruitless struggling, I was shewn the gospel method of obtaining rest, not by *working*, but *believing*. A strange and foolish way it seems to nature, and so it seemed to me; but is a most effectual way, because it is the Lord's appointed way.

Jesus says, *He that believeth, shall be saved*. Paul declares, *We, who have believed, do enter into rest*. (Heb. iv. 2.) John affirms, *This is the victory, that overcomes the world, even our faith*. (1 John. v. 4.) And Isaiah bore his testimony long before, that *God would keep the man in perfect peace, whose mind was stayed on him*. (Isa. xxvi. 3.)

I find my bosom is a troubled sea, and none can give it rest, but that

God-man, who said to winds and waves, "Be still," and they obeyed his voice. And when I stand before him, as his patients did of old, imploring and expecting help, his help is freely given. *None ever trusted in him, and was confounded.*

Fain we would grow notable by *doing*; it suits our legal spirit; but we can only grow valiant and successful by *believing*. When salvation-work is taken on ourselves, it resteth on an arm of flesh, and a withered arm, which must fail; but when we wrestle by believing, the arm of Jesus is engaged to fight the battle; and he will and must bring victory, else his word and faithfulness must fail.

Means of grace are put into my hand, but the *work* is in the Lord's. Watching, praying and believing do belong to me, and these I must be taught of God, or I shall never do them right; but all deliverance comes from Jesus Christ. And because he does the work, fights the battle, and brings victory, he is rightly called the Saviour. I must watch against the inroads of an enemy; and when he comes in sight, must wrestle well with prayer, and *fight the fight of faith*; but if I thrust my arm into the battle, Jesus will withdraw his own: he will be all or nothing. And if *I lay my hand upon the ark*, to help hold it up, as Uzza did, I shall be slain, as Uzza was. (2 Sam. vi. 6, 7.)

The crime of Uzza is but little understood; some think it was a slight one, and the punishment severe. But the same sin destroyed Uzza, which destroyeth every sinner, even unbelief. What slew his body, slayeth all the souls that perish. He could not trust the Lord *wholly* with his ark, but must have a meddling finger, called in the Bible-margin, *his rashness*. *Rash* worm indeed, to help a God to do his work! and thousands every where are guilty of this *rashness*, and perish by this *Uzza-izing*. Jesus Christ is jealous of his glory, as a Saviour: he will not share it with another; and whoso takes it from him, shall take it at his peril.

The Saviour's word to an Israelite is, *Fear not, stand still, and see the salvation of God*, (Exod. xiv. 13.) *In quietness and confidence shall be your strength*. (Isa. xxx. 15.) *Cast thy burden on the Lord, and he shall support thee*. (Psal. lv. 22.) *Look to me for salvation, all the ends of the earth*. (Isa. xlv. 22.) *Cull on me in time of trouble, I will deliver thee, and thou shalt glorify me*. (Psal. l. 15.)

A stranger to the life of faith, makes a snuffle at believing, and thinks no work so easy or so trifling. He wonders why such *gentle* business should be called the *fight* of faith! and why the chosen twelve should pray for faith, when every human brain might quickly furnish out a handsome dose.

For my own part, since first my unbelief was felt, I have been praying fifteen years for faith, and praying with some earnestness, and am not yet possessed of more than half a grain. You smile, sir, I perceive, at the smallness of the quantity; but you would not, if you knew its efficacy. Jesus, who knew it well, assures you that a single grain, and a grain as small as a mustard-seed, would *remove a mountain*; remove a *mountain-load* of guilt from the conscience, a *mountain-lust* from the heart, and any *mountain-load* of trouble from the mind.

The gospel-law is called the *law of faith*, (Rom. iii. 27;) and Jesus sendeth help according to our faith, and is obliged to send it; not through any merit which is found in faith, but by virtue of his promise, *according to your faith, be it unto you*.

This law of faith, or a *whole* reliance upon Christ for *wisdom, righteousness, sanctification and redemption*, is become an exploded doctrine; and human arms are called in to help the Saviour in his work. Salvation is no longer, as St. Paul declares, *by grace through faith*, (Eph. ii. 8.) but by grace and nature *jointly*. And see, sir, what has followed.

Morality has lost its right foundation, and is sinking daily, because it resteth on a human shoulder, which cannot bear the weight.

The gospel too, is become not only much neglected, but rejected and despised also : a certain consequence of the present modish doctrine. A mixed covenant of human might and heavenly help, will rest at last on human shoulders altogether.

For, observe, preachers say, we must ourselves do *something*, in salvation-work, but cannot say how *much*. They do not mark the boundary of grace and nature, because they cannot tell what human wit and might may do ; of course every man must make the boundary himself.

One thinks he can do *much* ; another can do *more* ; and a deist will do *all*. Why should he not ? You have put him in the path, and set his feet a going ; and you must not be offended, if he takes a step beyond you. Perhaps, yourself can do with only Christ's shoe-latchet, and he will cast the latchet too away. If your path be right, he may enlarge his step, just as he pleaseth ; for you cannot mark the ground where he ought to stop.

Thus when the doctrines of *human merit*, or of *human might* are preached, they must naturally, and will judicially end in deism, or a total rejection of the grace of Christ : because no limit can be fixed, where that *human merit*, or this *human might* shall end. If Jesus Christ is not *all* in every thing, he will become a cypher.

Paul says, salvation is of faith, *that it might be by grace* : (Rom. iv. 16.) that is, we must be saved by faith *alone* in Christ, by a *whole* dependence upon him for every thing, otherwise salvation cannot be by grace, cannot be a *mere* matter of grace. If men retain some native will and power to save themselves, and exercise it properly, so far they are saved, not by dependence upon Jesus, but by a proper exercise of their own abilities. Adam was endowed with native will and power to save himself, and had he persevered in a right use of those powers, he would not have been saved by grace at all, but by works altogether. And if fallen man has yet some power to save himself, and makes a proper use thereof, so far he is saved by his own works : but, then, says Paul, pray, what becomes of grace ? If you are truly saved by grace, it must be through faith alone. Your whole dependence must be fixed on Jesus, and your obligations rise entirely from him, else you are not saved by grace. What you can do for yourself, you need not be obliged to another for : no grace is wanted here.

And as salvation, in a covenant of grace, must be through faith alone ; so that covenant supposes, that we want such grace, for God will offer nothing needless, not even grace.

A fallen man has no more power than a fallen angel, to sanctify his nature, or to make atonement for sin. Man fell through pride, as angels did ; and to humble man in his recovery, he must go clean out of himself for salvation. His *whole* dependence must be on the Saviour's blood for pardon, and on the Saviour's grace for holiness. Therefore Jesus saith, *Look to me, and be saved.* (Isa. xlv. 22.)

But, sir, a little recollection, how it fares with yourself and neighbors, would save a deal of talking on this matter. You are an aged man, and seem an honest man, and must have tried what human strength can do. Are your tongue and temper better bridled, than they were some forty years ago ? Can you love and feed an enemy much better ? Can you deal your bread more freely to the hungry ; and more cheerfully submit to sickness, pain, and worldly disappointments ? Are you growing more humble, and more vile in your own eyes ? Can you pray more frequently and fervently ; and walk with God more closely, and find the comfort of his presence ? Is the word of God more read, and read with sweeter savor ? Can you you keep a stricter watch upon your bosom, and find

more power over bosom sins? Is your *cage* more cleanly, and your *den* well scoured? Survey yourself all over; then call upon your neighbors, and ask them all the same questions, and see what answers they will make. I believe you will find no great amendment, and no room to vaunt of human strength, but abundant room for self-condemnation.

As for the tub you mentioned, it has lost its bottom, sir, above 5,000 years ago; and it would be strange, indeed, if it stood upon a bottom, when it had none. Adam has unhooped all our vessels, and left us no foundation to rest upon, but Jesus Christ. Adam fell, and ruined all his race.

Indeed, Doctor, I have the vanity to think myself as good a man as Adam was before he fell. Why should his fall put my nose out of joint? Could he not stumble without throwing me down? Perhaps he did receive a bruise, and his ankle might be sprained; but I do not read that he broke his neck, or broke a leg by the fall. Does the scripture intimate that his whole nature was impaired; and that he fell from his *first estate* altogether?

So I think, sir; but hear and judge. The Lord tells Adam, *In the day he eateth he shall surely die.* (Gen. ii. 17.) Adam did eat of the tree, and of course he *died* on the day he eat, if the word of God is true and faithful. But what death did Adam die, on the day he ate? Not a natural, but a spiritual death. All spiritual life ceased on the day he sinned, and his soul was *dead* to God. His animal life became a sickly and a mortal one; and the spiritual life expired in him, as in the sinning angels.

To fancy that mere mortality was only meant by the threatening, is a strange perversion of this awful sentence, which does not say, *Thou shalt be liable to death*, but *thou shalt surely die.*

Adam lived nine hundred years after his transgression, and might have lived nine millions, consistently enough with mere mortality, but not with the threatening. And if one expositor may add the word *liable* to the threatening, in order to shove it from the spirit; why may not another add the little word *not*, to shove it from the body too? So the threatening runs thus, *In the day thou eatest, thou shalt not be liable to death*; and all is safe and well. The threatening proveth only papal thunder.

But why must all the threatening light upon the body, and the curse be spent upon it altogether? The whole nature sinned, and the whole should suffer. The body lost its healthy state, and the spirit sure should lose its healthy state too. Nay, the spirit was the *chief* in transgression, and should bear the *chief* share of punishment. If the body grew *sickly* through sin, the soul should be *sick* to death. When a gang of thieves is taken, the captain of the gang is sure to suffer, whatever happens to the rest. But here the captain in rebellion is reprieved, and the underling is hanged: the spirit strangely escapes without a hurt, and the curse falls wholly on the poor corpse.

The change of Adam's *state* is pointed out by the following circumstances. After the fall, he desired no fellowship with God but dreaded it. When the Lord calls, he flies, and would avoid all converse with him. The language of his heart was this, "Depart from me, I desire no knowledge of thee, or communion with thee."

2dly. His *understanding* now was clouded, and a spiritual darkness crept upon it. He has lost the right knowledge of God, and thinks his Maker sees with human eyes, or useth spectacles. For he is no sooner called, but he slips behind a tree, as a mouse will slip behind a tile, to hide himself.

3dly. His *breast* was now become the seat of evil tempers, such as devils feel: and felt as Adam did, through disobedience. Their bosoms, once like his, were a blessed seat of heavenly peace, and love and joy:

but when sin entered, they became a woful seat of war, where wrath and envy, pride and stubbornness, and every evil temper reigns. Adam shows this devilish bosom, when examined; for though examined with much tenderness, he makes no meek confession, nor deigns to urge a single prayer for mercy. He acts a stubborn part, flies in the face of God, and lays the blame at his Maker's door, as if the woman had been made on purpose to seduce him; *The woman whom thou gavest me, she gave me of the tree.* (Gen. iii. 12.)

4thly. Adam's heart, through sin, became a cage of uncleanness. Before his fall, he felt no shame, though naked: but when he fell, such filthy lusts sprung up, as brought him shame enough, and made him seek a covering for his waist.

Lastly. Adam's first born child proves a murderer. A hopeful heir truly! Where the fruit shows the stock, and declares them both possessed of his nature who is called a *murderer from the beginning.* (1 John viii. 44.) And if St. John is credited, that *whoso hates his brother, is a murder,* (1 John iii. 15.) then every child of Adam in his turn has been a murderer too.

(To be continued.)

ART. V. Remarks on *Matthew*, XXVI. 30th. "And when they had sung a hymn they went out, &c."

This circumstance is also noticed by Mark, xiv. 26. but it is omitted by Luke and John; the reason of which, may possibly have been that it was sufficiently attested by the two former, before the two latter wrote. The singing of this hymn by Christ and his disciples, was among the last things or the very last thing, which was done before they went out; consequently, it was after the first supper. And we may safely infer that it was both, as to matter and form, a part of worship suitable to the ordinance of the supper, and to those doctrines set forth in Christ's preceding discourse in the 14th, 15th and 16th chap.'s of John, and to his intercessory prayer, chap. 17th.

What Hymn was it? Many professors and ministers of different denominations in the present day, have taken it for a *new song*, which Christ made for this new occasion. And from this assumed fact, they have inferred that the Psalms in the old Testament were unsuitable for new Testament worship. Behold, say they, Christ upon the first celebration of the first new testament ordinance, lays them aside, and makes a new song more suitable. If this was the fact, there might appear to be some plausible ground for their inference, but if it was not, if this is a mere assumption, the fact that is here recorded will bear a different inference, and though not quite so pleasing to many, yet not the less important.

But let us make a sober inquiry, and for the sake of illustration, let us assume that Christ made a new song on this occasion as above said. How comes it, that they were all able to join in singing it? It would appear they all joined—"and when they had sung a hymn," &c. were they all simultaneously inspired with it? or, was it read or spoken out piece meal to them? The record does not state, and we are not authorized to conjecture. But they all joined in singing, this is substantially stated, and if it was dictated by Christ just then, it is extremely difficult to understand how they could. There is no instance of such a thing left on record any where, to instruct us how they could.

If it was a new song for the occasion, why do all the four Evangelists omit to tell that it was. One or the other of them give us many circum

stances much more minute on this occasion. Every thing which Christ said and did to them. How he laid aside his garment and took a towel and girded himself, &c. What he said respecting the Passover, that it was the last he would celebrate, and consequently, that it was the close of that dispensation. And what he said at the institution of the new ordinance, that was to come in its place. One would be tempted to think that as they so distinctly record his abolishing the Passover and instituting the Lord's supper, that they would also have made mention in some way of this change also, viz. his laying aside the old psalms, and instituting the new. But really, they do not mention it at all—none of the four. They pass hurriedly over the circumstance of *singing it only*, as if it were a very common occurrence, or, just what was to be expected on such an occasion—"And when they had sung a hymn," &c.

If this was a *new song* made by Christ for the new ordinance and the new dispensation, it must be one more suitable than any then extant. Nay, it must be necessary to christian worship, and I do not see how we can do right at the dispensation of the supper without singing it. How would Christ the faithful and true witness who never did conceal God's verity, put aside all the old psalms together, if there were any of them suitable to be used on such occasion? If he did so at this first supper, I see not how we can infer any thing else than that they were unfit, and if he did compose a new hymn, we must conclude that it alone is suitable, and that it belongs to new Testament worship. We cannot get along without it. But where is it? We do not find it in any of the gospels, nor any thing that can be tortured into it by the utmost efforts of sophistical ingenuity. They mention the song of Mary, Zecharias and Elizabeth, upon a new and solemn occasion, but they drop not a word of this new hymn. Neither is there a line, or a word of it, in all the new testament. How can new testament worship be complete without it? How can Christ say that he has given us all God's verity and never did conceal it if he composed this hymn, and yet we have not a trace of it any where? But now I ask, if there is not a trace of it any where, and if there is not the least mention of making a *new hymn*, what necessity there is for supposing that there *was* such a one made at all? "Hymn-zantes" they sung praise or they sung a hymn, could not this be done without making a new composition? Was there nothing extant that praised God which they might sing? Must we assume that there was a *new hymn* made, although the sacred record is totally silent about it, and at the expense of implying that christian worship is incomplete and that Christ is not a faithful witness, or which comes to the same, that the inspired writers have not given a faithful account. And for what must we do it? Why, that the words of God's holy Spirit, the old psalms may be thrust aside to make room for the effusions of human fancy in his worship! I blush for the proud arrogance of human nature!!

But if it was not a new hymn, it was an *old one*. The use of the word *Hymn* by our translators seems to be conclusive evidence to our opponents that it could not be any of the old psalms. This appears to us no evidence at all, because, by attending to the meaning of the original term and not the *sound* of the English word hymn, we find a perfect agreement between it and the general design of the book of psalms, and more especially the design of some of them. The scholar knows that the Greek word is not a noun as we have it in the English, but, a participle, viz. of the 1st. aorist, and when rendered literally, would be "having hymned," or "when they had hymned." Parkhurst renders it, having said or recited a hymn. The past tense of the same verb is used Acts, 16, 25, and at midnight, Paul and Silas prayed and *sang praises-hymnoon* to God. Suppose I should assume this rendering as equally good, and say in this place "And when they had *sung praises*." What color would it

give for the supposition, that it could not be any thing in the book of psalms which they sung? We well know that it is the expressed design of many of the psalms to praise God. Dr. Gill on the place says "This Hallel or song of praise, which the Jews were obliged to sing on the night of the passover, (for the passover they say was bound to a hymn) consisted of six psalms from the 113th too the 118th inclusive. Now this they did not sing all at once, but in parts. Just before the drinking of the second cup, and eating of the lamb, they sung the first part of it viz. 113th and 14th, and on mixing the 4th and last cup, they completed the Hallel by singing the rest of the psalms, beginning with the 115th and ending with the 118th, and said over it what they called "the *blessing of the song*, which was psalm 145 verse 10th, &c. Now the last part of the Hallel Christ deferred to the close of his supper, there being many things in it pertinent to him, and proper for the occasion."

In agreement with this remark, I would observe of the 113th, 114th and 115th Psalms, that the subject matter of them is the manifestation which God gave of himself, as the only true God in delivering Israel out of Egypt, and therefore the singing of them was most appropriate to the celebration of the passover.

And the 13th verse of the 116th, answers well both to the cup used at the passover and in the Lord's supper, viz. "I will take the cup of salvation and call upon the name of the Lord." Add to this, that the 3d verse of this psalm, seems plainly to set forth the sufferings of Christ, and so the ancient Jews understood it; compare it with Christ's declaration of his sufferings in the garden. Indeed this whole psalm seems more designed to express his sufferings, and what was the exercise of his soul on this solemn occasion, and after his sufferings were over, than those of the Psalmist or any mere man. It may be thought that the 11th verse cannot be put in his mouth, who was never in any haste or confusion, viz. "I said in my haste, that all men are liars," but this term does not necessarily imply any thing sinful, but simply that state of mind which is the necessary effect of the most intense trouble, as when the sorrows of death compass one on every side, and the pains of hell take hold on him: and such were the sufferings of our Lord. In these deep and awful sufferings, our Lord looked not to any man for sympathy or help—there was no dependence to be put in the very best—even his own disciples, their strong and repeated protestations of attachment notwithstanding. They could not watch with him one hour, they all forsook him and fled. Peter even Peter, afterwards denied him with oaths and cursings, even in his presence, (see Luke xxii. 51,) and Judas betrayed him. If these his disciples acted such a part, may it not be justly said with respect to him at this time "all men are liars." The 117th psalm, is a prophetic call to the Gentile nations to praise God for the mercy and truth of the gospel sent to them after Christ's resurrection. And, therefore, was most suitable to be sung over the memorial of his death, which was the foundation of this blessing.

The 118th is a song of triumph, and is well adapted to celebrate Christ's victory over his enemies, whether men or devils, Jews or Gentiles. I shall mention only one point, because it determines the psalm to Christ in his glory, verse 22. The stone which the builders refused, is become the head of the corner—compare Acts iv. 11. These psalms "set the joy before him," as well as the cross and the shame, and were on that account at this particular time, well adapted to support the holy human nature under his awful sufferings just at hand. They were no less adapted to direct the views, and comfort the hearts of his sorrowing disciples, while they sung of the sufferings of their master, they sung also of his glory that should follow. Here then we have an *old hymn*, the express end of which, is to praise God—adapted to the celebration of Israel's de

liverance out of Egypt. Highly expressive of the sufferings of Christ, and his glory that should follow, and therefore, equally adapted to celebrate the spiritual deliverance of God's elect, by the death of Christ. Then it was suitable both for the passover and the Lord's supper. I will not say that this is enough to convince to a certainty that it was this hymn and no other which they sung, but until our opponents bring something more convincing in favor of another, I will hold that this was it.

And now if Christ did not use any new hymns on this particular occasion of instituting and dispensing the first gospel ordinance, is not the inference just, that he did not deem new hymns to be necessary to the new dispensation. If they were, we would be tempted to think that now was the time. If necessary to any new testament ordinance, surely they would be so to the Lord's supper, and if to it, surely to the first dispensation of it. For there would be the same reasons for it then, that would be for it ever after, and if new hymns were to be made, must not Christ, or his inspired Apostles be the maker? He is the ordainer of all the other gospel institutions, and why not of this? He is lord of his own house. But he did not himself, nor by his apostles, either now, or afterwards make any new hymn, and therefore, they were not necessary, and it might be proved that this will support the conclusion, that they are not *lawful*.

Again, if Christ *on this occasion* used old hymns, which could be none other than the church had been using and were in authority at the time, and which is therefore, noticed by the sacred writers as an ordinary thing, then are they both suitable and necessary to accompany the celebration of new testament ordinances. Christ dismissed the passover, its work was done, as also that of all the typical ordinances together, the great anti-type was come, and the new testament passover was that night to be taken from the flock and sacrificed. But he retained the psalms. Their work was not done. They were not given when the ceremonial law was given, neither were they taken away when it was set aside. EGO.

ART. VI. *Persecuting Spirit of Irish Popery.*

In the London Record of October 5th, we find a letter from the Rev. M. Hobart Seymour, curate of Ballinrobe, in the county of Mayo, in Ireland, to the Bishop of London, in relation to the persecution of Protestants, and especially of converts from Popery, by the Irish Catholic priests. Mr. S. gives the three following facts as specimens of numerous others which came under his *personal observation*.

1. I once had a parishioner whose name was D——, a Roman Catholic schoolmaster, who had been led by the reading of the scriptures to see the errors of the Church of Rome. He had frequently attended privately upon me for spiritual instruction, and had avowed his intention of attending openly at the parish church. As soon as this intention became known, there was a notice posted by night on his house, stating that if he did not forthwith cease from reading the scriptures, and immediately return to mass, he should be visited and shot; and the notice went on to state that he should be treated in precisely the same way as a man named M——, had been treated a short time before. That man, who was a Protestant, was shot dead in the cool of the evening, while sitting happily with his wife and children round his own fireside? This original notice, which was brought to me at the time, is still in my possession.

2. I had a parishioner named M——, a Roman Catholic farmer, who expressed his intention, together with all his family, of withdrawing

from the Church of Rome, and attending in future upon the services of the parish church. I had frequent conversations with him on the subject; but when his intention became known, attempts were made to intimidate him. One morning early, as he opened his door, the very first object that met his eye was his grave already made to the size and shape of a coffin at his own threshold. Awful as was this significant threat, he visited me that very day, and avowed his resolve to persevere. The result was, that in a few nights afterwards his house was broken open by a large gang, who shattered to atoms every article of property in his house; beat his wife and children; and after baptizing him again, as they called it, back into the Church of Rome, left him nearly dead from the horrid usage he received at their hands. One of the party was apprehended, and tried at the assizes before Judge Vandeleur and transported.

3. I know a man, named C——, a Roman Catholic schoolmaster, who was led by his reading the scriptures, to avow a change in his religious sentiments. He accordingly felt it a duty to attend, as a Protestant, at his parish church. The very first day he left his home to attend that church—on the Sabbath day, when all evil passions might well be stilled in its holy hours of worship, at the full noon-tide hour, and in the full blaze of day—for it was just twelve o'clock—on the King's high-road leading to the parish church, he was way-laid, and deliberately and horribly murdered! Nor was this all of the horrid tragedy, for a crowd assembled shortly afterwards, and the parish priest attended, and having taken some Protestant books from his pockets, he held them up in the presence of the people, and declared that the murder was a just judgment from heaven upon the man, for having such books in his possession! These particulars were proved on the inquest, and as the horrible affair occurred in a parish of which I was the curate, I can write, as I now write, from personal knowledge.

After relating these facts, Mr. S. thus proceeds:

These facts, my lord, have, with hundreds of others, come under my own personal observation—*quæque ipsa miserrima vidi*. The unhappy victims were my own parishioners; I was intimately acquainted with all the particulars, and I now publicly offer to have them proved before any suitable tribunal in the kingdom.

But it must not be supposed—as is too generally believed—that the great body of the Roman Catholic peasantry are willing perpetrators of these horrors, which make us blush for our country, and make appalled humanity shrink shuddering away. They are impelled to them by an iron despotism, which they deem as odious as it is irresistible, and which I shall now endeavor to describe to your Lordship.

The social state of the lower orders in Ireland is an anomaly. In every village or neighborhood there is a small knot or cabal of all the most factious and disaffected in the vicinity. They are generally but very few in number, seldom being so much as a twentieth portion of the population, but they possess extraordinary power by unity of purpose, over the whole population. This knot or cabal, is composed of various materials—some persons who conceive themselves aggrieved by some government prosecution—others who feel themselves injured by some needy landlords—some again, who are descended from ancient families and are looking to the forfeited estates, and others who forecast the same objects, hoping vaguely to obtain something in the general confusion. To these are to be added persons whose mistaken notion of Irish independence, and dreams of patriotism, lead them into the verge of disaffection, and others whose religious zeal incites to the expulsion of heresy, and the exaltation of their church; and a few reckless and daring spirits, who have nothing to lose, and every thing to gain, in a national convulsion. All

these various persons are combined in discontent, and are in cabal with factious and ill-affected intentions in every neighborhood; and around this knot or cabal, as a nucleus, all the evil passions of the people rally. The priest of the parish is generally, by a sort of common consent, the nominal head of these persons; an arrangement of considerable importance to them, as while it adds the sanction of religion to their actions, it removes those petty rivalries and dissensions that would otherwise exist among themselves. The object which these persons have in view, is a vague and undefined expectation of making this island independent of England, and of such a revolution or convulsion as will alter the present system of property altogether, and bring in some halcyon state, in which neither rent, nor taxes, nor tithes, will so much as be named among them; and the spirit that actuates all their proceedings is a burning hatred against England—against government—against landlords—against Protestants.

The parish priest has naturally an immense influence over these persons, and they are the principal means by which he governs the people. Their power is perfectly well understood by the people, who find by experience that their vengeance is more rapid, as well as more certain, than the laws of the land, and who, therefore dare not breathe a sentiment or commit an act which is likely to draw upon their heads swift and fearful vengeance. By this system of terror, these knots or cabals have obtained an irresistible influence over the peasantry, who dare not think for themselves or act for themselves in any thing that may interest those persons; so that there is an iron chain flung over the minds and bodies of the people on the subject of religion; for they feel perfectly convinced that by any tendency to conform they would ensure the hostility of the priest, and the consequent vengeance of those who act as his satellites; and thus it is, as many of this poor and oppressed people have personally told me, that a vast body of the population remain externally in the Church of Rome, through fear of that vengeance which is too sure to pursue all who abandon her communion.

I shall state a fact to illustrate this:

It is but a very short time since I was sent for to visit an aged woman on her death-bed: she had always been deemed a Roman Catholic, and I ever regarded her as such. I visited her, of course, and I asked her how it was that she, being a Roman Catholic, should have desired to speak with me in dying? She told me that although she was generally believed to be a Roman Catholic, yet that she was really a Protestant; and that she had been such, secretly, for sixteen years! Two adult females, members of her family, were the only persons present, and they stated that it had been long the same way with themselves; to the eye of the world they were Roman Catholics, but in their own house and private circle they had for many years been Protestants. I expressed my surprise that they, professing thus to have held so long the blessed truth of the Gospel, should have concealed it from me and from the world. Upon which the withered and dying woman raised herself in her bed with an effort, and with eyes in tears, and uplifted hands, declared that she had kept it secret, because she feared that if it were known, her family would be murdered or otherwise injured! She died immediately afterwards, and her family have left the neighborhood.

No one can conceive, who has not had an opportunity for personal knowledge, the fierce and horrid language which is too often uttered by the priests against every one who shows a tendency to abandon the Church of Rome; and your lordship would be shocked to your most inmost soul to hear the horrid and malignant curses which are often pronounced from the chapel altars in our country parishes against such persons. Nor, I grieve to say it, are they idle and powerless curses; for

those knots or cabals, which I have already described, are ever ready to fulfil them to the letter.

I shall illustrate this by a fact:

I knew a man named H——, who was originally a Roman Catholic, who had braved with the spirit of a martyr the hostility of the priest by embracing Protestant principles. The priest who is one of the clergy under the authority of Dr. M'Hale, who was a prophet of that school to which I have referred, and in one of his prophetic raptures denounced poor H—— by name from the chapel altar, and uttered a prophecy that, as a judgment of heaven for his apostacy, his property should be under a curse, and would pine away in afflictions and losses! A few short days had scarcely rolled away when the fulfilment of this prediction commenced: his cow sickened and died, and in a few days more his second cow sickened and died, and left the poor sufferer upon the verge of beggary! The fact is, that the satellites of the priest, taking the hint from the prediction, poisoned the cows, and thereby fulfilled the prophecy—confirming the influence of the priest—and deterred others from the example of abandoning the Church of Rome.

Your Lordship will at once perceive that this is a species of persecution infinitely more effective than the severest penal enactments against the extension of the religion of the Established Church, and that it is a despotism over the conscience of men which should not be tolerated in any land for an hour. In England a man may pass from the church to the chapel, and change the Presbyterian for the Episcopalian form of worship, without danger to his life, or his family, or his property; but in Ireland it has become a matter of life and death: * * * *

Whether I shall be deemed guilty or not guilty herein, I shall confess it before God and my country, and do now avow it to your Lordship, that for the last five years I have not asked any Roman Catholic to renounce the Church of Rome. I have preached to them the Gospel of Jesus Christ; I have, as far as God hath given to me the light of his truth, set that before their minds—but though I have seen them perishing around me, I have not called on them to abandon the Church of Rome, because I knew that they could not do so without being exposed to the malignant and virulent persecution of the priests and their emissaries. I could not bring myself to expose them and theirs to insults and injury in both person and property. I knew that they would be pointed at and sneered at in our streets—insulted at our markets—beaten at our fairs—reduced by combinations against them to undeserved poverty,—and finally perhaps, obliged to seal their testimony with their blood. Oh, my Lord, it is our God alone who knoweth how many martyrs—I use the word in full consciousness of its import—have been immolated in Ireland as victims at the shrines of the priesthood of the Church of Rome.

May the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, prove himself to me as a Father of Mercies, and forgive me if I have acted wrong in this matter, and proved unfaithful to his cause. Truly there was a time when asked many, and, by God's help, prevailed on many, to abandon the Church of Rome; but when I witnessed the fearful consequences—the poverty, the insults, the sufferings, the blood—my heart struggled against my head, and I could not bring myself to urge men to expose themselves to trials which no man whose heart was not cold as marble and hard as flint, could witness without bleeding for the sufferers.

ART. VII. *The Pernicious effects of Sir Walter Scott's Novels.*

It is matter both of surprise and regret that I so frequently find the Waverly novels in Christian families. I am fully aware that they are

countenanced upon the ground of their containing much useful historical knowledge, as well as being in a great measure free from the profanity and licentiousness which is constantly met with in novels of the by-gone ages.

As regards the historical knowledge which is to be met with in the Waverly novels, it is at best but a mixture of ideal fancy and fact, precluding the possibility of the reader, who is unacquainted with history, forming a right judgment between the truth and falsehood, and hence, so far from imparting knowledge, they must lead to erroneous impressions. And to which, I strongly suspect little information is *sought* for by most novel readers, and that the *narrative* is the all-engrossing topic of their thoughts and attention; but granting that knowledge is to be gained from the perusal of such works, how soon is it lost amidst the affecting scenes of the hero of the romance; how soon for instance is all the beautiful topical scenery in Waverly lost sight of in the doleful end of Vich Ian Vohr, and in the distressing musings of her sister Flora, who is described as engaged in making his shroud.

Again: it is said by the advocates of novel reading, that the lives of the most profligate murderers, &c., are held up as a warning beacon to others, and hence much good may arise to the reader. But if such is the intention of the author, he takes the most effective means for defeating his views; for instead of representing their characters in the dark and disgraceful colours which their conduct calls for, they generally substitute vice for virtue, breach of promise for good faith, and clothe them with so many fancied excellencies, that instead of the reader feeling a just indignation and detestation of their crimes, he is led to feel a deep and impassioned interest in their behalf. I appeal to those persons who have read the Heart of Midlothian, Rob Roy, &c., whether such is not the case.

It is true, there is not that licentious spirit in so great a degree in Sir Walter Scott's novels as is to be found in the generality of such publications, but he is guilty of that which (to my mind at least) is as bad—gross misapplications, if not perversions, of Holy Writ. But not only does he pervert sacred lore, but he treats, in many instances, *history* in the same manner; he caricatures in the most disgusting manner, honest feeling and religious principle, and would lead many to imagine that those godly men, (however some may think them misguided,) who fell in the unhappy religious wars in Scotland, were little better than loose fanatics and superannuated tools.

I would therefore desire to raise my voice, however feeble, against the admission of Sir Walter Scott's novels into Christian families, and I do most earnestly entreat of Christian parents who wish to preserve their children's minds in a pure and healthy state, and who desire to keep them "unspotted from the world" and to bring them up in the "nurture and admonition of the Lord," to beware how they put such works into their hands; as I am well persuaded (alas! by personal experience) that the evil effects arising from the perusal of one novel, counteracts the good effects of twenty sermons: the novel reader lives in a fancied world of his own, without sorrow and without pain, where all is happiness and peace; and consequently, when REAL misfortune drags him down from his visionary world, and compels him to view things as they REALLY ARE, and reminds him that he is but man, he murmurs against the providence of God, repines at his station, becomes irritated with all around him, neglects the duties which he owes to his God, his country, and to himself; lives in misery, and oftentimes dies in wo; and all this arises from the mischievous habit of novel reading.

Christian parents! you may perhaps think this picture is overwrought, but I assure you it is not; I have had cases come under my own person-

al observation, in which the above-named fearful truths have been strikingly illustrated. I have known ladies in the highest grade of society, who, from the love of the marvellous, have given themselves up to reading novels, fraught with supernatural absurdities, in which, however, after a time, they have put such *implicit* faith as to produce in them so great a degree of nervous excitement, that nothing would induce them to go into their own chamber without a servant after dark. Others, again, I have known whose tempers and habits have been completely ruined by that pernicious habit. But I must conclude, and have only to beseech your readers if they desire the welfare, happiness, and peace of themselves and families in this world, and the salvation of their immortal souls in the next, to keep from *them* ALL NOVELS. S. S.

P. S.—I cannot forbear appending the following extract which I lately transcribed from a highly esteemed novel—"the History of Eleanor was originally began, some years since, to draw off her mind from dwelling too poignantly on a recent calamity, by endeavouring to lose in the regions of fiction the overwhelming sorrows of real misfortune; it was continued at intervals to amuse the languor of a sick chamber."

Can any thing be more unsuitable than such sentiments as these; when the Almighty calls us by His rod of mercy and commands us "to be still and know that he is God," we are here taught to refuse to listen to His voice by plunging into ideal scenes. Christians, meditate on these things; it can require no eloquence of mine to show you the awful impiety of such sentiments.—(*London*) *Christian Guardian*.

ART. VIII. *Miscellaneous Items.*

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY N. Y.—This Seminary, as we before announced, is a New-school affair, and one, as we understand, which is regarded with peculiar approbation by the leaders in New-Haven, as manifestly designed to stand forth as the rival of Princeton. The only Professor yet successfully appointed is Justin Edwards D. D. as Professor of Systematic Theology. The following gentlemen being trustees of the institution have appointed themselves Lecturers; viz: Erskin Mason on Ecclesiastical History; Ichabod S. Spencer on the Ecclesiastical History of the Bible; Thomas H. Skinner D. D. on Sacred Rhetoric; Thomas McAuley D. D. on Pastoral Theology, and Henry White, on Church Government. Ordinance of more formidable calibre must be mounted before we entertain serious apprehension for the fate of Princeton.—*Presbyterian*.

It is a singular fact that the Protestant Bishop of Norwich, England, is married to a papist, who enjoys the privilege of having her private confessor to reside with her in the Bishop's house. A liberal Bishop truly.—*Ibid*.

Mr. Burchard, so well known as a prime mover in the spurious revivals in Western New-York, is carrying disorder and ruin through the churches in Vermont. A strong reaction, however, is now taking place.—*Ibid*.

CONGR. SS.—The late daring violation of the holy Sabbath by the Congress of the United States, may be justly regarded as one of the most lamentable occurrences of the present time. All the circumstances connected with it are disgraceful to the nation and dishonouring to God; and such conduct in the legislators of a great nation should be emphatically reprobated. If the rulers of the people thus cast contempt on a divine institution, we may soon expect a marked deterioration of public morals:—and surely God will visit us for these things.—*Ibid*.

AN EXCELLENT BEGINNING.—Mr. Finney and Mr. Leavitt with four others, have formed themselves into a Congregational Association, in the city of New-York. They have at length laid aside the *garb* of Presbyterianism in which they have so long been habited; and henceforth, we have real pleasure in announcing, that neither Mr. Finney nor the Editor of the New-York Evangelist, are any longer even Presbyterians in name. Well would it be for our Church if before the next Assembly, all who are with them in spirit were with them in the change.—*Ibid*.

SNEERING.—Mr. Leavitt, of the New-York Evangelist, referring to Dr. Wilson's intention of prosecuting his appeal, says: "So Dr. Beecher's book of 'Explanations,' by which he hoped to make the New-England divinity of his sermons harmonize with triangular theology, does not answer after all." Two things are here observable: Mr. Leavitt being judge, it is impossible for Dr. Beecher to reconcile his views with the Confession of Faith, and he taunts him for the attempt; and then again, how boldly Mr. Leavitt ridicules Calvinism, since he has honestly laid aside his mask.—*Ibid*.

SANDWICH ISLANDS.—The efforts of the Missionaries at the Sandwich Islands, to introduce education and the arts of civilized life, have been very successful during the past year. A newspaper in the native tongue has been established at Honolulu, and it promises to be of great usefulness. There is also another paper published at Mani. There are now on the Islands, forty-one missionaries, and twenty-one teachers, printers, physicians, &c. whose stations embrace a population of 76,141 people. There are several hundred native teachers employed in different parts of the islands who have received instruction from the missionaries, and are supported by the chiefs. Forty-two different works have been translated and printed.

ART. IX. *Ecclesiastical Proceedings.*

CASE OF JOHN R. M'DOWALL.—The third Presbytery of New-York after having been occupied for a considerable time past, on the trial of the Rev. John R. M'Dowall, came on Wednesday evening last to a decision in his case. We have now; only space to say, that Mr. M'Dowall was con-

victed, unanimously, (with a single dissenting voice on the second charge) of the following charges preferred against him by a committee of Presbytery, on the ground of common fame, and sustained by oral and documentary testimony at great length, viz. I. Unchristian and unministerial conduct. II. Intentional misrepresentation. III. Slander. Under the first charge, there were three specifications, one of which was sustained. Under the second charge there were originally nine specifications, but one was withdrawn, a good deal of diversity of opinion existed as to some of these specifications; some votes were given in the negative, and others were recorded *non liquet*, but the general charge was sustained. Under the third charge there were at first eight specifications, but two were withdrawn. The Presbytery thereupon came (with four dissenting voices) to the following decision in the case.

The Presbytery, before proceeding to express their ultimate decision in this case, deem it proper to record their regret that they were laid under the necessity of proceeding in the absence of the accused; but this necessity having been imposed by himself, the Presbytery think that he has no cause for complaint. And further they do judge and determine that his conduct, first in abruptly leaving the court; secondly, in twice refusing to accept the Presbytery's invitation to him to return, together with his reasons for refusal; and thirdly in prosecuting his defence in the public papers while the Presbytery were engaged in investigating charges against him, on matters contained in the previous part of that defence, is, in a high degree, contumacious. The Presbytery also judge, that notwithstanding the absence of Mr. M'Dowall, the evidence being in great part documentary, and derived from his own publications, and the witnesses being well known as christians of unblemished reputation, and their testimony perfectly concurring in all material points, the merits of the case have been, on the whole, fairly exhibited.

Therefore, on the ground of the preceding decisions, and of the charges which have been sustained against him, the Presbytery resolve,

That the said John R. M'Dowall be, and he hereby is, suspended from the exercise of all the functions of the gospel ministry, until he shall give satisfactory evidence of repentance in the particulars of which he has been convicted.

THE CASE OF MR. TRUAIR.—*Extract from the Minutes of the Presbytery of New-York, at their session Oct. 12, 1831.*—Whereas the Rev. John Truair has been guilty of conduct utterly inconsistent with the rectitude and purity of the Gospel ministry, and has been convicted thereof, after a patient investigation of the charges, during which and subsequently he has been furnished with every opportunity and facility of self-vindication; whereas the said John Truair has renounced the authority and contumaciously denied the right of his co-presbyters to sit in judgment on his conduct; whereas the Presbytery for the cause and after the investigation aforesaid, and at their sessions in November, 1830, did suspend him from the functions of his office, admonishing him at the same time, that they should feel themselves constrained to adopt further measures in his case, unless he gave evidence of repentance; and, whereas the Presbytery after having appointed a committee to correspond with Mr. Truair, and solemnly and affectionately exhort him to a due sense of his wickedness, and having waited with great forbearance, and in vain for some indications of conviction in their fallen brother;

Therefore, resolved unanimously, that John Truair, of the Presbytery of New-York, and now a resident in West Hampton, Massachusetts, be, and he hereby is *deposed* from the office of the Gospel Ministry, and excommunicated from the visible church.

2. Resolved, that a copy of the preceding preamble and resolution be transmitted to Mr. Truair, and also to the Hampton Association, and that the stated clerk of the Presbytery authorize that Association to publish the same.

A true copy.

Attest, ELIAS W. CRANE.

Stated Clerk of the Presbytery of New-York.

CHARLESTON PRESBYTERY ON SLAVERY.—The following is an extract from the Minutes of Charleston Union Presbytery at their meeting on the 7th April, 1836.

With reference to the relation which the church sustains to the Institution of Slavery, and to the possibility of attempts to agitate the question in the next General Assembly, this Presbytery deem it expedient to state explicitly the principles which they maintain, and the course which will be pursued by their Commissioners in the Assembly. It is a principle which meets the views of this body, that slavery as it exists among us is a *political Institution*, with which Ecclesiastical Judicatories have not the smallest right to interfere: and in relation to which any such interference, especially at the present momentous crisis, would be morally wrong and fraught with the most dangerous and pernicious consequences. Should any attempt be made to discuss this subject, our Commissioners are expected to meet it at the very threshold, and to oppose to the utmost of their power the introduction of any report, memorial, or document, which may be the occasion of agitating this question in any form. And it is further expected that our Commissioners, should the case require it, will distinctly avow our full conviction of the truth of the principles which we hold in relation to this subject, and our resolute determination to abide by them, whatever may be the issue; that it may appear that the sentiments which we maintain, in common with Christians at the South, of every denomination, are sentiments which so fully approve themselves to our *consciences*, are so identified with our solemn convictions of duty, that we should maintain them under any circumstances; and at the same time the peculiar circumstances in which we are placed, constitute an imperious necessity that we should act in accordance with these principles, and make it impossible for us to yield any thing in a matter which concerns not merely our personal interests, but the cause of Christ, and the peace, if not the very existence of the Southern community.

Should our Commissioners fail of accomplishing this object, it is expected that they will withdraw from the Assembly, with becoming dignity; not willing to be associated with a body of men who denounce the ministers and members of Southern churches as pirates and men stealers, or who co-operate with those who thus denounce them.

In conclusion this Presbytery would suggest to their Commissioners the expediency of conferring with the Commissioners from other Southern Presbyteries, that there may be a common understanding between them as to the course most suitable to be pursued at this crisis, and on this absorbing question. And may that wisdom which is from above, which is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, and easy to be entreated, be their guide in managing the important trust committed to their hands.

Resolved, That this expression of our views be signed by the Moderator and Clerk—that a copy be given to each of our Commissioners to the General Assembly, and that it be published in the Charleston Observer.

E. T. BUIST, Moderator.

B. GILDERSLEEVE, Temporary Clerk.

INDEX.

<p style="text-align: center;">A</p> <p>Apostasy, cause of. 10, 33, 72</p> <p>An address by the Associate Synod of Original Seceders, 18, 53</p> <p>Abraham commanded to sacrifice Isaac, 75, 109</p> <p>Appeal of Dr. Junkin, 69</p> <p>Assembly of Divines, Westminster, 144</p> <p>Albany, Presbytery of 163</p> <p>Alleghany, Presbytery of 175</p> <p>Act for a fast, 179</p> <p>Appointments, scale of, 183</p> <p>Atonement, Jenkyn on, 215</p> <p>Attack on Bassa Cove, 251</p> <p>A suggestion respecting unanimity, 285</p> <p>Associate Reformed Synod of the north, 313</p> <p>A letter from theological students in Scotland, 345</p> <p style="text-align: center;">B</p> <p>Board of managers of the Theological Seminary, report of, 64</p> <p>Barnes, case of, 86</p> <p>Beecher, trial of Dr. 92</p> <p>Baptism, mode of, 229, 357</p> <p>Baptism, remarks on mode of, 281</p> <p>Baptized youth, remarks in relation to, 321</p> <p style="text-align: center;">C</p> <p>Cause of apostasy, 10, 33, 72</p> <p>Convention at Pittsburgh, 30, 44</p> <p>Case of Mr. Barnes, 86</p> <p>Correspondents, to, 96, 320</p> <p>Controversy, the wine, 123</p> <p>Christian communion, nature of, 140</p> <p>Cambridge, Presbytery of, 164</p> <p>Carolinas, Presbytery of, 165</p> <p>Chartiers, Presbytery of, 171</p> <p>Cross, enemies of, 193</p> <p>Children, education of, 199</p> <p>Criticism on the Hebrew word <i>Chasid</i>, 205</p> <p>Christian world unmasked, 244, 275, 305, 336, 365</p> <p>Case of Chamber street church, 254</p> <p>Church of Rome, doctrines of, 321</p> <p>Creeds and confessions, the necessity of, 349</p> <p style="text-align: center;">D</p> <p>Death and burial of Sarah, 66, 104</p> <p>Declaration of Sentiment, 118</p> <p>Department of Soane and Loire, revival in, 149</p> <p>D. Murphy, Treasurer, report of, 168</p> <p>Dwight Dr. errors of, 239, 271</p> <p>Decline of Popery, 288</p> <p>Dick's Lectures on Theology, 299, 331</p> <p>Doctrines of the Church of Rome, 320</p> <p>Defection of the United Secession Church, 361</p> <p style="text-align: center;">E</p> <p>Extracts from the memoir of Dr. Payson, 157</p> <p>Enemies of the cross, 183</p> <p>Ecclesiastical proceedings, 218, 381</p> <p>Errors of Dr. Dwight, &c., 239, 271</p> <p>Eastern China, 287</p> <p>Europe, 289</p> <p style="text-align: center;">F</p> <p>France, suicide in, 255</p> <p>Funeral among the natives, 351</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">G</p> <p>General assembly, 31, 56</p> <p style="text-align: center;">H</p> <p>Holy Spirit, love of, 3, 38, 83</p> <p>Hebrew word <i>chasiid</i>, criticism on, 205</p> <p>Hearing the word, 225</p> <p>Hebrew, the word, its origin and import, 268</p> <p style="text-align: center;">I</p> <p>Isaac, Abraham commanded to sacrifice, 75, 109</p> <p>Increase of Popery, 96</p> <p>Illustrations of scripture, 114, 211</p> <p>Investigation of truth, 292</p> <p>Immersion not the scripture mode of Baptism, 289, 357</p> <p>Irish Popery, persecuting spirit of, 376</p> <p>Inquiry, the associate society of, 285</p> <p>Inquiry, 286</p> <p style="text-align: center;">J</p> <p>Junkin, Dr's. appeal, 69</p> <p>Jubilee of the Reformation, 190</p> <p>Jenkyn on the atonement, 215</p> <p style="text-align: center;">L</p> <p>Love of the Holy Spirit, 3, 38, 83</p> <p>Letter to Professor Stuart, 129</p> <p>Luther's opinion of the Psalms, 192</p> <p>Letter from theological students in Scotland, 345</p> <p style="text-align: center;">M</p> <p>Monitor, affairs of, 32</p> <p>Minutes of Synod, 161</p> <p>Niami, Presbytery of, 162</p> <p>Muskingum, Presbytery of, 160</p> <p>Meditation on the religious education of children, 199</p> <p>Moral influence of Universalism, 213</p> <p>Missions, news from, 232</p> <p>Medical Writers, 337, 333</p> <p>More union, 350</p> <p>Music sacred, 350</p> <p>Matthew xvii. 30, remarks on, 373</p> <p>Miscellaneous items, 381</p> <p style="text-align: center;">N</p> <p>Nature of christian communion, 140</p> <p>Notices, 223, 320</p> <p>News from missions, 254</p> <p>North Africa and Northern Asia, 287</p> <p>Necessity of creeds and confessions, 349</p> <p>Natives, funeral among, 351</p> <p style="text-align: center;">O</p> <p>On searching the scriptures, 149</p> <p>Original seceders, 173, 174, 181, 182</p> <p>On the investigation of truth, 292</p> <p>Obituary, 224</p> <p>On hearing the word, 225</p> <p>On the nature and extent of the obligation assumed in religious covenanting, 257</p> <p>Oaths, 266</p> <p>Origin and import of the word <i>Hebrew</i>, 268</p> <p>On the observance of sacramental fasts, 282</p> <p>Oberlin institute, 319</p>
--	---

P

Principles of the Church of Scotland, a vindication of. 18, 53

Pittsburgh convention. 30, 44

Psalmody in New England. 36

Popery, increase of. 96

Patience, on. 127

Present moral state of the world. 150

Payson Dr., extracts from the memoir of. 157

Providences, remarkable. 159

Presbytery of Miami. 162

 " of Albany. 163

 " of Cambridge. 164

 " of the Carolinas. 165

 " of Philadelphia. 167

 " of Muskingum. 169

 " of Ohio. 170

 " of Chartiers. 171

 " of Allegany. 175

Psalms, Luther's opinion of. 192

Prescriptions. 251

Popery, decline of. 2-8

Persecuting spirit of Irish Popery. 376

Presbytery of Charleston on Slavery. 382

Q

Queries. 352

Question. 117

R

Report of the board of managers of Theological Seminary. 60

Review of Somerville on the use of the psalms. 97

Rev. Professor Stuart, letter to. 129

Revival in the department of Soane and Loire. 140

Religion of the Russians. 152

Russians, the religion of. 152

Rev. Leigh Richmond's mother. 155

Remarkable providences. 159

Report of D. Murphy. 162

 " H. H. Blair. 162

 " D. Houston. 170

 " Treasurer of bible society. 179

 " Committee on the funds. 182

 " Committee on missions. 1-4

 " Committee on slavery. 185

Reformation, jubilee of. 190

Religious education of children. 190

Religious covenanting, on the obligations assumed in. 257

Remarks on the mode of baptism. 294

Review of Dick's lectures. 299, 331

Remarks in relation to baptized youth. 321

Remarks on Matthew xxvi. 30. 373

S

Something new. 64, 96

Sarah, death and burial of. 66, 94

Somerville on the use of psalms, review of. 97

Sentiment, declaration of, by the Ohio anti-slavery convention. 118

Summary. 122, 159

Sickness, the christian in. 125

Searching the scriptures. 147

Sandwich Islands mission. 153

Synod, minutes of. 161

Sub. Synods. 170

Statistical tables. 187, 190

Scale of appointments. 183

Swearing allegiance to Christ a duty. 207, 235

Sulcis in France. 255

Sacramental fasts, observance of. 257

South Africa. 267

Southern Asia. 268

Sacred music. 250

Supplement to the paper headed "Immersion not the scripture mode of baptism." 357

Scott's novels, pernicious effects of. 379

Slavery, Charleston Presbytery on. 382

T

The love of the Holy Spirit. 3, 36, 53

The vindication of the principles of the Church of Scotland. 18, 53

The Sabbath Magazine. 26

Thoughts on the temper and employment of the Lord's day. 38

Trial of Dr. Beecher. 92

To correspondents. 96

The christian in sickness. 125

The wine controversy. 123

Theological Seminary. 172, 173

Truth, investigation of. 202

The swearing of allegiance to Christ. 207, 235

The word, on the hearing of. 225

The christian world unmasked. 244, 275, 306, 338, 365

The origin and import of the word *Hebrew*. 269

The associate society of enquiry. 265

The associate reformed Synod. 313

The pernicious effects of Scott's novels. 379

The case of John R. McDowall. 381

The case of Mr. Truair. 382

U

Universalism, moral influence of. 213

Unanimity, a suggestion respecting. 265

United States. 268

United Secession Church, defection of. 361

W

Wine controversy. 123

Westminster assembly of divines. 144

World, christian, unmasked. 244, 275, 306, 338, 365

Writers, medical. 327, 353